Early Christianity

Mohr Siebeck

Editorial

"Recalled to Life": When Charles Dickens penned this phrase he was referring both to scientific advances of his day – Erasmus Darwin, Luigi Galvani, Alexander von Humboldt – and to his conviction that love and devotion can bring about individual and social (i.e., French revolution) transformation. Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley explored the enviable and deleterious aspects of these trends with the Frankenstein myth. The essays of this issue share with Dickens's statement both its representation of scientific advancements of the time ("the best" and "worst of") and its generally hopeful application of regeneration, in this case, to ancient texts.

The issue begins with John S. Kloppenborg's comparative historiographical study entitled "Fiscal Aspects of Paul's Collection for Jerusalem." Without detracting from their distinctiveness, Kloppenborg refutes *sui generis* explanations of early Christian phenomena by engaging scientific developments in papyrology and epigraphy to contextualize early Christian donative practices. He compares Paul's collection for the poor in Jerusalem with the fiscal practices of ancient Greek cities and private associations, demonstrating some level of commonality. The second essay, likewise, participates in comparative historiography. Entitled "Paul and Plutarch on Religion," Ronald Charles's study places the voice of Paul, in his letter to the Romans, alongside the voice of Plutarch, in his treatise *De superstitione.* In so doing, two *topoi* emerge: fear of God and true religion. In the essay entitled "1 Clement, Judaism, and the Jews," James Carleton Paget brings into association a few acknowledged data points in order to establish a historical background for 1 Clement. Specifically, he explores whether 1 Clement might belong to discussions of Jewish-Christian relations in Rome during the late first and early second centuries. According to Suetonius, Claudius expelled Jews from the city *impulsore Chresto* in 49 CE (*Claud.* 25.4), leaving a community once mixed, with predominantly gentile Christians. Paul's letter to the Romans (esp. ch. 11) may also point to this status of gentile Christians in Rome. First Clement, written to the church in Corinth by the church in Rome, treats the ousting of one group of presbyters by usurpers. Exempla from Jewish history comprise the grist of the argument – as if it goes without saying that Christians are the rightful heirs of this heritage. Carleton Paget argues that a context of gentile Christianity in Rome explains Clement's unapologetic cooptation of the Jewish scriptures for Christians. Similarly, Zachary B. Smith's essay "Of Firstfruits and Social Fixtures" argues that a broader

Roman social context aids our understanding of the community behind the Didache. According to Smith, provision for prophets in Did. 13 attempts to reconcile the patronage system with certain Torah guidelines on the topics of social hierarchy, community management, and leadership. Returning to the theme of comparison, George M. Hollenback's brief piece entitled "An Overlooked Backdrop to the Coining of ἀρσενο-κοίτης" examines the controversial meaning of this word in 1 Cor 6:9 and 1 Tim 1:10 in view of the similar expression in older legal contracts of Roman Egypt. Peter J. Williams presents the Greek New Testament produced at Tyndale House and Jennifer Knust sets AnneMarie Luijendijk's *Forbidden Oracles? The Gospel of the Lots of Mary* in the context of discussions about late antique divination, the history of the codex, developing notions of scripture, and daily life in Christian Egypt.

Mary Shelley identified change as painful: "Nothing is so painful to the human mind as a great and sudden change." We might wonder whether this is not an apt reminder for us today. Requiring that we remain open-minded, change – based on reliable scientific advancement together with hope – offers the possibility of "recalling to life." The essays of this issue make headway toward this goal. *Sic iter ad astra* (Vergil, *Aen*. 9.641).

Chicago   Clare K. Rothschild

John S. Kloppenborg

Fiscal Aspects of Paul's Collection for Jerusalem

Die Kollekte des Paulus für „die Armen unter den Heiligen in Jerusalem" wird zumeist ohne hinreichende Rücksicht auf die Abgabenpraxis in den Städten und kleinen Vereinen des griechischen Ostens betrachtet. Dieser Artikel trägt zusammen, was über die Geldbeschaffung und -verwendung anderer Gruppen in dieser Zeit bekannt ist, und stellt die damit verbundenen Probleme dar. Vor diesem Hintergrund erscheint die Kollekte des Paulus in einem anderen Licht, in dem die besonderen Schwierigkeiten und Herausforderungen dieser Sammlung besser zu verstehen sind, wobei sich Fragen ergeben, die wohl die meisten Griechen gestellt hätten, die von den Exegeten der paulinischen Literatur aber bislang übersehen wurden. Dabei zeigt sich, dass die paulinische Kollekte am ehesten mit der ἐπίδοσις zu vergleichen ist, einer Praxis von Städten und Vereinen zur Beschaffung von Geldmitteln für außerordentliche Projekte, die anders als das Patronatsverhältnis zur Beteiligung aller Mitglieder einer Bürgerschaft oder Vereinigung beitrug, indem von jedem Einzelnen nur kleine Beiträge erwartet wurden.

Keywords: collection for the saints, associations, fiscal practices of Greek cities, ἐπιδόσεις

One of the significant contributions that contemporary papyrology and epigraphy can make to the study of the early Christ groups is to contextualize or "normalize" some of their practices. Past scholarship has shown a strong tendency to treat certain practices of early Christ groups as though they were singular or unusual without paying attention to possible *comparanda*, or if *comparanda* were adduced at all, it was to demonstrate precisely how different and "unique" were Christ groups. Such an approach owes more to theological triumphalism than to sound historiography and misses the critical point of comparative historiography that well-chosen *comparanda* serve to illumine historical data without thereby detracting from their particularity.

This paper will examine the collection "for the poor of the holy ones of Jerusalem" from the perspective of the fiscal practices of both Greek poleis and the private associations – cult groups, occupational guilds, athletic guilds, diasporic associations, neighborhood clubs, and *collegia domesti-*

ca – which could be found in every city of the empire and in many towns and villages.[1] Because we have an unusually large dossier of fiscal practices relating both to cities and to associations, this paper will employ our knowledge of those practices heuristically, to raise questions about the fiscal practices of early Christ groups.

1 *Status Quaestionis*

Most of the discussion of 1 Cor 16:1–4, Gal 2:10, 2 Cor 8–9 and Rom 15:25–28 to date has focused on the understandings of the collection, respectively, by the Jerusalem group and by Paul. At least four rationales for the collection have been offered:[2]

(1) Perhaps the most straightforward solution is that the collection was to relieve the distress of poor in Jerusalem. After all, Paul refers to the collection as a κοινωνίαν […] εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ (Rom 15:26) and in 2 Cor 8:14 Paul depicts the collection as something that is a matter of "your present abundance and their need" so that there might be ἰσότης (8:14). In 2 Cor 9:12 he calls it ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας which is intended to supply τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν ἁγίων (9:12). Accordingly, David Horrell argues that Paul's fundamental motivation was to relieve poverty among the poor among the Christ followers in Jerusalem and for this Paul appealed to the value of equality as God's ultimate purpose.[3]

While this view has advantage of simplicity, it sidesteps two issues: first, the earliest mention of the collection in 1 Cor 16:1–4 says nothing of the relief of poverty as the motivation for the collection and when this rationale is mentioned in 2 Cor 8 and 9, it is part of Paul's impassioned and highly rhetorical attempts to revive the Corinthians' flagging interests in the collection. Second, this approach makes the collection Paul's initiative and leaves unexamined what understanding and interest, if any, the Jerusalem group had in the collection, the relation of the collection to Gal 2:10, and

---

1 See now the outstanding survey of financial practices in associations by P.A. Harland, "Associations and the Economics of Group Life: A Preliminary Case Study of Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands," *SEÅ* 80 (2015), 1–37.

2 D.J. Downs, *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul's Collection for Jerusalem in Its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts* (WUNT 2/248; Tübingen, 2008), 3–26, offers a helpful schematic analysis, which is adapted considerably and expanded here.

3 D.G. Horrell, "Paul's Collection: Resources for a Materialist Theology," *EpRe* 22.2 (1995), 74–83, here 76, 78.

why in Rom 15:25–28 Paul seems anxious that the Jerusalem group would accept the collection.

James Dunn and Bruce Longenecker expressly address some of these issues. Dunn holds that Gal 2:10 is not directly related to the mention of the collection in 1–2 Corinthians and Rom 15 but simply reflects Paul's long-standing concern for the poor in general.[4] When Paul took up the collection for the Jerusalem group, it was his strategy to "bridge the gulf which evidently opened up between his mission and the Jerusalem or Judean churches following his failure at Antioch." He heeded the Jerusalem's request to "remember the poor" (Gal 2:10), but a collection specifically for the "poor of the holy ones in Jerusalem" was his initiative.[5]

Longenecker also seeks to separate Gal 2:10 from the collection. He argues that the "poor" in Gal 2:10 referred not to the Jerusalem group at all, but to all poor persons. The Jerusalem group was keen to ensure that the gospel preserve the distinctively Judean element of care for the poor as an essential component in the gospel, something that could not be taken for

---

4 J.D.G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making*, vol. 2: *Beginning from Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2009), 934–935. So also A.J.M. Wedderburn, "Paul's Collection: Chronology and History," *NTS* 48.1 (2002), 95–110, here 99, who argues that "nowhere in all his explicit mentions of the collection (if one does not count Gal 2.10 as such) does Paul connect the project with the carrying out of an agreement reached between himself and the Jerusalem church; nothing suggests that in the raising of the collection he saw himself as carrying out his side of that particular bargain." Yet his argument relies on the exclusion of Gal 2:10, which does suggest an agreement, and helps to account for the anxiety that Paul expresses about the reception of the collection in Rom 15:31. Wedderburn's argument is meant to address the tension created between the present first person plural subjunctive μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν ("only that *we* continue to remember the poor") which suggests a continuous process, and Paul's first person singular aorist, ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, could refer to action in the past. Wedderburn suggests that the "council" occurred on the occasion of the "collection visit" (Acts 11:29–30) when funds had already been delivered to Jerusalem, and that "even if there were no strings attached to the aid brought, the aid had functioned as a carrot, a sweetener, a lever to induce the Jerusalem church to look favourably upon the concerns of the Antioch church" (100). Paul later realized that this strategy could be adapted in the collection that he independently organized. This solution, however, puts too much faith in Lukan chronology which on other grounds can be shown to be flawed. Moreover, if Paul in Gal 2:10 were referring to a collection in which he had already participated, we might well expect ὃ ἐσπούδακα ἐγὼ ἤδη αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. Since it is obvious from Galatians that Paul's relation with the Galatian group has soured, the absence of any reference to their (non-)participation in a collection is hardly surprising. As Wedderburn himself observes, "On the other hand, had the Galatians subsequently refused to cooperate with the project and had they consequently refused to endorse this recognition, then it would perhaps have been wiser in retrospect to be silent about this aspect of the agreement. To mention it would be counter-productive" (98).

5 J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1998), 706 n. 170; id., *Beginning from Jerusalem* (see n. 4), 933–935.

granted in pagan social practices and thus enjoined upon Paul to ensure that the Judean complexion of the "gospel" be preserved.[6] For their part, the Jerusalem group was not interested in receiving money from gentiles:

[A] request to "send money to the poor among us here in Jerusalem" may well have sent out extremely confusing signals about patron-client relations between the Jesus-groups. But the charge to "remember the poor" carried no such specificity, instead it replicated an essential feature of Judeo-Christian identity – that of caring for the needy, without geographical restriction.[7]

Paul's collection, then, was "a single application of the more general principle of caring for the poor, and perhaps even one of the most important manifestations of that principle."[8] This leaves the collection as Paul's initiative, even though he was mobilizing the more general wishes of the Jerusalem group – wishes that Longenecker insists were already integral to Paul's own missionary practice long before the "council."[9]

The immediate question that is raised by Longenecker's thesis is why there are no other such translocal initiatives to benefit the poor mentioned in Paul's letters, or, for that matter, encouragements to participate in local poverty-reducing initiatives. And if it were true that the Jerusalem group was uninterested in receiving money from gentiles, it renders curious the fact that Paul would commit such efforts in arranging just such a collection.[10] Dunn's suggestion, which acknowledges the political dimension of the collection, makes better sense of Paul's efforts and of the trepidations he expresses in Rom 15:25–28.[11]

(2) Karl Holl emphasized the political and indeed legal aspects of the collection, at least from the perspective of the Jerusalem group of Christ followers. He conjectured that the collection was effectively a tax imposed

---

6 B.W. Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2011), 197.

7 Longenecker, *Remember the Poor* (see n. 6), 198.

8 Longenecker, *Remember the Poor* (see n. 6), 187.

9 Longenecker, *Remember the Poor* (see n. 6), 191–195, interprets ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι (Gal 2:10) as "I had *already* been devoted to this cause" (emphasis added).

10 Longenecker, *Remember the Poor* (see n. 6), 194 n. 35, concedes that the decree in Gal 2:10 might have contributed to Paul's own strategy of using the collection to prove "the theological legitimacy of gentile Jesus-groups in ways that bypass the stipulations of the decree, with which he may not have been in full sympathy."

11 V.D. Verbrugge, *Paul's Style of Church Leadership Illustrated by His Instructions to the Corinthians on the Collection* (San Francisco, 1992), 368, likewise argues that the collection was Paul's initiative (and not a tax imposed by Jerusalem), and that it was conceived partly to aid the poor, and "especially to help bring about unity between the Jewish and Gentile segments of the church."

by the leaders of the Jerusalem group, which had assumed a leadership and supervisory role vis-à-vis all other Christ groups.[12] Part of his argument was predicated on the assumption that οἱ πτωχοί and οἱ ἅγιοι were monikers for the Jerusalem group itself and that, accordingly, the injunction to "remember the poor" in Gal 2:10 amounted to a requirement of support for the Jerusalem group imposed upon Paul. Holl also saw that there was tension between Jerusalem's view and Paul, who regarded the collection not as a tax but as a free gift or reciprocation, flowing from the fact that gentiles had received spiritual benefits ("geistliche Güter") from them.[13] Nevertheless, "as much as Paul emphasized the free nature of the undertaking, and as much as the size of the contribution was left to each individual, it was nevertheless a rightful imposition made on gentile Christians by the 'mother church'."[14]

Holl's suggestion that the Jerusalem group referred to themselves as οἱ πτωχοί has generally been rejected[15] and his juridical interpretation of the collection has not met with wide acceptance. While rejecting Holl's juridical interpretation, Bengt Holmberg nevertheless argued that the Jerusalem group's stipulation at the "council" was not simply the formalization of an ethical norm of care for the poor, but flowed from their self-understanding as the elect and holy group within Israel "with an eschatological task of witnessing to and expecting the second coming of the Risen Messiah Jesus."[16] Paul understood the collection differently, however: its receipt by the Jerusalem group would be a validation of Paul's work among the gentiles, especially important in the wake of criticism of Paul's version of the gospel by some within the Jerusalem group. Nevertheless, Jerusalem was "in its own and Paul's eyes entitled to support

---

12 K. Holl, "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde," *SPAW* (1921), 920–947, here 940–941: "Diese Gemeinde ist befugt und verpflichtet, ein Aufsichts- und selbst ein gewisses Besteuerungsrecht über die ganze Kirche auszuüben. Denn sie hält tatsächlich die Reinheit des Glaubens zuletzt allein aufrecht."

13 Holl, "Kirchenbegriff" (see n. 12), 938.

14 Holl, "Kirchenbegriff" (see n. 12), 940: "Denn so sehr Paulus die Freiwilligkeit der Übernahme betont und so gewiß das Maß des Beitrags jedem einzelnen überlassen war, es handelt sich doch um eine richtige Auflage, die den Heidenchristen von der Muttergemeinde gemacht wird."

15 See L.E. Keck, "The Poor among the Saints in the New Testament," *ZNW* 56.1/2 (1965), 100–129; id., "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran," *ZNW* 57 (1966), 54–78.

16 B. Holmberg, *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (ConBNT 11; Lund, 1978; repr. Philadelphia, 1980), 39.

from other Christian churches and not primarily on moral grounds but on theological grounds, viz. its unique salvation historical role."[17]

Knowing that this rationale would not easily be accepted by gentile groups, Paul dressed it with the secondary rationales of reciprocity brother love, and κοινώνια, although occasionally the formality of the requirement was betrayed by terms such as λειτουργία.[18]

(3) Johannes Munck also objected to Holl's juridical interpretation and to the inference that Paul had fraudulently misrepresented a legally-mandated collection to his gentile groups as a free offering. Munck insisted that it was in fact a free offering, taking 2 Cor 8:7 and 9:7 at face value and not as Paul's desperate attempts to appeal to the Corinthians' generosity and to continue the collection project. Munck's main contribution, however, was the suggestion that Paul's motivation for the collection as "ecumenical,"[19] evoking the idea of the eschatological pilgrimage of gentiles to Jerusalem that would serve as a demonstration to the Jerusalem group of the impending eschatological age,[20] and even as a "provocative" act to spark the conversion of Israel.[21]

Munck was silent on Jerusalem's understanding of the collection, even though he cited Gal 2:10 in connection with the inauguration of the collection. Hence, it is difficult to know whether he thought that the eschatological pilgrimage motif also informed the Jerusalem group's thinking. But there are good reasons to doubt that this rationale was actually determinative for Paul. As Terence Donaldson has pointed out, 1–2 Corinthians and Galatians, where the earliest references to the collection occur, are notorious devoid of pilgrimage texts.[22] And as David Downs observes, although Rom 11:25 and citation of Isa 11:10 in Rom 15:12 might conceivably be connected with the constellation of gentile-pilgrimage texts, "those who would find Paul evoking the pilgrimage tradition in Rom 11:25 and 15:12 are hard pressed to explain why, when Paul in Rom 15:25–32 writes

---

17 Holmberg, *Paul and Power* (see n. 16), 39–40.

18 Holmberg, *Paul and Power* (see n. 16), 40.

19 J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (trans. F. Clarke; Richmond, Va., 1959), 290.

20 Munck, *Paul* (see n. 19), 299–308; K.F. Nickle, *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy* (SBT 48; London, 1966), 138–139.

21 Munck, *Paul* (see n. 19), 301; D. Georgi, *Remembering the Poor: The History of Paul's Collection for Jerusalem* (Nashville, 1991), 118–119.

22 T.L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis, 1997), 194.

about his impending trip to Jerusalem, […] he does not frame his journey in terms of the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations."[23]

Just as telling is Downs's observation, that when Paul discusses the delivery and acceptance of the collection in Rom 15:31 he represents the collection as *his service* (ἡ διακονία μου), not the "wealth of nations" being brought to Jerusalem.[24]

(4) Josef Hainz revived some aspects of Holl's view, suggesting that differences existed between the original agreement mentioned in Gal 2:9–10, the interpretation that the Jerusalem group put both upon the agreement and on the collection, Paul's understanding of what had been agreed upon, and the understandings of his gentile Christ groups. As to the original agreement, "The covenant ratified by a handshake is therefore *more precisely defined, that it relates* to the mutual recognition of various expressions of one gospel, and *that it is expressed* through the collection that was agreed upon."[25]

From his analysis of Rom 15:25–28, 31, Hainz also observed that there was a tension latent between Paul's understanding of the collection, and that of the Jerusalem group.[26] Paul's formulation, εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι, underscores that when writing to the Roman Christ groups, Paul depicted the collection as an initiative that rested with his gentile groups, not with either himself or Jerusalem. The collection was a matter of a free decision of those groups, not a legal imposition of the Jerusalem group. Moreover, κοινωνία τις in Rom 15:26 amounts, in Hainz's view, to an intentional "restriction" ("Einschränkung") of possible claims of Jerusalem, limiting the warrants of the collection to the "Bereich brüderlicher Solitarität" and removing it from the "Sphäre rechtlicher Ansprüche Jerusalems oder der Heiligen dort."[27] Hainz thus argues Paul's careful presentation of the collection in Rom 15 and his inclusion of the qualifications and restrictions suggests that Jerusalem had a very different view: "The Pauline perspective on the matter suggests that according to the intention of the Jerusalem authori-

---

23 Downs, *Offering* (see n. 2), 7.

24 Downs, *Offering* (see n. 2), 8.

25 J. Hainz, *Koinonia: "Kirche" als Gemeinschaft bei Paulus* (BU 16; Regensburg, 1982), 134: "Die durch Handschlag bekräftige Gemeinschaft wird *dahingehend näher bestimmt, daß* sie auf gegenseitiger Anerkennung der verschiedenartigen Ausprägungen des einen Evangeliums *beruht* und *daß* sie durch die vereinbarte Kollekte ihren *Ausdruck* findet" (emphasis original).

26 Hainz, *Koinonia* (see n. 25), 123–151 ("Die Kollekte der paulinischen Gemeinden für Jerusalem").

27 Hainz, *Koinonia* (see n. 25), 149.

ties, the collection should be treated as a kind of legal recognition of the preeminence of Jerusalem."[28]

Thus Hainz did not fully endorse Holl's thesis, but in effect argued that both Paul's gentile Christ groups and Paul himself wanted to make clear that κοινωνία with Jerusalem was not a matter of a legal obligation. Instead, for Paul it was "a work of love, and expression of the interconnection of his churches with Jerusalem."[29] Paul fully endorsed the preeminent position of Jerusalem, and was adamant that there must be a partnership or κοινωνία between his gentile groups and Jerusalem, based on an exchange of gifts; but preeminence was freely recognized, and exchange was not legally enforceable. "The tendency that can be observed in Rom 15:25–28, 31, accordingly, is directed only against a possible misunderstanding of the collection, not against the principle of the preeminence of Jerusalem."[30]

(5) In one of the most sophisticated treatments of the problem, Stephan Joubert understands the dynamics between Paul, his Christ groups, and the Jerusalem group within the framework of reciprocal exchange. The initial agreement, described by Paul in Gal 2:9–10, involved recognition by οἱ δοκοῦντες of Paul's law-free gospel, a benefit that placed Paul in the debt of the Jerusalem group and put him under an obligation to reciprocate. The reciprocation asked of Paul and of the Antiochene group was material support for the poor members of the Jerusalem group.[31] This is not a matter of a tax, but rather of the moral obligations created by benefaction.

---

28 Hainz, *Koinonia* (see n. 25), 150: "Die paulinische Sicht der Dinge läßt vermuten, daß es sich bei der Kollekte nach der Intention der Jerusalemer Autoritäten um eine Art von rechtlicher Anerkennung des Vorrangs Jerusalems handeln sollte."

29 Hainz, *Koinonia* (see n. 25), 150.

30 Hainz, *Koinonia* (see n. 25), 151: "Die in Röm 15,25–28.31 zu beobachtende Tendenz richtet sich folglich einzig gegen ein mögliches Mißverständnis der Kollekte, nicht gegen den prinzipiellen Vorrang Jerusalems."

31 S. Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection* (WUNT 2/124; Tübingen, 2000), 114–115: "(a) The 'pillar apostles' rendered a rewarding service to Paul and Antioch, which in terms of status demarcations within the reciprocal relationship, served as a claim to their own superior position as benefactors of Paul and Antioch. (b) Paul gratefully accepted the benefit bestowed upon him, thus confirming Jerusalem's position as benefactor. At the same time Paul, in his position as beneficiary, now became obliged to Jerusalem. (c) In return, the *dokountes*, who were in need of specific services (= material assistance) made their own needs known to Paul in particular, who was perceived as being in a position to provide these services. The latter responded positively, thereby confirming the public expectations about his ability to deliver the ministrations in question. (d) From then on the pressure was solely on Paul, the would-be benefactor of Jerusalem, to make good his promises, by delivering the collection to Jerusalem in order to secure his own honour." See also G.W. Peterman,

According to Joubert, the breakdown in Paul's relationship with Antioch and Barnabas, and hostility to his cause from some factions in Jerusalem, led to a shift in his own representation of the collection. In appealing to the gentile groups in Macedonia and Achaea, he did not refer in the first instance to the economic plight of believers in Jerusalem, still less to an agreement with Jerusalem, "but rather *the repayment of their own debts* to the mother church."[32] Since gentiles would not ordinarily have considered care for the poor as a moral priority, Paul emphasized balanced reciprocity: "not only did they joyfully embrace their role as debtors, but their generous contributions was also proof of their striving to surpass the gift from their benefactors in Jerusalem in deed and spirit."[33] Paul even encouraged the agonistic nature of euergetism, whereby benefactor and beneficiary would exchange roles in a continuing game of gift and counter-gift.[34] This presentation of the nature of the collection obscured entirely the original rationale present in Gal 2:9–10 and any notion of subservience to the Jerusalem group, emphasizing instead the free nature of the gentiles' undertaking. In Rom 15:25–28, 31, however, when writing to Roman Christ followers, Paul no longer represented *his role* in the delivery

"Romans 15.26: Make a Contribution or Establish Fellowship?" *NTS* 40.3 (1994), 457–463, who emphasizes less any obligation imposed upon Paul by Jerusalem, and instead notes that Paul's language of obligation reflects the Greek and Roman norms of reciprocity and appropriate acknowledgement of a benefit. "In 15.27 the Romans are informed of the defining characteristics of this fellowship: it is an exchange of material goods for spiritual goods. It is a fellowship which acknowledges the debt of the Gentiles toward the Jews for the spiritual things they have enjoyed" (463).

32 Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor* (see n. 31), 132 (emphasis original). The term "mother church" is rather unfortunate, since it seems rather doubtful that Paul regarded the Jerusalem group as a "mother church" given his comments in Gal 1 and even his somewhat disparaging references to οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι in Gal 2:6, 9. Nevertheless, Rom 15:25–30 indicates the Paul saw the importance of acknowledgement by the "pillars."

33 Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor* (see n. 31), 139.

34 S.J. Friesen, "Paul and Economics: The Jerusalem Collection as an Alternative to Patronage," in *Paul Unbound* (ed. M.D. Given; Peabody, Mass., 2010), 24–54, here 48, is critical of Joubert for holding that Paul and the Corinthians could be both benefactor to, and beneficiary of, the Jerusalem group, arguing that this violates basic definitions of patronage and benefaction. Joubert, however, is careful to distinguish patronage from euergetism. It is not that the Corinthian group aims to become the "patron" of the Jerusalem groups, its erstwhile patron. Joubert's point, moreover, might be explained more clearly by observing that Paul does not represent the relationship with Jerusalem in a single and consistent manner, and that the representation changes depending on Paul's correspondents. To the Corinthians in 2 Cor 8–9 he stresses the free initiative of the Macedonians and thus casts to them an euergetic role. To the Romans he stresses both free undertaking of gentile groups, and their balanced exchange with Jerusalem, while constructing himself as an agent of διακονία.

of the collection as a fulfillment of his side of a reciprocal exchange, but instead as flowing from his concern for the welfare of the poor in Jerusalem, that is, as a form of euergetism.[35] Thus Paul refocused the collection: it was no longer the offering of a return-gift, but an expression of his own and his gentile groups' "positive inner orientation, irrespective of the reaction on the side of the recipients."[36]

The sophistication of Joubert's account lies not only in his use of anthropological theory of gift-exchange, but in the attention to the complex and shifting ways in which Paul represents his relationship with Jerusalem (and his gentile groups). In Galatians, he treated the relationship with οἱ δοκοῦντες as one of the reception of a benefit, for which he and Barnabas were obliged to reciprocate. In 2 Cor 8–9 it is not Paul's own obligation to Jerusalem that is mentioned, but the enthusiasm and, in fact, insistence of the Macedonians to participate in a reciprocal exchange, and their free undertaking in doing so. A more complex picture is offered in Romans, since Paul again underscores the initiative of the gentile groups in engaging in the collection (15:26) and articulates the balanced reciprocal nature of the exchange (15:27), ignoring entirely his own obligations. Nevertheless, he *also* represents the collection as *his* διακονία rather than as *their* gift.[37] The anxiety he expressed about the reception of the collection nevertheless betrays the fact that his honor and standing is at stake in the exchange.[38]

There is little reason to follow Holl's suggestion that the collection was a tax imposed by the Jerusalem group, but Joubert is likely correct in seeing the collection at least initially as part of a reciprocal exchange to which Paul agreed, and which he felt more pressing in view of the tensions between him and some factions in the Jerusalem group. At that point the collection became a critical piece in the validation of Paul's activities even if he did not admit this in his correspondence with his gentile groups and only conceded it implicitly in Rom 15.

---

35 Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor* (see n. 31), 217.

36 Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor* (see n. 31), 217.

37 This ambivalence is also expressed in 2 Cor 8:19, 20, where he refers to the "gift that is being administered by us" (σὺν τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ τῇ διακονουμένῃ ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν) but also as *their* χάρις (2 Cor 8:6, 7).

38 Downs (*Offering* [see n. 2], 35–36) argues that Paul's trepidation about the reception of the collection would be hard to explain if he were merely carrying out the wishes of the Jerusalem group. Yet this ignores the profound difficulties that Paul encountered with parts of the Jerusalem group in the subsequent Antioch incident and in his dealings with the Galatian Christ-group. Clearly the terrain had changed since Gal 2:10.

2 Paul's Collection in Context

With a few exceptions, the discussion of Paul's collection has been con-
ducted without attention to the financial practices known from the
Greek and Roman world.[39] If any analogy to other collections is drawn,
it is usually the didrachma tax imposed on Judean males, or collections
for the poor mentioned in later rabbinic literature.[40] Yet the collection,
maintenance, and distribution of communal funds were extremely com-
mon throughout the ancient Mediterranean world and many of the prac-
tical issues that Paul's groups had to face find close parallels in other small
groups and in the administration of Hellenistic poleis.

   In what follows, I do not intend to propose that these "influenced" the
collection for the poor, or that either Paul or the Jerusalem group "bor-
rowed" practices from the Hellenistic world. It would be impossible to
demonstrate such a genealogical relationship in any case, short of Paul in-
dicating that he was imitating the financial practices of Corinth or Thes-
saloniki or the Temple Tax, which, of course, he does not. Moreover, the
notion of raising a collection is not conceptually very difficult to grasp: in
the twenty-first century all kinds of collections are taken up without us
having to suppose that they are all borrowed from a "common source,"
ancient or modern. My point, instead, is that we know much more
about Hellenistic fiscal practices than we do about the Pauline collection,
and knowledge of how other groups collected and disbursed funds, and
the problems that were involved in these practices, will help us to see
the Pauline collection in a different light, to understand better the
kinds of problems and challenges that his collection may have generated,
and to raise questions about the collection that would have occurred to
most Greeks, but have not occurred to exegetes of Pauline literature.
That is, my interests are heuristic, not genealogical, and I do not want
to fall into the apologetic trap of deciding where Paul's primary "influenc-
es" lay.[41]

---

39 Exceptions are Verbrugge, *Church Leadership* (see n. 11); Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor*
    (see n. 31); Downs, *Offering* (see n. 2); and Longenecker, *Remember the Poor* (see n. 6).
40 Nickle, *Collection* (see n. 20), 74–99.
41 D. Frankfurter, "Comparison and the Study of Religions of Late Antiquity," in *Compa-
    rer en histoire des religions antiques: Controverses et propositions* (ed. C. Calame and B.
    Lincoln; Collection Religions 1; Liège, 2012), 83–98, here 93–94, helpfully describes the
    role of comparison in the study of ancient religions "My procedure then largely follows
    the method that Smith laid out: (a) to understand that anomaly as part of a *system*, (b) to
    describe it tentatively, (c) to ask of what phenomenon it might be an *example*, (d) to de-
    scribe it according to some *critical terminology*, (e) to ask or seek out what might be a

Four aspects of fiscal practice offer possible analogies to the Pauline collection: the management of common funds with special interest in security; the according of due recognition for largesse; the description of *comparanda* of types of euergetic donations for public projects; and ideology at work in such collections.

2.1 Financial Administration: Security and Audit

It is mostly uncontroversial that the Corinthians wrote to Paul inquiring about the collection and that 1 Cor 16:1–4 addressed their questions.[42] It has, unfortunately, been common to suppose that the Corinthians were unpracticed in collecting funds and accordingly, they inquired as to how to organize the collection. Thus Hans Conzelmann concludes, "there is obviously as yet no organized system of finance. Not even a collection at the service or worship is envisaged, if each is to 'lay by him in store' his own contributions."[43] Downs argues similarly: "In fact, Paul's instructions regarding the organization of the contribution for Jerusalem in

---

fuller or richer example; (f) to articulate, on the basis of both proximate *comparanda* with limited context and distant *comparanda* with richer context, a plausible social *context* in which the datum makes sense, the anomaly familiarized – a context that may require abandonment or adjustment with further primary data; and finally (g) to propose some broader observations about the *pattern*, the phenomenon, on the basis of this new data." For the purposes of this essay, my procedure is similar: not genealogical (to discover the "source" of Paul's collection), but rather analytic: to propose Hellenistic fiscal practices of which Paul's collection might be an *example*; to describe those practices using critical terminology (security, recognition, analogy, and ideology); and without seeking more distant *comparanda*, to articulate a social context for the collection.

42 This assumes that περὶ δὲ τῆς λογείας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους in 1 Cor 16:1 is a letter response formula, referring to the a question raised in the Corinthians' letter to Paul. See J.C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (London, 1965), 200–206. Hurd rightly argues that the Corinthians were likely concerned about the nature of the delivery of the collection, but as will be clear from what follows they have additional concerns about security and credit.

43 H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, 1975), 296. Similarly, J.M.G. Barclay, "Money and Meetings: Group Formation among Diaspora Jews and Early Christians," in *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kairserzeitlichen Kleinasiens* (ed. A. Gutsfeld and D.-A. Koch; STAC 25; Tübingen, 2006), 113–128, here 102: Because there were no "institutional structures – buildings to construct or maintain," and without a membership fee or annual dues to collect, "there is no reason for the earliest Christians to handle money on any other than an *ad hoc* basis"; Downs, *Offering* (see n. 2), 101: "There is no evidence that the members of Paul's churches paid monthly or weekly membership dues, or that community funds were used to subsidize the burial expenses of deceased members"; Longenecker, *Remember the Poor* (see n. 6), 271: "There is little to suggest that urban Jesus-groups, unlike other associations, had a membership fee that was paid to the association's treasurer to enhance the goals of the association."

1 Cor 16:1–4 seem to imply that the congregation of his mission in Galatia and Corinth did not regularly administer funds."[44]

Yet it infantilizes the Corinthians to suppose that they were somehow so naive that they needed instructions on how to collect funds. We have good epigraphical evidence from Achaea, the Isthmus, and the Peloponnese that groups of handworkers and resident aliens (metics) – that is, precisely the kinds of persons who made up the majority of Pauline groups – had been engaged in collecting funds for at least four hundred years before Paul arrived in Corinth.[45] Besides, the idea of collecting money for a common project is hardly a conceptually or practically challenging notion.

The issues for the Corinthians and which they expressed in their letter to Paul was not about how to collect funds, but concerned *collecting funds for a non-local group* – the ἐκκλησία in Jerusalem –, *how to ensure that such funds collected for that purpose would be delivered to their intended recipients*, and *how an accounting of the full amount would be guaranteed.* That is, the concern that the Corinthians expressed derived not from not knowing how to collect money, but from the anomalous nature of the collection and the peculiar fiscal problems that such a collection presented.

One of the most commonly recurring elements in private association inscriptions pertaining to the management of funds is the insistence on adequate audit procedures. A single example will suffice. In early second-century CE Attica, an association of Herakleiastai, whose activities included sacrifices and banquets, was funded through an endowment, the purchase of priesthoods, entrances fees, member contributions, and various fines (*SEG* 31.122 = *GRA* 1.50). The treasurer was enjoined not to expend more than 300 drachmae on dinners;[46] if he did, he would incur a fine of three times the sum in excess of 300 drachmae (ll. 13–15). Likewise, a former treasurer, having been discovered though audits to have purloined funds for his own use, would be subject to a similar fine (ll. 15–16). Those deputed to purchase wine and meat for the banquets who did not deliver the goods were to be fined twice the value of

---

44 Downs, *Offering* (see n. 2), 101.

45 See, inter alia, the collection of inscriptions in J.S. Kloppenborg and R.S. Ascough, *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, vol. 1: *Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace* (BZNW 181; Berlin, 2011), hereafter *GRA* 1.

46 At a 6 % draw on the investment, this would represent an endowment of 5000 drachmae, well within the typical range of endowments (see J. Sosin, "Perpetual Endowments in the Hellenistic World: A Case Study in Economic Rationalism," PhD dissertation, Duke University, 2000, passim). On investment returns, see R.P. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies* (rev. ed.; Cambridge, 1982), 364–365. Sosin uses the figure of 6–10 %.

what they were to supply. The treasurer was required to provide an account of his income and expenses, and auditors were appointed to scrutinize this:

> ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ταμίας ἀποδιδοῖ λόγον ἀγ-
> 30   ορᾶς γενομένης καταστάνεσθαι ἐγλογιστὰς τρεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἐγλογιστὰς ὀμ-
> νύειν αὐτόν τε τὸν Ἡρακλῆν καὶ Δήμητρα κα[ὶ] Κόρην
> […]
> 40   καταβάλλεσθαι δὲ τὸν λόγον ὅταν οἱ ἐγλογισταὶ ὀμόσαντε[ς]
> ἀποδῶσι τῷ ἀρχερανιστῇ τὸν λόγον καὶ ἐπιδίξωσι εἴ τι ὀφίλι ὁ τα-
> μίας.

Likewise, when the treasurer provides an accounting, after a meeting (30) has been called, they shall appoint three auditors and the auditors shall swear by Herakles and Demeter and Korē. […] (40) And let the account be closed when the auditors, having taken an oath, return the accounts to the ἀρχερανιστής, and indicate whether the treasurer owes anything.

Each of these regulations points to a deep concern that the association's funds would be secured against theft and misuse. That careful auditing of the work of the treasurers and secretaries and scrutiny of their accounts were normal practices in associations is indicated by the frequency with which former treasurers and secretaries are commended δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκα ("on account of their honesty").[47] Concern about the disposition and integrity of common funds was simply a standard part of associative life.

There is very little, if any, data on the precise mechanism by which private associations assembled members' contributions, although in the case of public subscriptions (ἐπιδόσεις, discussed below) more is known. Perhaps our ignorance of associations is due to the fact that because the procedure for receiving contribution was self-evident (to them) and entirely

---

47 See the commendations in, e. g., *IG* 2².1256.8 (*GRA* 1.5) (two members); *IG* 2².1263.22 (*GRA* 1.11) (a secretary); *IG* 2².1278.11–12 (*GRA* 1.17) (a treasurer, supervisor, secretary, comptroller, and a record-keeper); *IG* 2².1284.30–31 (*GRA* 1.22) (secretary). D. Whitehead, "Cardinal Virtues: The Language of Public Approbation in Democratic Athens," *Classica et Mediaevelia* 44 (1993), 37–75, here 67–68, notes: "Rendered 'righteousness' by Cynthia Schwenk [*Athens in the Age of Alexander: The Dated Laws and Decrees of "the Lykouran Era" 338–322 B.C.* (Chicago, 1985), 507 (*SEG* 35.239)] and others, *dikaiosynē* is better understood in an epigraphic context as something like 'honesty', the behavior – financial and otherwise – of someone who has been in a position to feather his own nest but has not (detectably) done so. It was thus a virtue which, unlike some of the ones we examined earlier (such as *eunoia*), was from the outset of its use regarded as at least as suitable for Athenian citizen honorees as for noncitizens, and it was a common choice for both the demos as a whole and its subdivisions to apply to the conduct of those who had discharged service in an official capacity."

unproblematic, the available inscriptions and papyri tell us nothing. Contributions might have been made in some ritualized form, or simply delivered to the secretary or treasurer at each meeting, or at some specified time during the month. Or associations might have used the system of initial pledges of an entire sum followed by periodic delivery of portions of this, as in the case of ἐπιδόσεις discussed below.[48] What is abundantly clear is that associations kept careful records of contributions, endowments, extraordinary gifts, fines and other income, as the following three inscriptions illustrate:

IG 2².1298 (*GRA* 1.20): The θιασῶται of Artemis

<div align="right">ἀναγράφ-</div>

ειν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπεισιόντων συνθιασωτῶν (*vac.*)
τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὰν καταβάλωσιν τὸ ἐπιβάλλο-
[ν] αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἀργυρίου κατὰ τὸ-
20   [ν ν]ό[μον] ἐν τῶι ἐράνωι· (*vac.*) ἐνγραφέτω δὲ ἕκαστ-
ος αὐτὸν τῶι αὐτοῦ ἀναλώματι μετὰ τοῦ ταμ-
[ί]ου καὶ τοῦ γραμματέως.

And (be it resolved) also to inscribe the names of the associates (συνθιασῶται) who join, once they have contributed the (share) of the money that is their due in the "fund" (ἔρανος), in accordance with the law. Each shall register himself and his dues with the treasurer and the secretary.

SEG 31.122 (*GRA* 1.50): A synod of Herakleiastai

<div align="right">τὰς δὲ φορὰς</div>

καταφέριν τῷ ταμίᾳ ἐπάναγκες ἰς τὰς ἐγδόσις· ὁ δὲ μὴ κατενένκας
ἀποτινέτω τὸ διπλοῦν * ὁ δὲ μὴ δοὺς τὸ κάθολον ἐξέρανος
45   ἔστω·

The dues (φορά) must be brought to the treasurer (so that) loans can be made. Whoever does not pay shall be fined a double amount. Whoever does not pay at all shall be expelled from the association (ἐξέρανος).

---

48 An inscription from Ionia lists the goods promised and delivered to a Dionysiac association: "… pro|vided (παρέξειν) sufficient wine; | previously … he had | promised (προεπηγγείλατο) [. .] *metrētai*. . . || […]goras son of Protamachos | provided sufficient wine; | he had promised 100 *metrētai*; | Dionysios son of Dionysios provided | sufficient wine and cooks || and musicians | for banquet and [. .] *choinikes* of bread. | …" (*SEG* 31.983.3–11, Söke, Ionia). Because 100 μετρηταί (3,900 litres) is obviously far to much for a single banquet, we should conclude that the alternation between προεπηγγείλατο (promised) and παρέξειν (to provide) indicates there was an initial subscription of 100 μετρηταί and that this was then divided among several banquets.

IG 2².1368 (*GRA* 1.51): The Iobakchoi of Athens

<div align="center">μηδενὶ</div>

ἐξέστω τῶν ·ἰ·οβάκχων τῶν μὴ συντελε-
σάντων εἴς τε τὰς ἐνάτας καὶ ἀμφιετηρί-
70   δας εἰσέρχεσθαι ἰς τὴν στιβάδα μέχρις ἂν
ἐπικριθῇ αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῶν ·ἰ·ερέων ἢ ἀπο-
δοῦναι αὐτὸν ἢ ἰσέρχεσθαι.

None of the Iobakchoi who has not paid (the contributions) for either the meetings on the ninth (of the month) or the annual festival is permitted to enter into the gathering, until it has been decided by the priests whether he should pay the fee or be allowed to enter (anyway).

Although the precise procedure for payment of dues is not described, the two-stage penal procedure of *SEG* 31.122 suggests that there was a point at which payment was expected, and that after some period of grace, free-riders were expelled.[49] *IG* 2².1368 suggests that in this case dues were expected prior to the monthly meetings and yearly festival, and that records were kept so that free-riders could be identified and prohibited from participation.[50] Papyri from Egypt containing club accounts – *P.Petr.* 3.136; *SB* 3.7182; *P.Tebt.* 3/2.894; 1.118, 177, 224, for example – illustrate the careful bookkeeping practices of various associations, documenting income from dues, members who had paid in full, members who were in arrears, members who were dues-exempt (ἀσύμβολος) and the expenses incurred for each banquet.

There is no reason to suppose that the Corinthians were any less invested in the solvency of their group or the management and security of funds which they collected. In the case of the funds used for normal operations – the providing of monthly or weekly banquets –, there were presumably procedures in place analogous to what are widely reported in other associations.[51] A more complicated situation existed in the management of funds collected for a special project, such as the collection for the Jerusalem group.

---

49 On disaffiliation in associations, see J.S. Kloppenborg, "Disaffiliation in Associations and the ἀποσυναγωγός of John," *HvTSt* 67 (2011), 159–174.

50 See other examples of the recording of contributions: *IG* 2².1301.14–16 (*GRA* 1.30): ἀναγρά|||[ψαι δὲ τόδ]ε τὸ ψήφισμα τοὺς [ἐπιμελητὰς εἰς τὴν στή]|[λην ἐν εἶ το]ὺς ἐπι-δεδωκότας ("the supervisors shall inscribe this decree on a stele, on which [are listed] those who have made contributions"); *IG* 2².1335 (*GRA* 1.43): a list of 51 contributors.

51 I have argued elsewhere that the funding of communal meals in Corinth was likely either by a mechanism of member contributions or rotating liturgies. See J.S. Kloppenborg, "Precedence at the Communal Meal in Corinth," *NovT* 58 (2016), 167–203.

There are many epigraphical and papyrological examples of collections taken up for special purposes. *IEph* 20 (*GRA* 2.127)[52] lists 99–100 donors who have contributed to the construction of a first-century toll-station in the harbor of Ephesus. The donations included such high-cost items as the cost of several columns and 100 cubits of paving stones, to smaller monetary donations of sums ranging from 50 denarii to as low as 5 denarii.[53] What is unspoken in this inscription is how the funds were amassed. Ephraim Lytle observes, "in fact the project appears not to have been centrally budgeted; that is, donations seem not to have simply been collected in cash with the funds then dispersed as needed to vendors. Rather, individual donors were found to pay *ad hoc* for many or perhaps even all of the costlier items."[54]

Since this inscription concerns a building project that extended over at least several weeks, it is conceivable that the architectural elements and funds were collected on an *ad hoc* basis throughout the duration of the project, as Lytle suggests. Yet at some determinate point, the inscription had to be cut, with the donors' names and their contributions arranged in descending order, according to the value of their contributions. Likewise, an Attic ἐπίδοσις-inscription of some 358 lines (*IG* 2².2332, Athens, 183/2 BCE), lists several hundred contributors to an unnamed project, with contributions that ranged from 5 to 30 drachmae (the majority are 10 drachmae).[55] Nothing is said of the way in which these funds were amassed,

---

52 P.A. Harland, *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, vol. 2: *North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor* (BZNW 204; Berlin, 2014), hereafter *GRA* 2.

53 See E. Lytle, "A Customs House of Our Own: Infrastructure, Duties and a Joint Association of Fishermen and Fishmongers (IK, 11.1-Ephesos, 20)," in *Tout vendre, tout acheter: Structures et équipements des marchés antiques; Actes du colloque d'Athènes, 16–19 juin 2009* (ed. V. Chankowski and P. Karvonis; Bordeaux, 2012), 213–224, here 220, makes the point that while some of the donors are likely members of the fishermen's guild, not all are necessarily members. "Although the verb προσκαταφέρω is nowhere else attested, the sense of οἵδε προσκατήνενκαν in line 11 of our dedication is quite certain: προσ- in compound prefixes such as προσκατα- almost always conveys the sense of 'in addition to' or 'besides': individuals listed provided funds *in addition to* the contributions of the association of fishermen and fishmongers. This point is ignored by G.H.R. Horsley ['A Fishing Cartel in First-Century Ephesus,' in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 5: *Linguistic Essays* (North Ryde, N.S.W., 1989), 95–114] who makes sociological claims about ancient fishermen and fishmongers based on the prosopography of the recorded donors, none of whom need have been either. Likewise, there is no way of ascertaining how large the contribution of the association itself will have been, although the association will obviously have wished to fund externally as much of the project as possible."

54 Lytle, "Customs House" (see n. 53), 220.

55 See L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques* (HEMGR 17; Geneva, 1992) (hereafter Migeotte), no. 19, and also *IG* 2².2345 (Athens, 360–335 BCE), a list of

whether the larger (or even more modest) sums were given all at once, or were contributed in several stages over a period of time. At least by the time of the cutting of the inscription, however, there was a full tally of each contributor's donation and, in this case, of the wives and minor persons who associated with the donors.[56] Likewise, *P.Oslo* 3.144 lists contributions to a guild of sacred victors by members of *other* guilds – weavers, perfumers, dyers, bakers, oil merchants, etc. Again, irrespective of how the funds were actually collected, at some point they had to be tallied and the list of donors drawn up.

The situation that Paul addressed in Corinth in 1 Cor 16:1–4 was one of a collection which he assumed would take several months to complete, but at least by the time of his arrival in Corinth, it was to be complete so that the Corinthian funds could be added to those from Macedonia (and as he supposed when he wrote 1 Corinthians, Galatia). First Corinthians 16:2 implies that Paul imagined that most would be unable to produce a full and final contribution on the spot, but would have to accumulate smaller contributions over a period of several months. Hence, his advice κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου ἕκαστος ὑμῶν παρ᾽ ἑαυτῷ τιθέτω θησαυρίζων ὅ τι ἐὰν εὐοδῶται. That these presumably smaller weekly sums should not immediately be given to the ἐκκλησία but be kept individually (παρ᾽ ἑαυτῷ) meant only that the bookkeeping connected to the collection could be kept separate from whatever other funds the ἐκκλησία administered. And it would mean that upon Paul's arrival, the *full* contribution of each member would be known immediately. As in the other examples cited above, the final tallies were important if a donor list was to be created. Paul's main concern, as ἵνα μὴ ὅταν ἔλθω τότε λογεῖαι γίνωνται indicates, however, is not in the size of each donation, but rather that the collection not be started only when Paul arrived. His recommendation about the mechanism for collection is reasonable, given his belief about the financial resources of at least some of the Corinthians Christ followers, and his interest having a final collection when he arrived.

The other topics that Paul addresses in 1 Cor 16:1–4 concern the security of the collection against theft and misappropriation, the delivery instructions, and the issue of due acknowledgement. Paul's statement in

---

members of several θίασοι, each consisting of 10–30 members, with sums beside some of the names. See S.D. Lambert, "IG II² 2345, Thiasoi of Herakles and the Salaminioi Again," *ZPE* 125 (1999), 93–130 (*SEG* 47.187 and 188).

56 *IG* 2².2332.133 names as one of the donors Διονυσογένης Διονυσίου Παιανιεύς, who is also listed as a member of a Dionysiac association: *IG* 2².1325.9 (*GRA* 1.33) (Piraeus, 185/4 BCE, Dionysiac association).

1 Cor 16:3 addresses two critical topics (actually three, the third to be discussed below): first, it assures the Corinthians that the collection will be delivered by οὓς ἐὰν δοκιμάσητε; and then he indicates that they will travel with a letter from Paul (δι' ἐπιστολῶν τούτους πέμψω), presumably explaining the collection, its sources, and its intended recipients.

As is obvious in the case of funds that are being transported to a different locale from where they are raised, there was always a danger of loss and misappropriation. For this reason, envoys *approved* by the Corinthian group would assume responsibility for the honest conveyance of the collection. The term Paul uses, δοκιμάζω, is well-attested in both civic and association contexts, signifying the vetting of prospective citizens, candidates for office, and candidates for membership in an association.[57] The point for Paul is that honorable and reliable envoys *of the Corinthians' choosing* will deliver the collection. Holmberg's comment apropos of the description of entourage in Acts 20:6, which included representatives from Beroea, Thessaloniki, Derbe, and Asia (and no doubt from Corinth), that "Paul's churches, represented by an (*unnecessarily*) large delegation of Gentile Christians"[58] fundamentally misses the point of such a delegation: every Christ group that had contributed had a stake in guaranteeing their funds would be secure from theft and fraud and would be delivered to the intended recipients.[59]

---

57 See J.S. Kloppenborg, "The Moralizing of Discourse in Greco-Roman Associations," in *"The One Who Sows Bountifully": Essays in Honor of Stanley K. Stowers* (ed. C. Johnson Hodge et al.; BJS 356; Providence, R.I., 2013), 215–228, here 216–219, and more generally, T.E. Rihll, "Democracy Denied: Why Ephialtes Attacked the Areiopagus," *JHS* 115 (1995), 87–98, here 93–97; C. Feyel, *Dokimasia: La place et le rôle de l'examen préliminaire dans les institutions des cités grecques* (Études anciennes 36; Nancy, 2009) (on the vetting of officials), and G. Adeleye, "The Purpose of the *Dokimasia*," *GRBS* 24.4 (1983), 295–306 (on the vetting of prospective citizens).

58 Holmberg, *Paul and Power* (see n. 16), 38 (emphasis added).

59 Fraud and misappropriation were constant dangers. Thus in the third century BCE an ἐπίδοσις-decree from Chios warns that anyone who attempts to alter the purpose of the collection or to divert it to another use will be fined 3,000 drachmae: [ἐὰν δέ τις γ]ράψηι ἢ πρύτανις προ[θ]ῆι | [ταῦτα εἰς ἄλ]λο τι μετενεγκεῖν ἢ κατα|[χρήσασθαι] ἢ ποιήσηι τίς τι παρὰ τόδε τὸ | [ψήφισμα τό] τε γραφὲν ἢ πραχθὲν ἄκυρον | [ἔστω καὶ ὀφε]ιλέτω τῆι πόλει δραχμὰς XXX (L. Robert, "Sur des inscriptions de Chios," *BCH* 57 (1933), 505–543, here 505–517 no. 1.5–9). Five centuries later as former στρατηγός in Alexandria is told by the emperor that the ἐπίδοσις that he proposed to offer relief of the farmers in Oxyrhynchus who are suffering economically is approved, but its funds cannot be turned to a different use (*P.Oxy.* 4.705.62–63 [Oxyrhynchus, 200–202 CE]: ἀμε|τά-στρεπτον εἰς ἕτερόν τι δαπανήσ[εσ]θαι τὴν χάριν). A little later, an official from Oxyrhynchus reports that the city treasurer has left the city and perhaps Egypt altogether, and that only a portion of the ἐπίδοσις that was collected in support of the sacred Capitoline games is available (*P.Oxy.* 63.4357.12–13 [317 CE]: καὶ τὴν γενομένην

An additional indication that the security of the collection was at stake, both for the Corinthians and for Paul, is Paul's comment in Rom 15:28 – τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας καὶ σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον ("having completed this [the collection] and having certified [or authenticated] this 'fruit' for them") – where the use of σφραγίζω underscores the importance of a formal authentication or "sealing" of the gift that Jerusalem is to receive. The verb, found often in connection with the delivery of letters or the production of copies of documents, carried it with a nuance that care has been taken to guard against fraud and deception.[60]

This also implies that *all* of the funds collected would have to be accounted for at some point. Commenting on the "unusually large" group of envoys accompanying the collection (Acts 20:4), Munck assumes that part of the collection would have been used to defray their travelling expenses.[61] This may be so, but if we were to assume the fiscal procedures employed here were the same as those employed in the case of the movement of other envoys, there would be a strict limit placed on how much of the collection, if any, could be expended for travel. More likely, if we take seriously analogous situation where envoys of one group or city travelled to make a petition or otherwise interacted with authorities elsewhere, they would have travelled ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ("at their own expense").[62] In this way the full amount of the collection would reach Jerusalem and receive a proper accounting when the envoys returned.

The other issue is both practical and rhetorical: Paul, at least at the time of 1 Corinthians, underscores that he is diffident as to whether he will even go to Jerusalem. For this reason a letter of introduction would be essential to ensure the delivery of the collection, for if Paul was to accompany the collection, no such letter would be needed. But his conditional statement, ἐὰν δὲ ἄξιον ᾖ τοῦ κἀμὲ πορεύεσθαι, σὺν ἐμοὶ πορεύσονται (1 Cor 16:4)

ἐπί|δοσιν τῶν βουλευτῶν (ταλάντων) ρ′ μόνων, (τάλαντα) ξ′). It is not clear from this whether only 60 talents were collected from the ἐπίδοσις of the councillors, or whether only 60 talents remain after the departure of the treasurer.

60 See J.A. Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (HUT 32; Tübingen, 1995), 133 (I am indebted to Bert Harrill for drawing this to my attention).

61 Munck, *Paul* (see n. 19), 303.

62 Ambassadors normally travelled ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων: e.g., *TAM* 5/2.1002 (Thyateira, Lydia, undated): "The leather-cutters (σκυτοτόμοι) honoured T. Flavius Alexandros son of Metrophanes of the tribe of Quirine, who had served as *agoranomos* for six month in a vigorous and extravagant manner, superintendent (*curator*) of the company (*conventus*) of Romans, ambassador to the emperor in Rome three times acting as an advocate at his own expense (δαπά|[ναις] ἰδίαις) in the matters that were brought concerning Attaleians, and priest of Artemis in a manner displaying piety and love of honour […]" (trans. Harland, *GRA* 2, pp. 224–225, modified slightly).

and the diffidence he expresses are ways to signal that he would not be in a position to misappropriate the collection, either because he might not be going to Jerusalem at all, or because in any case he would be accompanied by those whose task it was to ensure the proper delivery of the collection.

Hence, Paul's comments in 1 Cor 16:1–4 have nothing to do with the Corinthian's inexperience in collecting money, either for themselves or for some other purpose. Instead their questions reflect the typical concerns that arose in virtually all associations concerning for financial propriety. Paul's statements are intended to assure the Corinthians that their contributions will not fail to arrive in Jerusalem, and Paul himself, even though he had initiated the collection, does not stand to benefit financially from this enterprise.

2.2 Recognition of Largesse

A consistent feature of Greek donative inscriptions is that due recognition of the benefactor or patron was essential. This was simply part of the nature of exchange, whereby a patron or group of benefactors provided a benefit to the polis or to an association and the polis or association in turn recognized this largesse in some public form. This type of exchange provided benefits to the polis or association, and symbolic capital to the donor or donors.[63]

There is plenty of evidence that the recognition of largesse was critical. A standard provision in an honorific decree was the requirement that the supervisor or secretary of the association arrange for the crowning of those who had demonstrated largesse, and that crowning be announced, usually at the next meeting. For example, *MDAI.A* 66 (1941), 228 no. 4 (*GRA* 1.39):

> ἵνα οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες φαίνωντ[αι τιμῶντες τοὺς πρός τε]
> θεοὺς φιλοτιμουμένους καὶ εἰς ἑαυτούς· [δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν ἐπαινέσαι Σεραπίωνα]
> Ποσειδωνίου Ἡρακλεώτην καὶ στεφανῶ[σαι αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ στεφά]-
> 15   νωι καὶ λημνίσκωι ὧι πάτριόν ἐστιν εὐσε[βείας ἕνεκεν τῆς πρὸς τοὺς]
> θεοὺς καὶ ἀναγορεύειν καὶ τοῦτον τ[ὸν στέφανον τὸν γραμμα]-
> τέα καὶ τὸν ἐπιμελητὴν καθάπερ καὶ [τοὺς ἄλλους μετὰ τὰς σπονδὰς]
> ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγορεύσω[σιν ἢ μὴ στεφανώσωσιν, ἀποτεῖσαι]
> [δρ]α[χμ]ὰς 3· ἱερὰς τῆι Ἀφροδίτε[ι, ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα]
> 20   [εἰς στήλη]ν λιθίνην κα[ὶ] στ[ῆσαι ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι]

---

63 On symbolic capital, see P. Bourdieu, "The Economy of Symbolic Goods," in *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action* (Cambridge, 1998), 92–126.

In order that the ὀργεῶνες be seen to be honoring those who benefact the gods and themselves, the ὀργεῶνες have agreed to commend Sarapion son of Poseidonios of Herakleia, and to crown him with an olive wreath and a woolen fillet, which is in accord with ancestral custom, on account of the piety that he has shown to the gods; and further, that the secretary and the supervisor shall announce the crowning along with the other (honors) following the libations in the temple. If they should fail to make the announcement or to crown him, they will be fined 50 drachmae, sacred to Aphrodite. This decree shall be inscribed on a stele and erected in the temple.[64]

A Roman benefactor of a group of Poseidoniastai on Delos in the mid-second century BCE was likewise honored and allowed to set up a bust with the honorific inscription in the compound, "or in whatever other place he may decide, except for the ναός or the pronaos (προστῷον)."[65] The decree then threatened anyone who attempted to remove or otherwise change the bust and decree with a large fine.[66]

The need for such proscriptions points both to the critical importance that public recognition of benefactors played in the economy of benefaction and to the agonistic culture of antiquity, where honors for one person might be imagined as coming at the expense of a competitor. Even in the case of ἐπιδόσεις, where many donors contributed small sums to a common project were recorded, it was important that all donors be named and thus receive credit for their contributions. The idea that a collection taken up to build a toll station for fishermen in Ephesus, or a collection in Athens for some public good, or contributions to a guild of sacred victors would come without the names of the donors, even if they had given only a few denarii, was counterintuitive.[67] Hence we find lists of contributors like IG 2².2332 with its more than 400 names, each contributing 5 or 10 drachmae: largesse recorded is largesse recognized; unrecorded largesse was pointless.

Given the normal expectations of some form of reciprocity in acts of benefaction, I suggest that the point of Paul's undertaking in 1 Cor

---

64 Similarly, *IG* 2².1263.43–45 (*GRA* 1.11) (Piraeus, 300/299 BCE); *IG* 2².1273AB.22–23 (*GRA* 1.18) (Piraeus, 265/4 BCE); *IG* 2².1292.16–17 (*GRA* 1.26) (Athens or Piraeus?, 215/4 BCE); *IG* 2².1297.17–18 (*GRA* 1.24) (Athens, 236/5 BCE).

65 P. Roussel and M. Launey (eds.), *Inscriptions de Délos*, vol. 5 (Paris, 1937) (hereafter *IDelos* 5), no. 1520.24–26.

66 *IDelos* 5.1520.56–66.

67 On the public nature of the recognition of contributors to an ἐπίδοσις-collection, and the pressure placed upon those who refused, see A. Chaniotis, "Public Subscriptions and Loans as Social Capital in the Hellenistic City: Reciprocity, Performance, Commemoration," in *Epigraphical Approaches to the Postclassical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD* (ed. P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas; Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents; Oxford, 2013), 89–106.

16:3, that he would send approved Corinthians to convey *their* gift (ἀπε-
νεγκεῖν τὴν χάριν *ὑμῶν* εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ), not be missed. The critical part of
this sentence is τὴν χάριν ὑμῶν ("your gift"). For from the point of view of
the Corinthian donors, it was as essential as it was for Ephesian, or Athe-
nian, or Egyptian contributors, that the source of their gift be acknowl-
edged. The presence of envoys from each Christ group would guarantee
that due credit for the gift would be recorded.

We should, therefore, imagine that the envoys, when they arrived in
Jerusalem, carried not only coin, but a parchment list of the names of
those who had contributed, or at the very least, the names of each of
the gentile groups involved, and perhaps even the amounts each contrib-
uted.[68] Paul, as it would turn out, was also positioned to gain social capital
from ἡ διακονία μου, as he calls it in Rom 15:31, since he was acting as a
broker of a benefit and, at least as far as the Jerusalem group was con-
cerned, as a partner fulfilling his part of an agreement.[69] But that should
not obscure the likelihood that each of the Christ groups represented by
the collection would expect to be credited as well.[70]

---

68 This is perhaps a shocking conclusion, and one that contradicts the supposition that
members of Christ-groups typically favored anonymous donations and cared little
for recognition. (Of course, Paul cared a great deal for recognition, as Rom 15:25–
28, 31 indicates). On the other hand, as Chaniotis observes, "In Greek antiquity
there is no such thing as the noble spender who wants to retain his anonymity. Financial
contributions for the city were visible, transparent, and, above all, very loud" (Chaniotis,
"Public Subscriptions" [see n. 67], 91).

69 J.N. Collins, *Diakonia: Re-Interpreting the Ancient Resources* (Oxford, 1990), 220,
makes the important point that the term διακονία here refers to Paul's role as an
envoy: "Paul has used the words in this passage to indicate that he is acting in an official
capacity as the appointed courier of the churches. His responsibilities are primarily
technical and it is these that he urges in order to explain his delay in visiting Rome,
and the instances of the verb and abstract noun at [Rom] 15:25 and 31 speak directly
and exclusively of his commitment to this charge from the churches in Macedonia and
Achaia. This has an important bearing on the identity and role of 'God's people' in the
earlier translation: 'an errand to God's people', that is the people in Jerusalem. These are
rather to be understood as the people of the churches who have commissioned Paul so
that we should translate: 'on a mission from God's people'."

70 A possible objection might be that the thrust of Paul's engagement with the Corinthians
in 1 Corinthians is to oppose the self-exertions of the so-called "strong" who have ex-
hibited status through displays of speech, elite eating, and virtuos performances of char-
ismatic speech. While it is true that Paul wishes to limit such performances, certain
forms of ἐπιδόσεις in fact deliberately limited status displays by levelling contributions
or by setting a maximum gift (see below, p. 183) and thus focused on "communitarian"
values rather than individual self-assertion (see below, p. 183), values that are complete-
ly in agreement with Paul's own views. This, however, did not obviate the need for rec-
ognition of those who had contributed to the collection.

2.3 Extra-Civic Finances and Collections for Common Purposes

Various financial practices known from the Greek world offer points of comparison with the Pauline collection. To the extent that Paul's collection appears to reflect a hierarchical view of early Christ groups, with Jerusalem at the apex – which might have been the view of the Jerusalem group, though hardly Paul's view –, the most obvious analogies are the Greek federal states, called κοινά, in which individual poleis paid taxes to a common fund at their κοινόν-headquarters.

On mainland Greece and the Peloponnese, about 40 % of poleis (183 of 456) belonged to a κοινόν.[71] The cities of Lycia were likewise organized into a κοινόν that acted as a federal state issuing decrees and making alliances on behalf of member poleis.[72] Some – probably all of the member poleis of a κοινόν paid taxes to support common military needs and perhaps to maintain a central sanctuary.[73]

In spite of the possible analogy between the financial practices of Greek κοινά and Paul's collection, however, there are very significant differences. In the first place, κοινά were constructed on the basis of cities that were contiguous and where it made sense to foster interregional trade and to have common military interests. Some κοινά looked to a common eponymous ancestor – Ion in the case of the Ionian κοινόν – and maintained a common central sanctuary. For these reasons, it is difficult to argue that the κοινόν model has much salience in our case, since the Greek cities in Macedonia and Achaea were scarcely contiguous with Judea; they lacked a common founding mythology; and they lacked significant economic and military ties.[74]

---

[71] E. Mackil, *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon* (HCS 55; Berkeley, 2013), 1; id., "The Greek Koinon," in *The Oxford Handbook of the State in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean* (ed. P. Fibiger Bang and W. Scheidel; Oxford, 2013), 305–323, here 305.

[72] See Friesen's discussion of Junia Theodora, a resident of Corinth, who had acted on behalf of the Lycian κοινόν: S.J. Friesen, "Junia Theodora of Corinth: Gendered Inequalities in the Early Empire," in *Corinth in Contrast: Studies in Inequality* (ed. S.J. Friesen, S.A. James, and D.N. Schowalter; NovTSup 155; Leiden, 2014), 203–226.

[73] The evidence of taxation, whether routine or extraordinary, is not clear in all cases. Mackil, "The Greek Koinon" (see n. 71), 317, notes, "when the western Achaian poleis of Dyme, Pharai, and Tritaia seceded in 219, they did so by refusing to pay their *eisphora* (Polybius 4.60.4), but because their secession was prompted by the failure of the *koinon* to defend their territory from attack, it would be reasonable for them to refuse to pay a tax (whether regular or exceptional), the revenues from which funded the Achaian army."

[74] It could be added that at least in Greece, the advent of Roman rule had the effect of dismantling many of the Greek κοινά. The Achaean κοινόν was dismantled in the wake of

The practice of Hellenistic synagogues collecting funds for the support of the Herodian temple in Jerusalem could be seen as a variation on the κοινόν model.[75] Indeed it provides a close analogy for diasporic groups widely separated from a central sanctuary contributing to its operation and upkeep. We know relatively little about the organization of theses collections, apart from the facts that collections seem to have been organized at the level of cities,[76] and that imperial edicts tried to protect their transport to Jerusalem.[77] How the collection for each city was assembled is not clearly known, but one of the available models is public subscription (discussed below). We have at least one example from Berenikē of an ἐπίδοσις taken up by members of a synagogue in support of the repair of their building (below, p. 184).

There is no way to know whether either Paul or the Jerusalem group (or both) had the synagogue collections in mind in conceiving the collection for the poor. The gentile groups that participated in Paul's project would likely know little or nothing of the practices of Hellenistic synagogues and Paul never presented the collection to them in those terms. Moreover, the Pauline collection was always presented as support, not for a central sanctuary or for the provision of sacrifices, but as support for the πτωχοί in the Jerusalem group.[78]

Instances of translocal munificence are also attested in Roman Lycia, perhaps not coincidentally, a κοινόν still in the Roman period. Several in-

---

the conquest of Greece and the destruction of Corinth in 146 BCE (Mackil, "The Greek Koinon" [see n. 71], 319). Nevertheless, many κοινά continued. Arjan Zuiderhoek (personal communication) points out to me that κοινά priesthoods had strong links with the imperial cult and in that sense were politically "neutralized."

75 See, e. g., Philo, *Leg.* 156: "Therefore, [Gaius] knew that they had prayer houses (προσευχαί), and that they gathered in them, especially on the sacred seventh days, when they publicly taught their ancestral philosophy; and he knew also that they collected sacred funds from their first fruits (χρήματα συνάγοντας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπαρχῶν ἱερα), sending them to Jerusalem by the hands of those who were to offer the sacrifices." See further, M.P. Ben Zeev, *Jewish Rights in the Roman World* (TSAJ 74; Tübingen, 1998).

76 Cicero (*Flac.* 68) refers to gold destined for the Temple collected from Apamea, Laodicea, Adramyttium, and Pergamum, but says earlier that monies were collected *ex omnibus nostris provinciis Hierosolymam exportari* (67).

77 Josephus, *A.J.* 16.162–165 (Augustus), 166 (Augustus to Norbanus Flaccus), 167–168 (Marcus Agrippa to the magistrates of Ephesus), 169–179 (Marcus Agrippa concerning the Judeans of Cyrene), 171 (Norbanus Flaccus to the magistrates of Sardis), 172–173 (Julius Antoninus to the magistrates of Ephesus).

78 J.A. Harrill, *Paul the Apostle: His Life and Legacy in Their Roman Context* (Cambridge, 2012), 73, suggests that Paul's collection was intended to purchase sacrifices for the temple and was *provocative* on Paul's part since it was framed as the offering of "first fruits" of uncircumcised gentiles. It was this act that caused the riot of which Acts speaks and which eventually led to Paul's arrest and execution.

scriptions commemorate rich benefactors like Junia Theodora[79] and such super-rich patrons as Opramoas of Rhodiapolis,[80] Iason of Kyaneai,[81] the Anonymous Benefactor of Letoon (near Xanthos),[82] who gave huge sums to multiple cities throughout the Lycian κοινόν.[83] Most of these benefactions were building projects and hence not directly comparable to the translocal collection Paul had in mind. Athanasios Rizakis has examined similar extra-civic patronage by rich elites in the Peloponnese in the early imperial period. It was cultic festivals that they tended to favor with their wealth as a way of consolidating their power, influence and prestige.[84]

  Steven Friesen is critical of the application of the notion of "patronage" to the Pauline collection since the gift to the Jerusalem group was not from a wealthy individual or even from a group of elite families, but instead from groups of persons with very modest resources. Friesen proposes instead that Paul's practice was "redistributive," aiming at gentile and Jewish poor, and that it "contradicted the normal expectations of patronage and replaced them with an economy of voluntary redistribution among the saints."[85] This critique appears to confuse "patronage" with "euergetism":

---

79 See Friesen, "Junia Theodora" (see n. 72), 223–226, for a convenient dossier of honorific decrees from the Lycian κοινόν, and from member poleis, Myra, Patara and Telmessos.

80 C. Kokkinia, *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis: Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien* (Antiquitas 3/40; Bonn, 2000).

81 *IGRR* 3.704–706; L.G. Berling, "Das Iason-Monument von Kyaneai," in *Die Siedlung Kyaneai in Zentrallykien*, pt. 1: *Öffentliche Bauten und Wohnareale* (ed. F. Kolb; Lykische Studien 9/1; Bonn, 1993), 25–37.

82 See J.J. Coulton, "Opramoas and the Anonymous Benefactor," *JHS* 107 (1987), 171–178.

83 See A.J. Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites, and Benefactors in Asia Minor* (Greek Culture in the Roman World; Cambridge, 2009), 24–26. I am indebted to Zuiderhoek for the references to Opramoas, Iason and the Anonymous Benefactor.

84 A.D. Rizakis, "Supra-Civic Landowning and Supra-Civic Euergetic Activities in Urban Elites in the Imperial Peloponnese," in *Being Peloponnesian* (Nottingham, 2007), 1–16, here 4–5, and S.E. Alcock, *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece* (Cambridge, 1993), 210–211.

85 Friesen, "Paul and Economics" (see n. 34), 51. Friesen cites with approval Down's conclusion that "Paul's attempt to frame the collection as an act of corporate worship offered in service of God functions to *subvert* the values of patronage and euergetism by depicting an alternate mode of benefaction, one that brings glory, praise and thanksgiving to God rather than to human benefactors" (Downs, *Offering* [see n. 2], 158, emphasis added). Patronage and euergetism, however, were typically *associated* with the "theological" virtue of εὐσέβεια such that commendation of a patron was never seen to infringe on reverence for the god and in some instances, it was seen as an imitation of the gods (Seneca, *Ben.* 6.26–32). Moreover, since Paul never forbids acknowledgement of benefactors or those engaged in euergetic activities (Paul himself included), it is difficult to see any "subversion" here (as if Paul were ever be in a position to subvert a dominant cultural script). No outside observer would understand the Pauline collection to

both involved benefactions, but patronage classically is a relationship between two persons of unequal status (or a patron and a city). Friesen's main target, Joubert, does not in fact use the term "patronage" to describe the Pauline collection.[86] It could be added that the collection also lacked the dissembling features of patronage, insofar as patronage and its attendant honorific practices functioned to construct patrons with all the Aristotelian virtues of εὔνοια, δικαιοσύνη, and εὐσέβεια even though their benefactions were often not on the scale to effect real economic change, and were usually oriented toward public buildings and games.[87]

It can readily be agreed that the model of patronage is not easily mapped onto the collection. If it were the case that this was the only possible model for understanding Paul's practice, it might be right to conclude that Paul was resisting or rejecting the practice of patronage. But it is not. Other

---

be the "subversion" of patronage or euergetism, since Paul's practice had no potential political impact nor did it conceivably represent a threat to the political interests of anyone.

86 Friesen, "Paul and Economics" (see n. 34), 49–50. Friesen's main target is Joubert, who, however, carefully distinguishes between "patronage" and "benefaction" (or euergetism), and does not use the category of patronage at all in relation to Paul or the collection, except to argue that the *private* meeting with the δοκοῦντες reported in Gal 2:1–10 could be seen as a matter of "patron-friendship" (Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor* [see n. 31], 105) and that Paul presented himself to the Corinthians as a *broker* of heavenly patrons (ibid., 126–127). Friesen's characterization of patronage as making "it appear as though the wealthy were giving to the poor even though it was the poor who made this possible by contributing to the wealthy on a daily basis through the normative structures of the economy" (Friesen, "Paul and Economics", 50) is a possible misconstrual of patronage, which was rarely was directed at the poor. L.L. Welborn, "'That There May Be Equality': The Contexts and Consequences of a Pauline Ideal," *NTS* 59.1 (2012), 73–90, is less critical of Joubert's notion of "benefaction" (not patronage) but acknowledges the "fundamentally asymmetry" endemic even to benefaction, which renders problematic Joubert's view that the Corinthians and the Jerusalem group could exchange roles as benefactor and recipient. Welborn instead suggests that the better cultural context in which to interpret Paul's appeals in 2 Cor 8–9 is that of "unequal friendship." According to Welborn, Paul's appeal was to embrace the principle of ἰσότης, which was basic to the construction of friendship, even unequal friendship: "Paul is arguing implicitly that the poor Jerusalem saints are in the position of the superior party, by virtue of spiritual wealth, which has alleviated the Corinthians' deficiency; so now, as the beneficiaries, the Corinthians are obliged, by the logic of inverse proportion, to make an extraordinary gift to the Jerusalem Christians, in order to restore 'equality'. This argument, advanced somewhat elliptically in 2 Cor 8:1–15 is articulated explicitly in Rom 15:26–26" (ibid., 80–81).

87 Zuiderhoek, *Politics of Munificence* (see n. 83), 26, notes that although there are a few staggeringly large benefactions in Lycia, most were relatively modest, with a mean of 16,500 denarii and a mode of 10,000 denarii. His conclusions, which concern the Antonine period, are probably valid also for the first century.

redistributive practices are attested in the Greco-Roman culture, none of them a matter of patronage in the sense that Friesen uses the term.

One example of funds sent between two groups is evidenced in an inscription from Puteoli (174 CE), a letter from a group of Tyrian *stationarii* in Puteoli to Tyre requesting financial assistance.[88] The Tyrians from Puteoli pleaded that their numbers had dwindled and that the city (Puteoli) had imposed liturgical costs on them for a yearly festival, with the result the they lacked the ability to pay the rent on the *statio* (of 250 denarii[89]) and to continue the cult of their ancestral deities. Their appeal was successful, with the βουλή of Tyre deciding that the *stationarii* in Rome, who benefitted from tariffs imposed on merchants and shippers (probably at Ostia), would contribute (or continue to contribute) 250 denarii yearly to the Puteolean group. This is not an example of patronage, but resource-sharing between two related groups, both invested in the cult of their deity.

The precise source of the Roman contribution is unclear, but it likely is a matter of tariffs taxes collected by the Roman *stationarii* being earmarked for the support of the Puteolean group, and therefore not a terribly close analogy to the Pauline collection. But there is an even closer analogy to the Pauline collection, in the form of ἐπίδοσις-collections, widely attested in the Greek East.[90]

Public subscriptions are attested in Athens, other parts of Greece, the Aegean islands, Asia Minor, Cyrenaica, Sicily and Egypt, and from the

---

88 *CIG* 3.5853 (*IG* 14.830 and *IGRR* 1.421).

89 Mommsen read CN′ as an abbrevation for *c(entum milia) n(ummum)*, i. e., 100,000 denarii (followed by G. La Piana, "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Century of the Empire," *HTR* 20 [1927], 183–354, and others). This results in an absurdly high rent. Dittenberger (*OGIS* 595) is surely correct that Ҳ σν′ means 250 denarii (so recently J. Sosin, "Tyrian *Stationarii* at Puteoli," *Tyche* 14 [1999], 275–284 [*SEG* 49.1366]).

90 The only scholar to note the ἐπίδοσις in connection with the Pauline collection is, as far as I know, Verbrugge, *Church Leadership* (see n. 11), 157–176. Curiously, although Verbrugge concludes that the ἐπίδοσις "does serve as a true parallel to Paul's notion of raising money for the poor in Jerusalem" (157), and after (appropriately) acknowledging that ἐπιδόσεις were typically raised for local needs, rather than those of another group, he focuses his attention on the fact that ἐπίδοσις inscriptions "are never used for the actual appeal to make a pledge" (176). This is, of course, true, since these inscriptions are all retrospective; the actual appeal was likely made orally in the assembly. He concludes that "we have uncovered no example of a letter that asks for donations for a group of needy people" (209) and even ἐπιδόσεις "cannot really be compared to a fund-raising letter seeking to motivate the people to give" (369). This seems both curious, insofar as the infinitive-accusative construction with δεδόχθαι in fact has an imperative function in civic decrees, and obvious, in the sense that local ἐπιδόσεις did not require a letter to be sent to anyone.

fourth century BCE to well into the imperial period.[91] They were used for a wide variety of purposes: for the construction or repair of city walls; the construction or repair of sanctuaries; construction or repair of public buildings; for the support of sacrifices and religious festivals; support for games; the purchase of grain; ransom for the return of prisoners and victims of piracy; and the purchase of oil for the gymnasium. These were normally not on-going collections but raised for special needs: as Angelos Chaniotis observes, Greek cities had relatively sophisticated fiscal systems in place to take care of routine expenses, but for heterogeneous and less predictable expenses, they turned either to external assistance (loans from foreign benefactors), or "the financial contribution of citizens and foreign residents in the form of extraordinary taxes (εἰσφοραί), organized contributions (ἐπιδόσεις), and voluntary donations (δωρεαί, εὐεργεσίαι)."[92] The (yearly?) collections undertaken by Hellenistic synagogues thus resembled in some respects the ἐπιδόσεις of Greek cities, but seem to be imagined as ongoing projects.

Although the point of ἐπιδόσεις was to raise funds for specific projects, the administration of the contributions varied significantly. An inscription from Cos (*SEG* 50.1050, 3rd cent. BCE) concerning funds for the repair of a temple is unusually helpful for illuminating the mechanism for the collection of funds:

A (front face)

> ἐπὶ μονάρχου Φιλώτα, μηνὸς Δαλίου τετράδι,
> Θευγένης Ἑκατοδώρου εἶπε· ἑλέσθαι ἄνδρας
> τέσσαρας ὅπως πορισθέντων χρημάτων
> ἐν τάχει τὰ κατάλοιπα τῶν ἔργων τοῦ ναοῦ
> 5   τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος κατασκευασθῆι, καὶ μὴ κιν-
> δυνεύσηι τὰ συντετελεσμένα ἔργα τᾶς
> ὀροφᾶς καὶ τοῦ θυρώματος ἐπιγενομένου
> χρόνου πλείονος καταφθαρῆμεν, τάν τε συν-
> αντίλαμψιν τᾶς κατασ<κ>ευᾶς τοῦ ναοῦ

---

91 Migeotte is the major collection of ἐπιδόσεις but others are also attested. See Chaniotis, "Public Subscriptions" (see n. 67); A. Ellis-Evans, "The Ideology of Public Subscriptions," in *Epigraphical Approaches to the Postclassical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD* (ed. P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas; Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents; Oxford, 2013), 107–125. L. Migeotte, "Les souscriptions dans les associations privées," in *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (IIIe siècle av. J.-C.–IIe siècle ap. J.-C): Actes de la table ronde de Paris, INHA, 19–20 juin 2009* (ed. P. Fröhlich and P. Hamon; HEMGR 49; Geneva, 2013), 113–127, discusses ἐπιδόσεις in private associations and collects more than a dozen subscriptions, most for repairs to temples.

92 Chaniotis, "Public Subscriptions" (see n. 67), 91.

10 μὴ μόνον ἁ πόλις φαίνηται πεποιημένα, ἀλλὰ
καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶι χρη-
μάτων καὶ τοὶ δηλόμενοι ἐπαγγείλα{σ}σθαι εἰς
ταῦτα, συντελεσθέντος τε τοῦ ναοῦ ἐπιφα-
νέστερον τὰ κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐξάγηται, ἀγαθᾶι

15 τύχαι, δεδόχθαι τὸς μὲν νεωποίας τελέσαι τοῖς
αἱρεθεῖσιν ἀνδράσιν ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χρημάτων
δραχμὰς ͵ΧΧ′, τῶν δὲ δαμοτᾶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων
πολιτᾶν καὶ παροίκων ἐπαγγείλασθαι τὸς δηλο-
μένος ἐς τὰν κατασκευὰν τοῦ ναοῦ ἕκαστον

20 μὴ ἐλάσσω δραχμᾶν τριάκοντα, ποιεύμενοι τὰν
μὲν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐν ἐνιαυτῶι ἐν ταῖς συνόδοις
ταῖς γινομέναις ἐν τῶι δάμωι ἄρχοντος Δαλίου
τοῦ ἐπὶ Φιλώτα, τὰν δὲ καταβολὰν τοῦ ἀργυρίου πο-
εῖσθαι ἐπὶ τὸς ἄνδρας τὸς αἱρεθέντας ἐν τρισὶ

25 καταβολαῖς, διδόντες τὰ<ν> μὲμ πράταν μετὰ τὸ
[τὰ]ν ἐπαγγελίαν γενέσθαι παραχρῆμα, τὰν δὲ ἐ-
[χομ]έναν ἐν ἑξαμήνω[ι] καὶ τὰν ἄλλαν ὡσαύτως·
[ὅπως] δὲ [κ]αὶ τῶν ἐ [± 9–10] ἕνων ὑπάρχη ὑ-
[πόμναμα – – – – – – – – – – –]
<lacuna>

B (back face)

ἐσόκα ταί τε ἐπαγγελίαι πέτωντι καὶ ἐκ τᾶς πόλιός τι
ψαφισθῆι· συντελεσθέντων δὲ τῶν ἔργων αἴ τινά κα πε-
ριῆι ἐκ τᾶν ἐπαγγελιᾶν χρήματα ἀποδόντω τοὶ ἄν-
δρες ἐφ᾽ ὧν κα πέτη ναπόαις τοῖς ἐν ἀρχᾶι εὖσιν· τοὶ δὲ

5 ναποῖαι διδόντω εἰς τὰς φυλὰς τοῖς ἐπιμηνίοις καθὰ
καὶ πρότερον ἐδίδουν εἰς τὰς δύο ἁμέρας· τὸ δὲ ψάφισ-
μα τόδε ἀναγραψάντω τοὶ ἄνδρες τοὶ αἱρημένοι ἐ-
πὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶι πρότερον κυρωθέντι ψαφίσματι ἐπὶ μο-
νάρχου Φιλώτα. (vac.)

(A) When Philotas was *monarchos*, on the fourth of the month of Dalios, Theugenes son of Hekatodoros proposed (the following motion). Four men shall be elected in order that, money having been secured, the work that remains on the temple of Apollo may be carried out quickly and the complete work on the roof and the door may not be in danger of being spoiled through further delay; and in order that not only the city may be seen to have been actively involved in construction of the temple, but also the god, from the funds that he has, and individuals willing to make pledges for this purpose, the rites in the shrine may be conducted with more magnificence on completion of the temple; for good fortune, let it be decided that the *neopoiai* shall pay 2000 drachmae to the men elected from the funds of the god, and that individuals from among members of the deme and the other citizens and resident aliens who are willing to pledge no less than 30 drachmae for the construction of the temple; they should make the pledge within a year at the meetings which occur in the deme, beginning with the month of Dalios in the term of Philotas, and they should make the payments of the money to

the men elected in three installments, paying the first straightaway after the making of the pledge, the next within six months, and the remaining one in the same way. And in order that there may be a record …

(B) … until the sums pledged are paid and the decree is passed by the city. When the works have been completed, if any money remains from the payments, it shall be handed over by the men in whose term they are paid to the *napoiai* who are in office. The *napoiai* shall give the money to the *epimenioi* for the tribes, just as hitherto they used to give for the two days. The men who have been elected shall inscribe this decree in the same place as the decree previously passed with Philotas was *monarchos*.[93]

While the mechanism for collecting funds in associations is unknown, in the case of this ἐπίδοσις the process is clear: prospective contributors would announce (ἐπαγγείλασθαι) amounts in the regular deme meeting, and then pay that amount in three installments over the course of a year. The minimum contribution was set at 30 drachmae and no maximum was prescribed.[94] Robert Parker and Dirk Obbink note that 30 drachmae was the price on Cos of a full-grown sheep and thus not beyond the means of most contributors,[95] who, as the inscription indicates, included not only demesmen but other citizens and resident aliens (A, ll. 17–18).

In some instances the donor's announced promise of a contribution was an occasion for theatricality, affording wealthier donors the opportunity to display their largesse (and for the miserly to be publicly heckled).[96] Coupled with various epigraphical practices of highlighting the name of the first to contribute,[97] or arranging the contributions in descending

---

93 R. Parker and D. Obbink, "Aus der Arbeit der 'Inscriptiones Graecae' VIII: Three Further Inscriptions concerning Coan Cults," *Chiron* 31 (2001), 253–265. The English translation is that of Parker and Obbink.

94 *IG* 2².791 (Migeotte, no. 17) (Athens, 244/3 BCE), sets the lower limit at 50 drachmae and the upper limit at 200 drachmae. Migeotte, pp. 316–319, suggests that in the absence of specific limits on contributions, minimums and maximums can be derived by from the donor list itself. Ἐπίδοσις-lists attest ranges from 10–30 drachmae, 100–300 drachmae, 50–500, 100–500 drachmae, but there are contributions to some ἐπιδόσεις as low as 4 drachmae and one list with no contribution greater than 10 drachmae (*IG* 7.3191–3192; Orchomenos, Boeotia).

95 Parker and Obbink, "Three Further Inscriptions" (see n. 93), 262.

96 E.g., Plutarch's description of Alcibiades' contribution to an Athenian ἐπίδοσις (*Alc.* 10.1); Ellis-Evans, "Ideology" (see n. 91), 109.

97 Migeotte, no. 34 (partially reproduced); Y. Béquignon, "Études Thessaliennes: VII. Inscriptions de Thessalie", *BCH* 59 (1935), 36–77, here 36–51 no. 1 face 2.32–38: ὀνγράφειμεν|μὰ τὸς ἐπα[γ]γελλαμένος ἐν κίονα λιθί|ναν ἕκαστον αὐτοῦν πατρόθεν καθούς || κε ἐπαγγέλλουνθαι, τὸν πρῶτον ἐπα[γ]|[γ]ελλαμένον πρῶτον καὶ τὸς ἄλλος ἔ|[πειτα] κα[ττὸ] πλεῖθος τὸς ἐπαγγελλα|[μένος ("they will inscribe on a stone stele the names of everyone who has promised [a contribution], along with their patronym, according to what they promised, the first to promise first, and then the others according to the amount").

order by the amount contributed, or by flushing the amounts to the right
margin of the inscription, making it easy to compare one donor with an-
other,[98] this type of collection allowed donors to gain considerable sym-
bolic capital.

Yet other practices are attested that had the effect of rendering status
less visible. Some ἐπιδόσεις set a minimum *and* a maximum contribution,
thus preventing the super-rich from entirely outshining those with more
modest resources.[99] The arranging of the list simply in the order in which
the contributions arrived[100] or listing of names in alphabetical order[101] had
a slight levelling effect. Other ἐπιδόσεις had contributors all give the
same – usually quite small – amounts.[102] An ἐπίδοσις-inscription from
Tanagra (Boeotia) raised in order to relocate the sanctuary of Demeter
and Kore has 95 donors – all women –, all but the last six contributing
5 drachmae.[103] Eleven of the eighteen contributors to the renovation of
a synagogue in Berenikē (Cyrenaica) in 56 CE contributed 10 drachmae,
and a further four (including two women) gave 5 drachmae.[104] In contrast
to the practice of variable contributions which made visible status differ-
ences, these more communitarian practices, as Aneurin Ellis-Evans ob-

---

98 Ellis-Evans, "Ideology" (see n. 91), 119, citing *SEG* 44.1219a; 48.1343; Migeotte, no. 70.

99 E.g., *IG* 2².791.19–20 (Athens, 243 BCE) sets the minimum contribution at 50 drach-
mae and the maximum at 200: μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ μηθενὶ ἐπιδοῦνα[ι πλέον ΗΗ δραχμῶν] ||
μηδ' ἔλαττον (*vac.*) 50 (*vac.*). Migeotte, pp. 316–317, observes apropos of *IG* 2².791 "les
83 montants encore lisible zur la pierre confirment non seulement que les donateurs
ont respecté la directive, mais que la plupart ont donné le maximum." He also points
out that in the case of *IG* 2².2332 (Athens, 183/2 BCE) all of the contributions are either
5 or 10 drachmae (presumably the minimum and the maximum, respectively), and
that in *IG* 2².2334 (Athens, 2nd cent. BCE), an ἐπίδοσις for the building of a theatre
in Piraeus, the contributions are all between 5 and 20 drachmae.

100 E.g., M. Segre, "Tituli Calymnii," *Annuario della scuola archeologica di Atene* 22–23
(n.s. 6–7) (1944/45), 1–248, here 122–127 no. 85 (late 3rd cent. BCE): contributions
in the range of 15 (N = 66), 20, 30, 40, 50, and 60 drachmae. Chaniotis, "Public Sub-
scriptions" (see n. 66), 94–95, suggests that the list was simply determined by the order
in which the donations arrived.

101 *SEG* 48.1103 (Cos, ca. 200 BCE).

102 W.R. Paton and E.L. Hicks (eds.), *The Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford, 1891) (hereafter
ICos), no. 387 (late 3rd cent. BCE): contributions to a temple of Aphrodite; 40 donors
each contributing 5 drachmae; *ICos* 404 (ca. 200 BCE): 42 donors to an unknown
cause, each giving 23 drachmae.

103 *SEG* 43.212A = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Ecole française d'Athènes:
Travaux et mémoires 18; Paris, 1969), no. 72 (*SEG* 25.67, 159, 160, 167, 173–175, 197)
(Tanagra, end 3rd/early 2nd cent. BCE) (the last six contributed less than 5 drachmae).
Other examples of all-female ἐπιδόσεις are discussed by Ellis-Evans, "Ideology" (see n.
91), 111.

104 G. Lüderitz and J.M. Reynolds, *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika* (BTAVO
53; Wiesbaden, 1983), no. 72.

serves, rendered less visible "the vast disparities of wealth and power that characterized *polis* life […] and the succession of similar sounding sums suggested to the audience that the act of giving, rather than the amount given, was what mattered."[105]

It was not only from citizens that contributions were elicited, but resident aliens and even foreigners. An ἐπίδοσις-inscription from Cos calls on contributions from all:

> δεδόχθαι· ἐ-
> [π]αγγέλλεσθαι τὸς δηλο-
> μένος τῶν τε πολιτᾶν καὶ
> 10   πολιτίδων καὶ νόθων καὶ πα-
> [ρ]οίκων καὶ ξένων·

It was resolved that those who so wish shall contribute, citizens, women citizens, bastards, resident aliens, and foreigners.[106]

In the early second century CE, a project to beautify Erythrai (or perhaps Smyrna) attracted contributions not only from citizens, but a group called οἵ ποτε Ἰουδαῖοι ("those formerly of Judea") evidently not citizens, who had collectively raised 1000 drachmae.[107]

As noted in connection with *SEG* 50.1050 cited above, the use of the verb ἐπαγγέλλομαι is noteworthy since it points to the practice of the contributor 'announcing' or 'promising' the value of his or her contribution, and at some point in the future delivering it. The gap between promise and fulfilment – marked with συντελέω – accounts for the repeated phrases such as one finds in an ἐπίδοσις-inscription from Lindos:

[ἐ]παγγείλαντο [δω]σεῖν δωρεὰν χρήματα […] [καὶ σ]υνετέλεσαν τὰν ἐπαγγελίαν καθ' ἃ ἐπαγγείλαντο.

They promised to give freely of their money […] and they kept their promise according to what they had promised.[108]

---

105 Ellis-Evans, "Ideology" (see n. 91), 111.

106 *ICos* 10 (Migeotte, no. 50) (202/1 BCE). Similarly, Ioulis: Migeotte, no. 56.1–4: [τῶν πολ]ιτᾶν καὶ τῶν πολιτ[ίδων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶ]ν ἐν τεῖ πόλει κα[τοικούντων] (late 4th/early 3rd cent. BCE); *IG* 12/4.94A.17–18 (Halasarna, 250–225 BCE): τῶν δὲ δαμοτᾶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτᾶν καὶ παροίκων; *IG* 12/4.314.2 (3rd cent. BCE); 320.11–12 (late 2nd cent. BCE); *SEG* 48.1111A.48–9; *IG* 2².791.15–17 (Athens, 248/7 BCE): τοὺς βουλομένους τῶ[ν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλ]|λων τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν τῆι πόλει ἐπιδιδό[ναι εἰς τὴν σωτηρία]|ν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας ἐ[παγγείλασθαι.

107 *IGRR* 4.1431 (*ISmyrna* 697 and *GRA* 2.139). On the interpretation of this term, see the discussion in *GRA* 2, pp. 314–415.

108 C. Blinkenberg, *Lindos: Fouilles et recherches, 1902–1913*, vol. 2: *Inscriptions* (Berlin, 1941) (hereafter *ILindos* 2), no. 252.3, 6 (Migeotte, no. 40).

Those who reneged on their promises were remembered and, as a speech in Isaeus shows, their names were inscribed on a list of defaulters.[109] Both the public display of contributor lists, and the display of defaulters, point to the importance of the social capital that was generated from contributions.

Although many of the known ἐπιδόσεις were used in order to fund building projects, or in times of military need, there is good evidence that ἐπιδόσεις were also collected for the purchase of grain in times of shortages, which is presumably what was intended in Paul's collection for the "poor."[110] A particularly interesting example comes from Iasos, a fragmentary ἐπίδοσις that shows relatively small contributions with the intent of creating a permanent endowment to supply grain in times of shortage:

```
   [οἵδε ἑκόντ]ες βουλόμενο[ι ἐπὶ πλεῖ]-
   [ον αὔξειν τὴ]ν δημοκρατί[αν ἐκ τῶν ἰδί]-
   [ων ἐπέδωκ]αν ἀργύριον [εἰς σιτωνί]-
   [αν, ὅπως ἂν] ὁ δῆμος ἀεὶ εὐδ[αιμόνως]
5  [ζῆι ἐν δαψ]ιλείαι σίτου γιν[όμενος]
   [ὑπαρχού]σης πᾶσι τοῖς π[ολίταις ἐκ]
   [τῶν κοι]νῶν σιτομετρία[ς κατὰ τὸν νό]-
   [μον. Με]νεσθεὺς Κλέαντ[ος ὑπὲρ]
   [αὐτοῦ κ]αὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ Κλεάν[ακτος?]
10 [δραχμὰς ἑξακοσίας· Φάνυ[λλος]
   [– ὑ]πὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ το[ῦ υἱοῦ]
   [– δ]ραχμὰς δια[κοσίας·]
   [– Νημέ]ρτεως [–]
   [–]ιλο[–.]
```

---

109 Isaeus 5.37–38 (On the Succession of Dicaeogenes): "Though so many extraordinary contributions for the cost of the war and the safety of the city have been made by all the citizens, Dicaeogenes has never contributed anything, except that after the capture of Lechaeum, at the request of another citizen, he promised in the public assembly a subscription of 300 drachmas, a smaller sum than Cleonymus the Cretan. This sum he promised but did not pay, and his name was posted on a list of defaulters in front of the statues of the Eponymous Heroes, which was headed: 'These are they who voluntarily promised the people to contribute money for the salvation of the city and failed to pay the amounts promised'" (trans. E.S. Forster, LCL 202).

110 *IG* 2².360.8–12 (Migeotte, no. 8) (Athens, 328/7 BCE); *IG* 7.1719 + 1744 (Migeotte, no. 29) (Thespies, Boeotia, 191–172 BCE); *IG* 12/5.135 (Migeotte, no. 55) (Paros, early 1st cent. BCE); *IG* 12/6.1.172 (Migeotte, no. 62) (Samos, 260 BCE); *IIasos* 244 (E.L. Hicks, "Iasos," *JHS* 8 [1887], 83–118, here 100–101) (Iasos, mid-2nd cent. BCE); *IG* 14.427–430 (Migeotte, no. 87) (Tauromenion, Cyrene, between 110–90 and 46–36 BCE).

These, wishing from their own free will to reinforce democracy from their own resources, have contributed funds for the purchase of grain so that the demos will always live happily, having an abundance of grain, with all the citizens having a supply of grain from the common fund, in accordance with decree. Menesthenes son of Klean, on his own and for his son Kleanax gave 600 drachmae; Phanyllos … on his own and for his son … 200 drachmae; … son of Nemertes …[111]

Klean and Kleanax, who contributed 600 drachmae, likely were afforded first place on the list but after that the contributions are smaller. Since it is impossible to know the original dimensions of the stone, it is impossible to ascertain how many contributors were listed and whether this Iasean ἐπίδοσις achieved sufficient funds so that the interest could supply grain to the city.

An ἐπίδοσις from the early third century CE was organized by Aurelius Horion the former στρατηγός in Alexandria for villagers in the Oxyrhynchite nome who, Horion declares, "are completely exhausted from distressing demands of the yearly liturgies of both the treasury and the taxes for the guarding of the nome." The funds were to be used εἰς τροφὰς καὶ | δ[απά]νας τῶν κατ᾽ ἔτος λειτουργησόντων ("food and the expenses for the yearly liturgies," *P.Oxy.* 4.705.78–79). This is an ἐπίδοσις for villagers in Upper Egypt, but initiated by Horion, who lives in Alexandria in the Delta. Yet since, as he declares, he and his son owned property in the Oxyrhynchite nome and he feared that should the farms fail, both he and the imperial treasury would suffer,[112] the case is not a close parallel to Paul's collection, since neither the Macedonians nor the Corinthians likely had a financial stake in properties in Jerusalem.

2.4 The Ideology of Public Subscriptions

Ἐπιδόσεις were powerful instruments of social formation because they called not only upon the wealthy but upon all residents – citizens, metics and even foreigners – to contribute to a common project and thus to "perform" their membership in the polis.[113]

---

111 *Iasos* 244 (Hicks, "Iasos" [see n. 110], 100–101) (Iasos, mid-2nd cent. BCE).

112 *P.Oxy.* 4.705.73–74: κινδυνεύουσί τε τῷ μὲν ταμείῳ παραπολέ|σθαι τὴν δὲ ὑμετέραν γῆν ἀγεώργητον καταλιπεῖν ("there is a danger both they will be ruined as far as the treasury is concerned, and your [*sic!* our?] land will be left uncultivated").

113 The role of contributions, even small contributions, in the formation of a social imaginary is documented by anthropologists such as M. Lambek, *The Weight of the Past: Living with History in Mahajanga, Madagascar* (Contemporary Anthropology of Religion; New York, 2002), who observes of the Sakalava (Malagasy), "It is here that ordinary people most directly experience their own participation (their will, intentionality, and agency) and identification with the ancestral system, which can thrive

The ideological construction of identity in Greek cities has been discussed extensively, in part in connection with Greek tragedy and the festival of the Great Dionysia.[114] The festival included, dramatic performances, but began with several initial elements: a procession; the display of war booty to demonstrate to visitors the power of Athens; the naming of those who had benefited the city in some way; and the particular honors (crowns, garlands) that had been given them.[115] Citing Demosthenes' comment that the awarding of the crown is as much for the benefit of those who do the crowning as it is for the person crowned (*Cor.* 120), Simon Goldhill notes, "The proclamation of the names of those who had benefited the city is another way of asserting the ties, connections and duties between individuals and the city. Above all it stresses the moral and social imperative of doing good for the city as a key way of defining behaviour in the democratic polis."[116]

Although the degree to which Greek drama evinced a "democratic ideology" rather than "civic/*polis* ideology" has been contested,[117] what is important for our purposes is the valorization of benefitting the polis as a critical part of the construction of civic identity.

The benefactions of individual civic elites were certainly celebrated as expressions of polis ideology. This ideology in part mobilized the heroic tradition of the individual warrior, competing for honor in the defense of himself, his family, and his property. But the invention and eventual dominance of the hoplite phalanx introduced a new value, since military success now depended on cooperative action, not the prowess of the individual warrior. Athens celebrated such collective sacrifice in its erection of casualty lists of those who had fallen. The civic commemoration of those who had died in battle indeed allowed for individual rites. But the

---

only through their commitment to service" (143). "Each act of giving is formally *received* with thanks, clapping, speeches, and the like, and the reception constitutes a form of recognition. Acts of giving take place in a sociable context, with music, drink and warm fellowship. Everyone appears to have a stake in the maintenance and reproduction of the politico-religious system; they are proud to have the honor to participate" (162). See also J. Comaroff, *Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance: The Culture and History of a South African People* (Chicago, 1985), 235–236.

114 We are, of course, better informed about Athens than Corinth, and especially Corinth after its Romanization when it was rebuilt.

115 See S. Goldhill, "The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology," *JHS* 107 (1987), 58–76, here 66.

116 Goldhill, "Great Dionysia" (see n. 115), 63.

117 P.J. Rhodes, "Nothing to Do with Democracy: Athenian Drama and the Polis," *JHS* 123 (2003), 104–119.

"main event" was the ἐπιτάφιος λόγος which focused not on individual heroism, but on the glories of the city itself:

For now men are said to fight not for individual κλέος [fame] nor for the perpetuation of their names through the retelling of acts of individual prowess. Now fighting is for the city. One may fight to free a land, to protect homes, women, children, as in Homer, but success is measured in terms of the city's fortunes, and each individual's success is subsumed to the τύχη of the city. So in the Funeral Speech it is the city that is discussed and a citizen's role in democracy.[118]

It is not difficult to see how the cooperative value built into polis ideology could be mobilized in support of collective actions on behalf of the polis, in particular in the practice of the ἐπίδοσις as a performance of citizenship. Insofar as metics and foreigners were also called upon to support the city, the ἐπίδοσις was also a performance of those virtues intimately connected to civic identity. Ellis-Evans puts it this way:

Public subscriptions sought to encourage members of the *polis* community to reproduce civic values by publicly acting them out. Through the serialization of communitarian acts of generosity, both the initial performance and the subsequent epigraphic monumentalization promoted a specific set of values as normative for the inhabitants of a *polis*. Since, in the political imaginary of the *polis* of Tanagra, the women of Tanagra should be particularly concerned for the temple of Demeter and Kore, the *polis* makes them act out this ideal when it holds a public subscription. Because *polis* ideology imagines that all parts of the population, citizen or otherwise, would want to defend their home, at the Koan war subscription we witness otherwise politically disfranchised individuals, who would usually be passive observers or altogether absent from a subscription, making contributions alongside citizens. The reverential place allotted to the man who promises first romantically imagines the surge of emotion a wealthy patriot feels when a subscription is announced.[119]

Ἐπιδόσεις, insofar as they frequently received contributions from non-citizens and in some instances solicited contributions *exclusively* form non-citizens,[120] served as ways for metics and ξένοι to demonstrate their commitment to the polis. Such service brought with it the reasonable expectation that the polis would reciprocate, sometimes with the conferral of the title εὐεργέτης, or grants of the status of ἰσοτέλεια (i. e., exempt from metic taxes) or πρόξενος, or even with a grant of citizenship.[121]

Public subscriptions, then, mobilized simultaneously the value of cooperation and civic pride that had become part of Greek society and the competitive instinct for honor. An example of both cooperation

---

118 Goldhill, "Great Dionysia" (see n. 115), 66.
119 Ellis-Evans, "Ideology" (see n. 91), 112.
120 See Migeotte, p. 402 (index, s.v. "étrangers").
121 Chaniotis, "Public Subscriptions" (see n. 67), 99–104.

and competition functioning together is provided by such Athenian ἐπίδοσις-inscriptions as *IG* 2².835 (*SEG* 19.80). The inscription is a commendation of Apollas son of Tharrhymon, a non-citizen from Sikyon (in the northern Peloponnese) for having contributed to an Athenian ἐπίδοσις "without having been asked," for having contributed *first*. He also gave the *most* that was allowed by the terms of the ἐπίδοσις ([ἐν πρώ]τοις ἐπέδωκεν … ὅσον πλεῖστον [ἤν ἐν]||[δεχό]με[ν]ο[ν, ll. 3–5). Thus Apollas is said to have "*competed* with the citizens" (τοῖς πολίταις ἐνάμιλλο[ν, l. 12).[122] The function of the inscription is obvious: both to commend a foreigner for exemplary behavior, but also to stir Athenians to action, provoked by civic pride and competition for honor.[123]

Public subscriptions served multiple functions: first, to afford those without sufficient financial resources to function as single εὐεργέται the chance to participate collectively in acts that benefitted their cities. In many cases contributions were very small. Ἐπιδόσεις allowed contributors, whether citizens or non-resident aliens, to "perform" their loyalty to the polis and in the case of non-residents, to achieve through reciprocity closer affiliation with the polis. These subscriptions simultaneously engaged cooperation and competition, and allowed for a spectrum of practices, from those that blatantly encouraged agonistic, even "heroic" competition among the wealthy and powerful, to other forms that deliberately masked status differences and created a model in which communal ideals took precedence over competition for honors. Yet even in the latter form, competition resides not in how much one contributed, but in whether or not one contributed, since it was immediately known those who did, and those who did not. "Extraordinary" contributions by metics and foreigners stood out in particular.

3 The Pauline Collection and the Fiscal Practices of Greek Poleis

What have these fiscal practices to do with the Pauline collection? There are some obvious differences between the ἐπιδόσεις discussed above and

---

122 See the comments of Chaniotis, "Public Subscriptions" (see n. 67), 103–104. Because of his largesse, Apollas was granted πρόξενος status and the right to buy property (ἔγκτησις).

123 A similar instance of a foreigner from Salamis in Cyprus contributing to an Athenian ἐπίδοσις is attested in *IG* 2².283, on which see M.B. Walbank, "Notes on Attic Decrees," *ZPE* 139 (2002), 61–65, here 63 (no. 5).

Paul's collection. The Pauline collection, although it resembled in significant ways Greek ἐπιδόσεις, was novel in at least three important respects. First, we have no evidence of any ἐπίδοσις organized for the benefit of members of a community other than that of the donors themselves, with the possible exception of the collections that occurred in Hellenistic synagogues, to the extent that these can be regarded as instances of ἐπιδόσεις. There is, however, occasional evidence of noncitizens supporting a civic project, as in the case of the "former residents of Judea" contributing to a civic project in Erythrai (above, p. 185) or, Apollas of Sikyon contributing to an Athenian ἐπίδοσις (above, p. 190).

Second, it is also true that ἐπιδόσεις were not normally framed as relief for "the poor." It is widely acknowledged that support for the poor qua poor is likely the result of transformations that occurred in Late Antiquity.[124] Indeed, the idea of a special collection for the πτωχοί would probably have struck many Greeks as a curiously counterintuitive undertaking.[125] Ἐπιδόσεις were typically framed more abstractly, with the formulae ἐπέδωκαν … εἰς τὴν σωτηρίαν/ἐπισκευήν/κατασκευήν/σιτομετρίαν, although a few inscriptions expressly name the demos as the recipient of the funds.[126] The "poor" as such were rarely the express object of such undertakings, even if the demos in times of need was.

The letter of Pliny to Trajan (*ep.* 10.92–93) might seem an exception. In that correspondence, Pliny informs the emperor of the desire of the Ami-

---

124 P. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover, N.H., 2002); G. Woolf, "Writing Poverty in Rome," in *Poverty in the Roman World* (ed. M. Atkins and R. Osborne; Cambridge, 2006), 83–99, here 84; P. Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 AD* (Princeton, 2012); I.F. Silber, "Neither Mauss, nor Veyne: Peter Brown's Interpretative Path to the Gift," in *The Gift in Antiquity* (ed. M.L. Satlow; Malden, Mass., 2013), 202–220; L. Cecchet, "Gift-Giving to the Poor in the Greek World," in *Gift-Giving and the "Embedded" Economy in the Ancient World* (ed. F. Carlà and M. Gori; Heidelberg, 2014), 157–179; L. Cracco Ruggini, "From Pagan to Christian Euergetism," ibid., 203–212.

125 See K.J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford, 1974), 177; A. Gottesman, "The Beggar and the Clod: The Mythic Notion of Poverty in Ancient Greece," *TAPA* 140.2 (2010), 287–322, and Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 4.2 (1122a): "the term μεγαλοπρέπεια is not applied to one who spends adequate sums on objects of only small or moderate importance, like the man who said 'Oft gave I alms to homeless wayfarers' [Hom. *Od.* 17.420]; it denotes someone who spends suitably on great objects, for though the munificent man is liberal, the liberal man is not necessarily munificent" (trans. H. Rackham, LCL 73). But see A. Parkin, "'You Do Him No Service': An Exploration of Pagan Almsgiving," in *Poverty in the Roman World* (see n. 124), 60–82, for a balanced account of charity.

126 E.g., *IG* 12/5.135 (Paros, early 1st cent. BCE): ἐπὶ Ἀπελλοῦς Θαργηλιῶνος [ὑσ]τέρου | τετράδι ἱ[σ]ταμένου | οἵδε ἐπέδωκαν τῶι δή|[μ]ωι εἰς τὴν σιτομετρίαν.

seni, a *civitas libera et foederata* and therefore not directly under Roman control, to form an ἔρανος. Trajan agreed, but on the condition that "these contributions are employed, not for the purpose of riot and faction, but for the support of the indigent" (*sed ad sustinendam tenuiorum inopiam utuntur*). It is difficult to know whether *tenuiores* here meant the urban poor in general or members of the ἔρανος who were in need. If the latter, this would be unexceptional in Greek eranistic practice. There are plenty of examples of Greek associations coming to the aid of *members* who were in need.[127] A few years after Pliny's time, a collegium of Diana and Antinoüs formed a club, citing in their *lex* a *senatusconsultum* that permitted groups to meet (only) monthly and only for the purpose of collecting funds for the burial of the dead.[128] The *lex* makes it clear that it was the collegium's members – mostly freedmen and slaves – that were the beneficiaries of this collection and not the poor more generally. Moreover, contrary to the plain sense of the *senatusconsultum*, the club met more than monthly and not simply to collect funds for the *funus.* The gap between what the *senatusconsultum* imagined as the proper function of a collegium and what the collegium actually did may not be very different from a gap between what Trajan assumed apropos of the Amiseni and the actual purposes of their ἔρανος.[129] In the end, it remains unlikely that Greek (or Roman) clubs ever collected money to be disbursed to the poor in general.[130] By the same token, it is not at all clear, despite claims

---

127 See Harland, "Associations" (see n. 1).

128 *CIL* 14.2112.12–14: *quib[us permissum est co]nvenire collegiumq(ue) habere liceat qui stipem menstruam conferre vo|len[t ad facienda sa]cra in it*(!) *collegium coeant neq(ue) sub specie eius collegi nisi semel in men|se c[onveniant con]ferendi causa unde defuncti sepeliantur.* The corrected text is that of A. Bendlin, "Associations, Funerals, Sociality, and Roman Law: The *Collegium* of Diana and Antinous in Lanuvium (CIL 14.2112) Reconsidered," in *Aposteldekret und antikes Vereinswesen* (ed. M. Öhler; WUNT 280; Tübingen, 2011), 207–296.

129 Later jurists invented the idea of the *collegium tenuiorum* (e.g., Aelius Marcianus, *Digesta* 47.22.3.2), but it is not clear that this was not a legal fiction to allow for the continued existence of *collegia* under legal fiction that they were only for the support of poorer members.

130 J.P. Waltzing, "Les corporations de l'ancienne Rome et charité," in *Compte rendu du troisième congrès scientifique international des Catholiques* (Brussels, 1895), 165–190 (repr. as "The Roman Guilds and Charity," *Charities Review* 4.7 [1895], 345–362), argued that while Roman occupational guilds provided for the burial of members – his primary evidence was *CIL* 14.2112 – they did not offer aid to members who had suffered hardship and in this they were distinguished from Christian churches. It may be the case for Roman *collegia* but the provision of assistance was a common feature of Egyptian associations: see Harland, "Associations" (see n. 1), 26–31, and the texts cited there.

by Longenecker, that Pauline groups benefited the poor *outside* the groups of Christ followers.[131]

Third, Paul's collection was framed not only as a collection for the "poor," but as a collection for members of a *different* ethnic group. As Larry Welborn has aptly observed, "it must be emphasized how anomalous Paul's appeal to the principle of 'equality' between Jews and Greeks would have seemed. A careful examination of edicts and petitions, together with the relevant passages in Philo and Josephus, provides no grounds for thinking that Jews enjoyed equal rights identified with citizens in any of the Greek cities of the Roman east."[132]

In 2 Cor 8 and 9, Paul grounds the appeal for the collection in the notion of ἰσότης ("equality"). This should be seen in the context of other attempts at the articulation of equality, in particular the failed struggle, only a decade before, for ἰσοπολιτεία between Judeans and Greeks in Alexandria, and the periodic eruptions of conflict between Judeans and gentiles in Caesarea over the same issue that would become one of the events leading to the First Revolt. Paul's notion of equality in 2 Cor 8:14 is not one of equal civic rights[133] but of Greeks sharing economic resources with Judeans.

---

131 Longenecker, *Remember the Poor* (see n. 6), 292: "although Jesus-followers had to restrict their primary efforts to the offsetting of the needs of the poor within their own communities, that focus did not exclude the possibility of extending care to others beyond the community, at least if the Pauline data is anything to go by. His texts fall across a continuum of emphases. In Rom 12:13–16, he identifies care for the needy as an integral feature of intra-corporate love. In Gal 6:10, he speaks of doing good 'to all', but adds 'especially to those of the household of faith.' Yet, in 1 Thess 5:15 he endorses 'pursuing the good' (τὸ ἀγαθὸν διώκετε) in relation to both the corporate community (εἰς ἀλλήλους) and broader society in general (εἰς πάντας). And in 1 Thess 5:14 he extols helping the weak in general, without qualifiers of any kind. Paul seems to have imagined that, while alleviating the needs of the poor within communities of Jesus-followers was never to be compromised, neither was that practice to be set in opposition to caring for those beyond Jesus-communities."

132 Welborn, "Equality" (see n. 86), 83.

133 The meaning of ἰσοπολιτεία itself is disputed. J. Mélèze-Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (trans. R. Cornman, with a foreword by S.J.D. Cohen; Princeton, 1997), argued that in Alexandria it was a quest for citizenship, but A. Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (rev. Eng. ed.; TSAJ 7; Tübingen, 1985), and *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Hellenistic Cities During the Second Temple Period (332 BCE–70 CE)* (TSAJ 21; Tübingen, 1990), 256, thinks that Judeans in Alexandria were pursuing the status of a πολίτευμα, a separate and autonomous political body, with rights equal to the polis but not dependent upon it. The goal of ἰσοπολιτεία is even less clear in Caesarea, but the simmering conflict between the Judean and gentile populations of the city was longstanding (see J.S. Kloppenborg, "Ethnic and Political Rivalry at Caesarea Maritima," in *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle*

As I have indicated above, my goal is not to seek the "source" of Paul's practice or to argue that he was "imitated" or was "influenced" by the practices of Greek cities, but instead to use the practices about which we know quite a lot to raise heuristic questions about Paul's collection (about which we know little) and to understand better the appeal of a collection and the challenges it raised.

The main issue from which the concerns of the Corinthian group flowed had to do with the fact that a collection was being assembled, not to serve the needs of Corinthian Christ-followers, but the Jerusalem group. Although none of the ἐπιδόσεις that are attested provides close parallels to this situation, a number of dynamics integral to those collections do have a bearing on the Pauline collection.

First, the ἐπίδοσις offers an analogy for a community-based fund-raising project rather than a model based on reliance on the largesse of the elite. While some ἐπιδόσεις imposed no upper limit on contributions and allowed for theatrical offers by the elite – thus making these ἐπιδόσεις a site of the performance of status –, others limited the contributions and even restricted them to a given – usually very modest – sum, thus taking the focus from status-display and placing it on communal benefaction. Since Paul evidently could not rely on elite benefactors to contribute large sums, the more "democratic" practice like that of the ἐπίδοσις commended itself as a viable model. Moreover, the ἐπίδοσις of *SEG* 50.1050 allowed for amortized contributions, dividing even the relatively modest sum of 30 drachmae into three installments spread over a year (above, p. 183). Paul clearly has something like this in mind in 1 Cor 16:2.

Second, the gap between promise and delivery is something that troubled Paul as it did the organizers of public subscriptions. Nothing in the tone of Paul's letter in 1 Cor 16:1–4 suggests that the Corinthians rejected the proposal for a collection out of hand; they were concerned, on the contrary, with the details of its security and delivery. Whether they had already "promised" certain sums prior to 1 Corinthians is unknowable. But by the time of 2 Cor 8 it appears that the collection had broken down; hence, the rhetoric of Paul in this letter is to encourage the collection, which was also the point of sending Titus and "the brother" to Corinth to complete it.[134]

---

for Success in Caesarea Maritima [ed. T.L. Donaldson; SCJud 8; Waterloo, Ont., 2000], 227–248).

134 M. Mitchell, "Paul's Letters to Corinth: The Interpretive Intertwining of Literary and Historical Reconstruction," in *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (ed. D.N. Schowalter and S.J. Friesen; HTS 53; Cambridge, Mass., 2005), 306–338, here 327–333, building on a sensitive reading of rhetorical echoes between

Even later, in 2 Cor 9,[135] Paul says that he has boasted that the Corinthian collection was complete ἀπὸ πέρυσι, but it is clear from his anxiety that he is unsure that he believed this to be the case.

Given the fact that ἐπιδόσεις employed peer-pressure and the possibility of the public shaming of those who refused to contribute as motivations for action,[136] Paul's statement in 2 Cor 9:4 is unexceptional: he threatens in a not-too-subtle way that the imminent arrival of Macedonians in Corinth who *have contributed* will put to shame Corinthians who have not. Paul here is relying on the agonistic instincts of his addressees and an appeal to their civic pride.[137] While ἐπίδοσις-practices could avail themselves of the threat of the public shaming of non-contributors by placing the names of dead-beats on a public list (above, p. 186), Paul did not have this option open to him. Instead he imagines a scenario of humiliation of himself and Corinthian non-contributors upon the Macedonians' arrival in Corinth. No public inscription would be cut, but in the small face-to-face world of associations and ἐκκλησίαι all would know who had contributed and who had not.

Third, although the Pauline collection for the "poor" is anomalous in the context of Greek ἐπιδόσεις in the sense that it was a collection for a group in a locale far removed from that of the contributors, a similar ideology undergirds both kinds of projects. In a culture in which honor was a key and critical value,[138] euergetism was a powerful tool in the construc-

---

1 Cor 16 and 2 Cor 8, has suggested that Paul in 2 Cor 8:22 (συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν ὃν ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις σπουδαῖον ὄντα) is going back on this undertaking in 1 Cor 16:3 that the Corinthians will be responsible for choosing envoys to accompany the collection. She suggests, further, that this change of heart was the cause of anger and distrust reflected in Paul's defense of himself that he was not "peddling the word of God" (2 Cor 2:17) and that he was in fact behaving in a guiltless way (2 Cor 4:2) (assuming that 2 Cor 2:14–7:4 minus 6:14–7:1 follows 2 Cor 8). Such a change of heart would undoubtedly have cause consternation and distrust, but it is difficult to see how Paul could have blundered into such a counterproductive suggestion given the general anxiety that all had about the security of communally collected funds.

135 I follow H.-D. Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, 1985) in thinking that 2 Cor 8 and 9 are separate letters.

136 See Chaniotis, "Public Subscriptions" (see n. 67).

137 R.S. Ascough, "The Completion of a Religious Duty: The Background of Cor 8:1–15," *NTS* 42.4 (1996), 584–599, has shown that Paul's use of ἐπιτελέω in 2 Cor 8:1–15 (three times: 8:6, 11[*bis*]) is used in connection with the completion of a cultic duty. Since the verb is frequently connected with the completion of θυσίαι and μυστήρια, it would appear that Paul is attempting to link the collection with a cultic duty.

138 J.E. Lendon, *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World* (Oxford, 1997); C.A. Barton, *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones* (Berkeley, 2001).

tion of personal and corporate self-esteem. The providing of benefits to the polis or to the group was, to be sure, an important way to address real hardships and challenges that faced the polis and to demonstrate the loyalty of citizens (and non-citizens) to the polis; but the *quid pro quo* in this exchange was the public recognition of largesse, demonstrated by lists of donors that could be read out and inscribed in public space. It was a performance of citizenship. This is true whether the contribution was large or a mere 5 drachmae. And as I have mentioned above, some of the ἐπιδόσεις were even structured to level status differences and focus on the communitarian aspects of the contribution. Participation in an ἐπίδοσις did not constitute the donor as a patron, but it did constitute him or her as a true citizen.

Paul's appeal employs an analogous logic: he begins in 2 Cor 8 by citing the Macedonians' insistence on their participation in this collective event, thus appealing to competitive urges among the Corinthians: if "poor" Macedonians were eager to demonstrate their largesse, then better-off Corinthians should do even more. He then swiftly turns to praising the Corinthians for an array of virtues: πίστις, λόγος, γνῶσις, σπουδή, and ἀγάπη, expressing the hope that they will add χάρις to their accomplishments (2 Cor 8:7). This is plainly an appeal to something analogous to the civic virtues that were celebrated in public decrees and to competitive outlay characteristic of polis ideology.[139] So too is Paul's mention of his "boasting" about the eagerness (προθυμία) of the Corinthians in 2 Cor 9:2 an appeal to civic pride. In these instances, it is to the needs of the polis of Corinth to which the Corinthians were expected to contribute, but τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα of the Jerusalem group (2 Cor 8:14). In making this contribution, they would constitute themselves *as a group* that existed within a larger political network or fictive translocal polity.

Finally, I have suggested above that the role of the envoys of the gentile Christ groups was not only to ensure that the collection was delivered to its intended recipients and not diverted to other uses, but also to ensure that credit was given to those who had contributed. This would be entirely in accord with donative practices in the Greek world: anonymous donations had not yet become a cultural practice. Whether credit took the form of a list of the names of individual contributors, comparable to many of the

---

139 D. Whitehead, "Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: Φιλοτιμία In Democratic Athens," *Classica et Mediaevelia* 34 (1983), 55–74.

ἐπίδοσις-lists that we have, or a list of the ἐκκλησίαι that had contributed is a matter of speculation; both forms of lists are attested.[140]

We should not end without commenting on the novel aspects of Paul's project. As I have noted above, his collection was for a non-local cause; it was for the πτωχοί – not the poor generally but for a specific group of πτωχοί in Judea; and it was a collection taken up in Greek cities for persons who in the first century (and even much later) did not enjoy ἰσοπολιτεία in most Greek cities. It is an exaggeration to call Paul's project "subversive," as some have claimed. Subversion was simply beyond Paul's reach, since he lacked the political power and influence to bring about significant change. He lacked the ability to offer an effective challenge to prevailing forms of power and domination either by lampoon and satire that was sufficiently effective to destabilize the power of the elite, or by mobilizing a critical mass of persons to engage in a counter-practice that would offer a real alternative to civic patronage. It is doubtful that Paul's collection would be noticed by those outside the narrow circle of Christ followers. If it were, it is hard to imagine that a Roman prefect would consider Paul's collection as anything other than a quaint and benighted practice by an insignificant artisan.[141] Certainly nothing to worry or threaten the status quo, since it challenged no one's power or interests.

---

140 *ILindos* 2.252 (115 BCE) is an ἐπίδοσις-list of persons who had both promised to contribute, and did contribute to a collection to provide crowns for Athena Lindia, Zeus Polieus and Nike. The list is mainly the names of individuals, sometimes mentioning wives and sons as associated contributors, but also lists seven κοινά, all associated with a citizen, Timapolis: (225) ἀρχιεροθύτα καὶ ἱερέων | καὶ ἱεροθυτᾶν καὶ Ἀθαναϊστᾶ[ν] | Τιμαπολείων κοινὸν … (250–258) [Τ]ι[μ]άπολις καὶ Τιμαπολείων κο[ιν]ὸν [–] | Τιμάπολι[ς] καὶ Ἀγαθοδαιμο[νιαστᾶν κοι]νὸν ι′ | Τιμάπολις καὶ Ἀγεσ[τρ]α[τείω]ν | καὶ Λευκαρείω[ν] κο[ινὸν –] | Τιμάπολις [καὶ – – – – – –] || καὶ Ἀπολλω[ν]ια[στᾶν κο]ι[νὸν –] | [Τ]ιμά[πολις] κ[αὶ] Ἀρσι[νοείων? καὶ] | Ἀφροδ[ισιαστᾶν – – – –]είων κ[ο]ινὸν ι′ | Τιμάπο[λις καὶ Σ]ω[τη]ρ[ι]αστᾶν. Similar lists from Rhodes that combine individual donors and associations (κοινά) are found in G. Pugliese Carratelli, "Per la storia delle associazioni in Rodi antica," *Annuario della scuola archeologica di Atene* 17–18 (n.s. 1–2) (1939/40), 147–200, here 149–150 no. 4 (Segre and Pugliese Carratelli, "Tituli Camirenses" [see n. 100], 264 no. 159a, and G. Pugliese Carratelli, "Tituli Camirenses, Supplementum," *Annuario della scuola archeologica di Atene* 30–32 (n.s. 14–16) [1952–1954], 211–246, here 220–223 no. 157b).

141 Compare Pliny's report of his interrogation of Christians sixty years later (*ep.* 10.96): by that time Christian numbers in Bithynia-Pontus had grown to the level that their nonparticipation in local temples had economic impact; hence one might claim that Christ-followers were engaging in a "subversive" practice vis-à-vis local temples and their priestly apparatus. Yet Pliny seemed to treat Christian nonparticipation in the imperial cult not as a clear and present danger to the empire, but only as a test to determine who was a Christian. The Christians, in his view, were largely harmless, if benighted: *nihil aliud inveni quiam superstitionem pravam et immodicam.*

A better characterization of Paul's project is "transgressive."[142] His rationale for the collection transgressed the boundaries of several kinds of cultural practices current in the Greek world, in particular the promotion of an ἐπίδοσις-like collection for an extra-local, non-Greek group. At the same time, as this essay has shown, the project was deeply committed to the mechanisms and ideology of Greek ἐπιδόσεις: the broad appeal to gentile groups to maximize participation operated by the same logic as Greek ἐπιδόσεις, and Paul's collection, at least as he presented it, functioned as a way for individuals and individual groups to "perform membership" in a broader identity. This is hardly subversion, since it threatened no one, all the more so if the results of the collection were paltry, as Paul seems to have feared in his comments about the prospects that the collection would be "acceptable" in Jerusalem. Only two or three centuries later, when ecclesiastical powers took control of almsgiving and directed it towards the urban poor can one begin to imagine a practice that subverted the earlier practices of civic patronage by the elite. But such was far beyond Paul's means to effect or, likely, even to imagine.

Without arguing that Pauline Christ groups borrowed from, or were "influenced by" the practices of the many small face-to-face associations that dotted the Mediterranean city-scape, or the practices of cities themselves, this paper has shown how a knowledge of those practices can throw into sharper relief the issues that faced Paul's collection and how it would have been viewed by its participants and others.[143]

John S. Kloppenborg
University of Toronto
Department for the Study of Religion
Jackman Humanities Bldg.
170 St. George Street
Toronto, ON M5R 2M8
Canada
john.kloppenborg@utoronto.ca

---

142 See especially J.A. Harrill, "Paul and Empire: Studying Roman Identity after the Cultural Turn," *EC* 2.3 (2011), 281–311, for a compelling critique of the notion that Paul was engaged in a "subversion" of Roman imperialism. "*Transgressive* means violating the cultural norms or rules, whereas *subversive* means actually changing the cultural norms and rules" (292, emphasis original).

143

Ronald Charles

Paul and Plutarch on Religion[1]

Dieser Artikel ist eine religionsgeschichtliche Vergleichsübung. Die Haltung des Paulus im Römerbrief wird mit Plutarchs vermittelnder Position im Blick auf Religion in dessen Traktat *De superstitione* verglichen. Zunächst werden die unterschiedlichen Leseeindrücke analysiert, die sich bei der Lektüre der beiden Texte einstellen, um auf dieser Grundlage die Tonlage zu bestimmen, mit der die beiden Autoren ihre gegenläufigen Konzepte entwickeln und sich auf Gegenbilder beziehen bzw. bestimmte Zitattechniken anwenden, mit denen sie ihre Ansichten zur Praxis der wahren Religion stützen. Dabei werden schließlich einige Aussagen des Paulus zur Gottesfurcht im Römerbrief im Licht von Plutarchs Analyse der religiös irregeleiteten Person hinterfragt.

Keywords: Paul, Romans, Plutarch, superstition, religion, comparison, voice

1 Introduction

The practice of comparing the apostle Paul to other ancient figures has been undertaken for years.[2] This kind of comparative practice has usually been done to show how Paul is similar to the other individuals being analyzed, or how his philosophy or religious thoughts are similar to those of others. There is a lot to learn from this way of understanding the biblical writer, not as a particular or unique figure in the religious interpretation of ancient writings, but as one similar to others in his rhetorical practices,

2 For example, he has been compared to the Stoic philosophers, to Philo, and to other rabbinic teachers. In fact, when one understands the ways in which the rabbinic teachers of Paul's time used the Hebrew Scriptures to understand a contemporary problem, then it becomes easier to approach Paul. Looking at Paul through the lenses of the Stoic philosophers, or seeing him as a first-century mystic, opens up layers of understanding that could otherwise escape more than one reader. See, among countless others, T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics* (Westminster, 2000); W.D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (London, 1962); E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis, 1977); R.N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1999).

and in his philosophy; in sum as one human being trying to make sense of his religious experience and theology. What has been less explored, in this respect, is the appropriation and meanings of the category "religion" in Paul when compared to other Greek and Roman figures.

The scope of this paper is to compare and contrast Paul (as we can understand him from his letter to the Romans) and Plutarch (in his treaty *De superstitione*, Περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας) to determine, not if the works being surveyed occupy any specific literary genre, but if there is a relationship between the voices that speak in each text.[3] This paper will attempt to look at (1) what the texts assert, and (2) how each text goes about making these assertions. The comparative task at hand is to find out how these different authors express their views on the fear of God and the practice of true religion. This exercise is ultimately a comparative discourse that is not concerned directly with Paul and Plutarch. The goal here is to engage in a scholarly practice that allows relationships between the works to come to light through a process of simultaneous analysis.

As we embark on a comparative exercise involving Paul, one cannot ignore the extensive research presuming the apostle's dependence on the canons of Greco-Roman rhetoric. Though there is certainly value in this kind of inquiry,[4] and it is likely that Paul had some acquaintance with rhetorical methods,[5] I want to distance myself from such endeavors simply because there has been a lot written on it already.[6] My emphasis is on the voice of the text; that is, on the specific ways in which each author articulates his understandings of the fear of God. This way of engaging the text opens up more possibilities than just looking at the genre of the text.[7]

---

3 Δεισιδειμονία does not, literally, mean superstition, but a damaging and theologically wrong fear of the divine.

4 I completely agree with George A. Kennedy that "there is need for some knowledge of classical rhetoric in reading the New Testament." See G.A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1984), 57–60.

5 Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation* (see n. 4), 9–10.

6 A very good reference to contemporary issues in rhetorical interpretation is M.D. Nanos (ed.), *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation* (Peabody, Mass., 2002). The definitive challenge to scholarly opinion that Galatians is cast in the mold of the rhetorical handbooks is provided by P. Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an Approach to Paul's Epistle* (SNTSMS 101; Cambridge, 1998).

7 Let me illustrate briefly by taking the rigid taxonomic approach as an example. In this approach some of the questions asked are: what the text is and how one should read it. In this taxonomic approach we can look at the works of some formalists imposing a certain form or structure to a particular piece as, say, considering Romans as a diatribe in the work of S. Changwon, *Reading Romans as a Diatribe* (StBibLit 59; New York, 2004). Though this approach has some value in helping one to analyze the genre of a text – I am thinking here of the structural analysis à la Vladimir Propp and other struc-

This openness can enchant, puzzle, and even annoy us. Looking at the tone of voice of a text, instead of its genre, seems to be more interesting.[8] Again, the goal is not to ask whether the texts under consideration are in conformity to a specific literary genre, but why it is that the act of reading one author seems, at least to a modern reader, to be stranger and more difficult than reading the other, or why it is that the experience of reading one is boring, irritating and the other pleasurable. The hope is that the texts may surprise us as readers as we journey in putting them one alongside the other in dialogue in an exercise of intellectual imagination, so that one can discover, in humility, the fresh and surprising perspectives they may reveal on the practice of this fascinating cultural category we moderns call, problematically, "religion."

2 Reading Paul and Plutarch

First of all, it is harder to translate Plutarch than it is to translate Paul. Plutarch – born from a wealthy Greek family near Delphi (in Chaeroneia) in the 40s – exercised his literary abilities in the context of a position of privilege and power. He died probably around 120 CE and has left to posterity an impressive body of work in biography and philosophy. Although his adult life was spent as a priest of the Delphic temple, as a philosopher, and as a magistrate, Plutarch seems to have had time to spare. He is not pressured by any burgeoning community in dire need of instructions in order to grow in their religious understanding. He has a certain material ease which gives him comfort to hone his craft, and to present his case in a polished and leisurely way.[9] Plutarch is overall very elegant in his style of writing. His use of vocabulary is well assorted and rich. His examples are taken from different spheres of human activities, such as: war, slavery,

---

turalists – it does not help in the ability to assess voice(s) in a given corpus. Also one reason I am not prone to focus on the issue of genre in my analysis is that Plutarch is less engaged with questions related to genre in this particular text than in his later religious writings. Consider, for example, his Pythian dialogues.

8 See U. Eco, *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (Bloomington, Ind., 1979). In this watershed exposition, Eco approaches his subject from the angle of the reader and tries to articulate the transaction between reader and text. One important concept developed by Eco, which is related to the kind of analysis I am doing here, is that of the open text. For more on this see P. Bondanella, *Umberto Eco and the Open Text: Semiotics, Fiction, Popular Culture* (Cambridge, 1997).

9 See, among others, D.A. Russell, *Plutarch* (New York, 1973); the translation used for the purpose of this paper is the one done by F.C. Babbitt (LCL 222).

dreams, friendship, family, and medicine. Plutarch's syntax, at least in *De superstitione*, is not too difficult. Paul's syntax in Romans, on the other hand, is very difficult to follow and his arguments dense, or confusing to some degree. Discursively, Plutarch is more sophisticated than Paul. Each author has a particular rhetorical art; they share a repertoire of discursive habits, but they do not deploy them to the same effect. They ask rhetorical questions with the expectation of a negative response; they both use the interrogative form to involve the audience in their reflection (Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν), and they both use pathos (in different ways and to different degrees) to persuade their audience.

Plutarch's concern in *De superstitione* is mainly of his fellow citizens to whom he feels that he can share the dangers of atheism and superstition.[10] He takes leisure to write as a very skilled rhetorician and his writings have the potential to appeal to a more contemporary, Western type of audience. We can read Plutarch without having a sense of urgency to do any introspection because he seems to be a very logical fellow with whom we could have an easy discussion over tea. However, that is not quite true all the time because Plutarch, too, at times, seems to argue with some commitment and passion, as though something more than poetical pleasure was at stake. Plutarch portrays a vivid image of the atheist and, even more so, of the superstitious person, who attributes all circumstances of life to God. The images Plutarch offers of these character types seem intent on dissuading some unwelcome ways of being and living. Plutarch not only uses the power of emotion for dissuasion, he also makes great use of the power of reason to articulate his views on the atheist and on the superstitious. In sum, Plutarch's rhetorical style and strategies are those of a meticulous artist at work.

Paul, in Romans, seems to be very similar to Plutarch in *De superstitione*, although the language is rather different. Paul begins his epistle to the Romans by giving clues about how he is going to develop his thoughts throughout. Plutarch is very similar to Paul in the way his treatise is structured. He devotes all the power of rhetorical means at his disposal to make

---

10 *De superstitione* has always been very problematic, because neither the style nor the content fits in well with Plutarch's major and later writings. For this reason scholars have attributed it to the early Plutarch, possibly even as a rhetorical exercise written in school. M. Smith, "De Superstitione (Moralia 164E–171F)," in *Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature* (ed. H.-D. Betz; Leiden, 1975), 1–36, raised many questions regarding its authenticity, though he did not definitely say that he thought it was not authentic. His doubt was based on comparison with the rest of Plutarch's work. The piece looks like an apodeictic showpiece such as done by a Greek Sophist on the theme "Why superstition is worse than atheism."

his arguments more persuasive. He appeals to ethos, to logos, and to pathos from start to finish. The document relies on the reputation of the author as a priest and as a moderate man in the Greek polis to admonish the citizens to choose a middle way in the practice of religion.

Paul is more difficult to pin down. His position in time and space, his sense of vocation as one called by God for a specific purpose, his passion as a pastor and as a missionary wrestling with the theological and ethical questions the different Christ-communities he is in contact with were facing, all make him a fascinating figure in the history of religious interpretation.[11] He was born Jewish, growing up to become a very zealous Jew with the expectation that God was going to redeem the people of Israel from its enemies, and sort things out. He had no children, as far as we know, and he was a persecutor of the burgeoning communities of Christ-followers. From his call and conversion he had an itinerant life full of hardships and challenges. In the course of founding different Christ-assemblies and trying to communicate to them what he thought was the message of the resurrected Jesus, he wrote several letters that have been passed on to different ἐκκλησίαι, and to the world, over history. Paul seems to have written (or dictated a rough draft) of the letter to the Romans while in Corinth in the winter of 56–57.[12] He died as a martyr for his faith in Jesus whom he saw as the awaited Jewish Messiah, approximately at the time of the Neronian persecution in 64.[13]

Paul had a life full of movements before and after his call/conversion. From his undisputed letters one can observe how he presents himself as a very passionate person. He is assertive, outspoken – sometimes going overboard – driven to lead, and prone to be over-zealous, or so it may appear to some readers, for a cause that he might believe in. His passion for Christ would, or might, earn him the label of fundamentalist in modern

---

11 There is some missionary spirit in Plutarch as well when, especially in his later years, he writes as a priest of Apollo at Delphi. See R. Feldmeier, "Philosoph und Priester: Plutarch als Theologe," in *Mousopolos Stephanos: Festschrift für Herwig Görgemanns* (ed. M.M. Baumbach, H. Köhler, and A.M. Ritter; Heidelberg, 1998), 412–425.

12 It is possible that after writing his draft, a skilled, educated writer of Greek put Paul's letters into their final polished and highly sophisticated form. See R. Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 2007), 21–22; E.R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (WUNT 2/42; Tübingen, 1991), 15–26.

13 See, for different biographical issues on Paul, S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1982); J. Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (2nd ed.; Macon, Ga., 1987); A.F. Segal, *Paul the Convert* (New Haven, 1990); B.R. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament* (Philadelphia, 1986); D. Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley, 1994); J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford, 1996).

parlance. In sum, he was a compelling and complex personality. He was motivated by a single vision: to preach Christ crucified, and him alone. He operates from a post-Easter perspective and he feels that his vocation is to gather the gentiles to share in the eschatological harvest with the believing remnant of the people of Israel. He does seem to think that he is living at the beginning of something grandiose, and, at the same time, that there is not much time to spare. He is giving his all to his mission and there is no time to waste, to flounder in stylistic details that might please rhetoricians.

All in all, the information provided above seems to indicate that the socio-political contexts of both thinkers and their life experiences had an influence in shaping how they perceived their role, the world, God, and how one should approach the divine. Let us move on in considering how one can experience the art of reading Paul in Romans and Plutarch (*De superstitione*) in order to journey through the world of the texts, experiencing them anew.

3 On Setting the Tone of Voice in Both Works

The introduction to Romans tells us a great deal about its whole purpose and Paul's unique voice in Romans. Paul sees himself as one called/chosen as an apostle (κλητὸς ἀπόστολος) and set apart (ἀφωρισμένος) for a particular task, that is to preach the gospel of God (εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ, Rom 1:1). According to him, he is called to proclaim the good news to those outside of the covenant, those with no claim to grace in the eyes of Judaism. God has granted him the eschatological mission to proclaim salvation in Christ (1:5). What matters to him is "Christic-faith," and it is his understanding of the savior figure Jesus that drives his hermeneutics. Paul seems to be totally subsumed by Christ.[14] At times, the reader might have the impression that Paul is experiencing something that is not quite easy for him to explain, as if his religious experience was directing, challenging, and interrupting his religious language. His arguments are lengthy, and, on different occasions, the language is terse and cumbersome.

Plutarch, on the other hand, does not see himself as one who has a particular grandiose or eschatological mission in his introduction to *De superstitione.* His purpose is quite simple: exposing the danger of both atheism and superstition by propagating myths instilling fear of the gods,

---

14 See G.D. Fee, *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* (Peabody, Mass., 2007).

choosing a middle ground in the exercise of true religion. Plutarch approaches his topic with a lot of candor and precision. Based on the precision seen in his work, it seems that Plutarch's style would be considered very calculated, to some, when compared to Paul. Plutarch has a Platonic view of god, and he wants to demonstrate respect for the religious ancestral traditions wherever he might be.[15] There is in Plutarch – at least in the text under consideration – an abstract notion of divinity,[16] whereas, for Paul, it is a personal and universal deity, a creator and sovereign Lord over the whole world; one who has made himself known in Jesus, whom Paul proclaims as the Christ.

The differences are not the only thing to notice when doing a comparison. Sometimes it is helpful to see how the texts are similar.[17] In the case of the two authors under our microscope, we see that they are both interested in the subject of God – or the divine – and how one should position oneself in the practice of true religion. They share a wealth of similar ideas about God and the universe. Similarities in language, subject and style allow for opposing content to stand out, while the use of similar discursive techniques make the comparative exercise much more intriguing and telling.

For the apostle to the gentiles, the nature of idolatry serves to confuse the Creator with created things. The motif of the universal unrighteousness of human beings in the sight of God is evident throughout Romans. It is not so for Plutarch. For the Greek philosopher, the problem does not lay with idolatry as such, but with superstition. It is the superstitious person who practices idolatry by making objects such as wood or stones the very focal points of their devotion (*Superst.* 167D–F). Paul, in the eyes of Plutarch, would be in the category of a superstitious person, who puts too much emphasis on the fear of the divine to humiliate and to crush his fellow human beings.[18]

---

15 For more on the religious themes in Plutarch's works see F.E. Brenk, *Relighting the Souls: Studies in Plutarch, in Greek Literature, Religion, and Philosophy, and in the New Testament* (Stuttgart, 1998), and id., *With Unperfumed Voice: Studies in Plutarch, in Greek Literature, Religion and Philosophy, and in the New Testament Background* (Stuttgart, 2007).

16 Plutarch discusses the worship of idols extensively later in *De Iside et Osiride.*

17 Jonathan Z. Smith reminds us that similarity and difference are not "given." They are mental exercises on the part of the researcher to find out what the similarities and the differences are. For Smith, "it is the scholar who makes their cohabitation – their 'sameness' – possible, not 'natural' affinities or processes of history." And this is what renders the comparative task challenging and interesting. See J.Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago, 1990), 51.

18 I will develop this a bit more later in this paper.

Plutarch is trying to avoid two dangerous poles: atheism and superstition. He condemns atheism, which he considers a "sorry judgement that there is nothing blessed" (ἡ μὲν ἀθεότης κρίσις οὖσα φαύλη τοῦ μηδὲν εἶναι μακάριον, *Superst.* 165B), alongside superstition for its colossal damage. For Plutarch, "atheism is falsified reason, and superstition is an emotion engendered from false reason" (ὅθεν ἡ μὲν ἀθεότης λόγος ἐστὶ διεψευσμένος, ἡ δὲ δεισιδαιμονία πάθος ἐκ λόγου ψευδοῦς ἐγγεγενημένον, *Superst.* 165C). Paul's language in Rom 2 seems to be exactly what Plutarch is condemning, written with a seemingly superstitious voice. For Paul, "to those who act from selfish ambition and who disobey the truth, but who obey unrighteousness, wrath and anger, there will be affliction and distress for every human being who does evil, of the Jew first and the Greek" (τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός, θλῖψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνος, Rom 2:8–9). The semantic range of the words used by Paul here is one of fear. To this, Plutarch would be staunchly opposed. While Paul is referring to the fear of God, implying that all (Jews and gentiles) are in need of God's new creation in Christ, Plutarch does not see any need for such a discursive device. In fact, for Plutarch, the very recourse to such language could be fatal to Paul's own goal since "Of all kinds of fear the most impotent and helpless is superstitious fear" (Φόβον δὲ πάντων ἀπρακτότατος καὶ ἀπορώτατος ὁ τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας, *Superst.* 165D).

When one looks at Paul's language in light of Plutarch's critique of the superstitious person, one might be tempted to deduce that Paul's language is effectively one of threats to instill fear in his readers, and eventually gain them to his cause. A look at what constitutes the thrust of the third chapter of Romans could give this impression.

There, Paul's polemic is clear: the Jews are no better off than the gentiles. Here, Paul's gospel seems to contradict the Hebrew Scriptures because the gentiles, who had no regard for the law, would be admitted into God's new covenant without circumcision, or a commitment to Torah.[19] Paul saw the incorporation of the gentiles as the logical extension

---

19 This was debated within Judaism, especially in the Herodian period. See B.J.L. Peerbolte, "Jewish Monotheism and Christian Origins," in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity; Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst* (ed. A. Houtman, A. de Jong, and M. Misset-van de Weg; Leiden, 2008), 227–246; W. Horbury, "Jewish and Christian Monotheism in the Herodian Age," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (ed. L.T. Stuckenbruck and W.E.S. North; JSNTSup 263; London, 2004),

of his commitment to Christ, whom Paul came to see as the one bringing the redemption of Israel.[20] For the apostle to the ἔθνη, the crucified/vindicated Messiah is the dividing line between the accepted and the excluded ones in God's new humanity, and his visions of eschatological punishment are forced on the readers so that they are compelled to make a choice for Christ.

What would be Plutarch's response to Paul's understanding? He would probably show the correlation that exists between an excessive fear of the divine to a life of paranoia in fearing everything, and not being able to enjoy the pleasurable and the simplest things in life, such as a good laugh, or a good night of sleep: "Dear soothing balm of sleep to help my ill, How sweet thy coming in mine hour of need" (*Superst.* 165E). In Plutarch's words: τοῦτ᾽ οὐ δίδωσιν εἰπεῖν ἡ δεισιδαιμονία· μόνη γὰρ οὐ σπένδεται πρὸς τὸν ὕπνον οὐδὲ τῇ ψυχῇ ποτε γοῦν δίδωσιν ἀναπνεῦσαι καὶ ἀναθαρρῆσαι τὰς πικρὰς καὶ βαρείας περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ δόξας ἀπωσαμένη ("Superstition does not give one a right to say this; for superstition alone makes no truce with sleep, and never gives the soul a chance to recover its breath and courage by putting aside its bitter and despondent notions regarding God," ibid.). The sleep of the superstitious "calls up fearful images, and horrible apparitions and diverse forms of punishment" (*Superst.* 165F). In other words, it is possible that for Plutarch there is exaggeration in what Paul is telling the Romans,[21] and they would be better off by not taking Paul too seriously in the way he is pushing them to have an excessive fear of the divine. By saying that, Plutarch would not mean to discard the divine altogether. In fact, in his attempt to give a moderate voice to the sphere of religious discourse, Plutarch still finds a place for a certain respectful disposition towards the divine. He requires that one should "pray to the gods with the mouth straight and aright" (προσκυνήσεις δικαίῳ τῷ στόματι, *Superst.* 166B), and he considers that "the majesty of God is associated with goodness, magnanimity, kindliness, and solicitude" (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ σεμνότητα μετὰ χρηστότητος καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνης

1–16, and id., *Herodian Judaism and New Testament Study* (WUNT 193; Tübingen, 2006), 2–33.

20 See T.L. Donaldson, *Paul and The Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis, 1997).

21 A very good reference on the relationship between superstition and godly fear in the contexts of the New Testament and the Greco-Roman milieu is the book by P. Gray, *Godly Fear: The Epistle to the Hebrews and Greco-Roman Critiques of Superstition* (Atlanta, 2003), and another very good reference, which is highly relevant to the topic treated here, is Dale Martin's book *Inventing Superstition from the Hippocratics to the Christians* (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).

καὶ εὐμενείας καὶ κηδεμονίας, *Superst.* 167E). Thus, it is not that Plutarch does not have an elevated view of God, but that he does not believe that his devotion to the divine should prevent him from enjoying life through being caught up in absurd and outlandish worries. Thus, "religion" needs to be under control for Plutarch.

By placing Paul in front of a moderate religious thinker such as Plutarch, it becomes possible to consider Paul as one who is truly exaggerating his religious claims; one who corresponds somewhat to Plutarch's superstitious person. Paul seems to be constantly controlled by his religious motives. He cannot make any judgment without referring to his theological agenda and vision. Paul's reference to the divine's wrath on man's unrighteousness (Rom 1:18–3:20), his insistence on faith in Jesus as the sole solution to humanity's problem regarding the divine, and his language of sin and death – even when one is not aware of having offended the divine – would seem to confirm Plutarch's critique (again, in the sense of considering the type of intellectual imagination undertaken here) of Paul as a superstitious man. Paul is seen as preoccupied, not by changing the social status quo and contributing to alleviate the plight of the person inhabiting the social landscape, but as one caught up in his religious wonderings; his articulation of a discourse of fear, of divine's wrath, and of inherited sin.

For Paul to state that sin is inherited from Adam (Rom 5:12–17) would mean to Plutarch that the religious practitioner does not have to assume any responsibility; that understanding would illustrate perfectly how religious superstitions can lead to passivity. The proposition by Paul, that the sins of the Christ-followers are transposed to Jesus, would seem to assume that they do not have to take any responsibility for their own actions. Plutarch's critique of Paul would probably be that his language is so imbued with religious connotations that it becomes strange and hermetic. Paul, in this sense, would be the superstitious man par excellence who sees salvation in throwing himself at the mercy of the divine, and for whom mercy for his readers is found only in their acceptance of his message. Thus, Paul's message would be the sole avenue for salvation, for he did not leave room for anything else.

Now as far as Paul's critique regarding the Greek philosopher is concerned, Plutarch is clearly doomed, and in need of grace and repentance. Plutarch, to Paul, would be the superstitious man that Plutarch himself referred to. Since Plutarch finds grounds for his religious beliefs in the traditional "religion" (πάτριος πίστις) he grew up with, which might include the Dionysiac mysteries and which were widely accepted in his time, Paul

would refer him to a greater mystery, that of Christ.[22] Paul might respond to Plutarch that devotion is not the same as superstition, and if God is personal and knowable, as Plutarch seems in places to believe, then Plutarch's idea of duty to the gods borders on atheism. Paul would admit that the Greek philosopher has some vague, unarticulated knowledge, awareness, and experience of God (Rom 1:18–23), but that Plutarch cannot see God properly, nor know him adequately. For Paul, the gods of Plutarch are false gods. Plutarch is one who is not worshipping the true creator. Paul would not be ashamed to preach this gospel of Christ to the gentile philosopher, since for him it is the power of God to provide salvation for everyone who believes (δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Rom 1:16), that is of primary importance.

Paul's stance, in regards to other religions, was rooted in his Jewish tradition as seeing the god of Israel as the unique creator God. Paul could not find any room in his thinking to legitimize any of the polytheism that was so rampant in other religions, not even in the name of tolerance or acceptation. For Paul, the Shema (Deut 6:4) sets forth who God is in contradistinction to all other gods. Paul's God in this sense is unique and demands total love and obedience from his people. He is the covenant God who speaks, acts, and asks for complete obedience on the part of his people redeemed in Christ. It is through the election/choosing of a people for Himself that God's truth can be transmitted to other peoples. In Rom 8:15 Paul assures his readers that they have not received a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear because fear is incompatible to the new life in the Spirit.[23]

As we are concluding this section we can ask the following question to help in placing Paul and Plutarch more explicitly in dialogue with one another: What would be required of Paul to persuade Plutarch to change his taxonomy of good religion? It is certainly not a discourse of overconfidence, but one of open dialogue, humility, and a profound desire to listen to and understand what the Greek philosopher is actually saying about his

---

22 In fact, both Plutarch and Paul make a claim to knowledge which can be gained from the religious tradition. See R. Hirsch-Luipold, "Religion and Myth," in *A Companion to Plutarch* (ed. M. Beck; Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World 98; Chichester, 2014), 163–176; id., "The Most Ennobling Gift of the Gods": Religious Traditions as the Basis for Philosophical Interpretation in Plutarch," in *Plutarch's Writings: Transmission, Translation, Reception, Commentary* (ed. G. Pace and P. Volpe Cacciatore; Naples, 2013), 203–217; id., "Die religiös-philosophische Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit und das Neue Testament," in *Religiöse Philosophie und philosophische Religion der frühen Kaiserzeit* (STAC 51, Tübingen 2009), 117–146.

23 See H.-J. Klauck, "Religion without Fear: Plutarch on Superstition and Early Christian Literature," *SK* 18 (1997), 111–126.

own faith. That would enable Paul to find a way to share and communicate what he considers to be the truth of the Gospel for the salvation of anyone who believes to his Greek counterpart, and fellow human being. This leads us to consider how both Plutarch and Paul envisage the practice of true religion.

4 The Practice of True Religion

Plutarch does not use soft criticism on the superstitious person. For him, there is no limit to the troubles perceived by the superstitious person. Not even death is a limit to superstition. The superstitious one attaches "to death the apprehension of undying ills, and when it ceases from troubles, it thinks to enter upon troubles which never cease" (*Superst.* 166F–167A). It is interesting that Plutarch's superstitious individual carries his/her fear with him/her even beyond death. The afterlife is marred with more judgments and fears that loom over the shoulder of the superstitious, and that informs us about how the superstitious person lives life in a constant state of fear.[24] One thing that the superstitious person does not have is peace and joy, for he/she is never sure of the caprice of the divine.

As we have seen before, Plutarch is also very critical against atheism. For him, "its ignorance is distressing (ἡ μὲν ἄγνοια χαλεπή), and to see amiss or not to see at all in matters of such importance is a great misfortune for the soul; for it is as if the soul had suffered the extinction of the brightest and most dominant of its many eyes, the conception of God (καὶ τὸ παρ-ορᾶν καὶ τυφλώττειν περὶ τηλικαῦτα συμφορὰ μεγάλη ψυχῆς, ὥσπερ ὀμμάτων πολλῶν τὸ φανότατον καὶ κυριώτατον ἀπεσβεσμένης τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ νόησιν)" (*Superst.* 167B). Paul does not deal with atheism. For him, "What can be known about God is plain (τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανε-ρόν ἐστιν). [...] Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made. So they are without excuse" (Rom 1:19–21). The question Paul raises in the context of Rom 1 is that of rebelling against the authority of God and not acknowledging him as creator in spite of the fact that what can be known about him is made plain. Paul and Plutarch approach the relationship one has with God differently. As alluded to

---

24 Plutarch does discuss the afterlife, and even uses the fear connected to a judgement after death in *De sera numinis vindicta*.

before, the problem between the two lies elsewhere, namely in how they define God and the practice of true religion.

In Rom 5–8, Paul speaks of how God has solved the Adam problem and therefore the problem of the world. He demonstrates how Jesus's faithful act of obedience, by taking the form of a servant and by dying on the cross, solved Adam's and the world's problem. The result is a new creation through the covenant renewed in Jesus. Plutarch also maintains his search for balance in the religious life throughout chapters 5 to 8 of his work (*Superst.* 167B–169C). Unlike Paul, however, he is not dealing with categorical representatives such as Adam and Jesus. Plutarch is interested in one's social and existential reality in the present. His work does not address the world's problem, but the trap of ordinary people as they try to relate to the divine. Plutarch does not see or propose a savior figure to mankind. For him, the way of freedom is not by being arrogant in pretending that there is no God as the atheists advocate. Nor is it in being so infatuated with the divine that everything that happens in reality ultimately refers back to the divine, as Paul would seem to argue. What Plutarch is aiming for is a responsible life here and now, while acknowledging the reality of a life beyond the observable and the palpable. The following excerpt from Plutarch is worth quoting at length:

The atheist, when he is ill, takes into account and calls to mind the times when he has eaten too much or drunk too much wine, also irregularities in his daily life, or instances of over-fatigue or unaccustomed changes of air or locality; and again when he has given offence in administering office, and has encountered disrepute with the masses or calumny with a ruler, he looks to find the reason in himself and his own surroundings. […] But in the estimation of the superstitious man, every indisposition of his body, loss of property, deaths of children, or mishaps and failures in public life are classed as "afflictions of God" or "attacks of an evil spirit." For this reason he has no heart to relieve the situation or undo its effects, or to find some remedy for it or to take a strong stand against it, lest he seem to fight against God and to rebel at his punishment. (*Superst.* 168B–C).

Thus, the view that emerges from an understanding of Plutarch is that he is a very calculated thinker who is not so much interested in cosmological or categorical arguments when approaching the subject of religion.[25]

In summary, the practice of true religion for Paul finds its expression in living a life according to Christ, who has been crucified and raised from the dead. The picture one has of Paul from the epistle to the Romans is that he can no longer live for the old creation, for the sake of the Torah, but for the sake of the one who called him to preach the good news of Christ to the

---

25 This comment applies particularly to the texts under consideration but does not necessarily apply to other texts.

ἔθνη. For Plutarch in *De superstitione*, the practice of true religion is in the interstice between atheism and superstition. Life lived at this delicate balance is enjoyable and pleasing to the divine.

5 The Citation Techniques

At this point in this comparative exercise it is important to have a brief look at how Paul and Plutarch use the techniques of citation in order to have a better understanding of the voices that we are analyzing.[26] The anticipated result would be that the reader is journeying through the world of the texts and is experiencing them afresh. By comparing how Paul and Plutarch made use of quoted materials, I will attempt to show a pattern of ancient ways of writing that could elucidate the materials at hand. First of all, before plunging into the question of quoted materials in Romans, we need to remember that there are echoes, or allusions, that are not directly quoted materials.[27] That means there is not a clean-cut way to give a definition to the ancient way of making citations. Secondly, the scope of this study limits any pretension to any exhaustive study. What is feasible here is to look at one or two clearly identifiable quoted references in Romans, and look at how Plutarch manages the usage of citation in *De superstitione*.

Paul uses the Hebrew Scriptures extensively throughout the letter to the Romans and the ways he uses it can be difficult to assess if one is not aware of his hermeneutical premises.[28] In Rom 3:9–12, for example, Paul cites either Eccl 7:20 or rephrases Ps 14:3 and inserts the word δίκαιος in Rom 3:10 to introduce, at the outset, a distinctive element in his gospel. In Eccl 7:20 one reads, "There is not a righteous person on the earth, who will do good and will not sin." Psalm 14:3 (13:1 LXX) states

---

26 On citation techniques used by Paul in light of Greco-Roman practices see, particularly, C.D. Stanley, "Paul and Homer: Greco-Roman Citation; Practice in the First-Century CE," *NovT* 32 (1990), 48–56, and id., *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge, 1992). This is an area of research where further and thorough study is needed.

27 R.B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, 1989).

28 Regarding the use of Septuagint quotes, see among others S. Moyise, "Does Paul Respect the Context of His Quotations? Hosea as Test Case," in *"What does the scripture say?" Studies in the Function of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*, vol. 2: *The Letters and Liturgical Traditions* (ed. C.A. Evans, and H.D. Zacharias; LNTS 470; London, 1012), 39–50; W. Kraus, "The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11–12 as a Test Case," in *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect* (ed. R.J.V. Hiebert; Leiden, 2011), 171–189.

"There is no one who does good; there is not even one." The "all" (πάντας) of Rom 3:9 is in parallel with the "not one" (οὐδὲ εἷς) of 3:10. Verses 11–12 develop the first line with a series of five generally synonymous echoes or allusions to the theme "there is no one righteous." The pattern in verses 10–12 is: "there is none righteous, none that understands, and all have turned away." What Paul has done here is to take the potential meaning of the text in its original context and apply it to suit his own contextual significance.[29] Paul's use of his ancestral scriptures needs to be understood from his post-Easter perspective.[30] Otherwise, his hermeneutics is irrational and fanciful at best.

The second example of how Paul uses quoted materials is how he uses a word (πώρωσις), which is usually read as referring to hardened non-Israelites, and how he applies it to Jews. The text in question is Hos 2:1 as it is applied in Rom 9:25–26: "I will call my people the one who was not my people and the one who has not been loved, and it will be in the place where it was said to them, you are not my people, they shall be called sons of the living God." Paul, in light of the revelation of the mystery of God he believed to have received, equates non-believing Israel (belief in Jesus, understood) with the enemy of God and his people. Therefore he reduces non-believing Israel to the level of paganism, in a way analogous to Plutarch. For Paul, there is a striking role reversal that has taken place with the advent of Christ. He goes to the authoritative writings of his Jewish background to make his point, and he did so, not because he thought there was a fuller meaning in the Old Testament texts,[31] but because it was what people did then when trying to convince their audience of a particular line of reasoning.

In the case of the Greek rhetorician[32] in *De Superstitione*, he, like Paul, adjusts his text in a variety of ways and for a variety of reasons.[33] Plutarch's

---

29 For a good development of the inevitability of multiple interpretations of the biblical text see particularly B.K. Blount, *Cultural Interpretation: Reorienting New Testament Criticism* (Minneapolis, 1995).

30 See R.N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich., 1999); E.E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh, 1957).

31 This applies very well from a biblical theology standpoint, but my point is to focus the attention to a larger perspective that needs to be taken into account as well.

32 For a wealth of information on different aspects of Greek rhetorical practices see S.E. Porter, *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (Leiden, 1997).

33 On Plutarch's use of citations, Luc Van der Stockt gave a paper at the Corpus Hellenisticum session of the SBL in San Diego in November of 2014: "'Don't waste old filing cards!' Plutarch's Technique of Hypomnematic Composition." In this paper, Van der Stockt sees Plutarch working with "clusters," not only the citation, but also parts of

quotations are frequent (more than twenty in fourteen short chapters). They are taken from the great ancient Greek dramatists and philosophers (e. g., Pythagoras, Pindar, Demosthenes, and Plato). By quotations and by allusions to a shared matrix of myths, experiences, and literary resonances, Plutarch was able to drive his arguments home to his readers. In other words, he adapted and placed his quotations at appropriate places in his work in a way to construct a particular case. The modern reader who is not aware of the social, cultural, and hermeneutical universe of Plutarch's audience may have some difficulty in understanding some of the arguments that are being forged. However, an awareness of the familiarity of Plutarch's readers with the great authors of the past, even if only as echoes or allusions, may help to understand the function of the quotations. Accordingly, particularly through their awareness of Plutarch's thought world and sources, his readers would have had a general idea of what to look for in his arguments. References to the past authors would alert Plutarch's readers to consider the excess and futility of both atheism and superstition.

In sum, it seems that, though Paul has a different matrix of texts to refer to, he, like Plutarch, goes to the shared stories and authors to make his case. Such active and playful comparison allows us to observe that when features of Greco-Roman citation techniques are considered, they seem to indicate that Paul is not far from Plutarch in the ways he uses some discursive techniques to convey his views on the fear of God and on true religion.

6 The Designated "Other"

This section is a little bit trickier to assess for the simple reason that it is more elusive. The goal here is to test how the different authors under consideration explain what they consider to be bad examples. In other words, how do they consider people from outside their own culture, and where is the example of the good thing coming from? As was mentioned previously, there is, in the Paul of Romans, the idea that none (Jew or gentile) is righteous. According to Paul, "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom 3:23). But in spite of that, it seems that there is, in his mind,

---

other contexts, which then he inserts at will in different kinds of works. Here is not the place to engage the arguments of the paper.

a certain graduation as to the level of moral understanding between the Jews, on the one hand, and the gentiles on the other. The following statements seem to corroborate this point: "If those who are uncircumcised keep the requirements of the law, will not their uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision? Then those who are physically uncircumcised but keep the law will condemn you that have the written code and circumcision but break the law" (2:26–27). It seems that Paul wants to elevate the term "Jew" (ὁ Ἰουδαῖος) to a status that it did not have before: "A person is a Jew who is one inwardly (ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος), and real circumcision is a matter of the heart – it is spiritual and not literal. Such a person receives praise not from others but from God" (2:29). By doing that, Paul saves the term "Jew" and redefines it for his own purpose. Now those who are not receiving his message are not true Jews because, otherwise, they would have jumped on the theological wagon that he is conducting. The question then is: are they becoming gentiles? Paul does not answer.

Let us look briefly at Plutarch's view of "the other."[34] From the start, it seems that he did not quite understand the religious customs of the Jews. This is what he had to say concerning them: "For God is brave hope, not cowardly excuse. But the Jews (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι), because it was the Sabbath day, sat down in their places immovable, while the enemy were planting ladders against the walls and capturing the defences, and they did not get up, but remained there, fast bound in the toils of superstition as in one great net" (*Superst.* 169C). Clearly for Plutarch in this specific text, the Jews (all included and taking the term at face value without having to redefine it as did Paul in Romans) are poltroons, superstitious people with strange ways of being and living. Plutarch does not mute his words for the Greeks either. The following quotation, which he endorses, is far from innocent: "Greeks from barbarians finding evil ways!" (ὦ βάρβαρ' ἐξευρόντες Ἕλληνες κακά, *Superst.* 166A). However, most of Plutarch's references to the "other" seem to be reflecting a view that his anchoring position of analyzing is better than the other being referred to. He seems to be functioning as a champion interpreting his nationalistic themes and visions in face of the oddness of the "other." The examples of the superstitious ones are taken from the outsiders so that his kinsmen can see the foolishness in following the ways of the barbarians.[35]

---

34 See G. Roskam, "Plutarch on Self and Others," *AncSoc* 34 (2004), 245–273.

35 See the excellent treatment of the construction of Greek self-definition in E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford, 1989).

What one can observe, thus far, is that Paul and Plutarch operate from slightly similar, but different angles in this junction. For Paul, there is no guarantee in holding on to a certain nationalistic way of condemning the other, unless the nationalistic terms – in his case "Jews" and probably "Israel," if one takes the view of "Israel" as being a generic term for the elect including Jews and gentiles – are redefined. For Plutarch, in this specific text, though he might recognize some evils in his kinsmen, the uncivilized ones are clearly the others. The Jews are particularly one of the targeted groups that serve him well to illustrate where superstition can lead to. Plutarch is very concerned to indicate to his fellow citizens where not to go in order to find a balance between atheism and superstition.

7 Conclusion

This study has endeavored to explore how Paul in Romans and Plutarch in his treatise *De superstitione* express their views on the fear of God, and on the practice of true religion. By placing Paul in Romans and Plutarch in *De superstitione* in a dialogue with one another, the goal was not only to understand how different authors express their views on the fear of God and on the practice of true religion, but to also render both texts a bit more intriguing and to destabilize some uncritical views of Paul by placing his text alongside a contemporary, who is now much less well known.

Paul's passion and vigor, and Plutarch's calculated reasoning – and passion as well – present challenges that we cannot dismiss easily. The apostle to the ἔθνη operates from a post-Easter perspective with a cosmic understanding of what it is to be living in between two creations. His theological standpoint takes hold of his language and his life. His arguments are dense and fascinating. The reader is taken for an adventurous (and bumpy) ride. Plutarch's questions and concerns, though at some level similar to those of Paul, are nonetheless different and particular. Plutarch is not interested in a savior figure for man, or in cosmological arguments (at least not in this text). His reflections are mainly concerned with the here and now for people trying to make sense of the nitty-gritty of their religious impulses. Though Plutarch was very much interested in true religion like Paul, his answers are quite different. His questions, placed in front of Paul, may render one uncomfortable. One of the reasons for such plausible malaise is that to read Paul with Plutarch's questions (and answers) on the fear of God and on the practice of true religion might interrupt one's habitual reading of Paul, and might appear, at least to certain readers, to be out of

place or out-rightly spurious. To even ask if Paul is not exaggerated in his view of God and of sin, in light of Plutarch's moderate view of the divine, could be a shock to any reader of Paul who has never dared to think of (Saint) Paul as one human being struggling to make sense of his faith and theology in the midst of social and political difficulties and challenges.

Now that we arrive at the end of this comparative endeavor, the hope is to let the texts enter into uncharted territories with one another, and with us. This will be for our own benefit to continue to enjoy them, to be puzzled by the very pieces we may thought we have possessed, and watch them slip through our fingers. If this exercise stimulates more curiosity in opening the different ways one can approach Paul and Plutarch, or any other religious thinker, then this paper has served its purpose.

Ronald Charles
St. Francis Xavier University
Department of Religious Studies
P.O. Box 5000
Antigonish, NS B2G 2W5
Canada
rcharles@stfx.ca

James Carleton Paget

1 Clement, Judaism, and the Jews[1]

Der Aufsatz untersucht erneut die Bewertung des 1. Clemensbriefes in der Forschungsdiskussion um das Thema der judenchristlichen Beziehungen im Rom des 1. Jahrhunderts. Gegen die mehrheitliche Auffassung, dass Clemens eine negative Einstellung gegenüber der jüdischen Gemeinschaft erkennen lasse, argumentiert der Artikel, dass der Verfasser des Briefes eine durchaus positive Haltung einnimmt. Auf diese Weise wird unter anderem die verbreitete These einer sehr frühen Trennung von Juden und Christen in Rom infrage gestellt.

Keywords: Jews, Christians, Rome, Clement, Bible, biblical interpretation, presupposition

1 Introduction

In discussions of ancient Jewish-Christian relations in Rome, a consensus has been arrived at, namely that from a relatively early stage the two communities came to be distinguished from each other.[2] The supporting pillars of such a theory are easily described. In 49 CE Jews were expelled from Rome *impulsore Chresto* according to Suetonius (*Claud.* 25.4).[3] This led, it is argued, to the disappearance from Rome not only of Jews but so-called

---

2 See W. Wiefel, "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity," in *The Romans Debate* (ed. K.P. Donfried; Peabody, Mass., 1991), 95–101; J.C. Walters, "Romans, Jews and Christians: The Impact of the Romans on Jewish/Christian Relations in First Century Rome," in *Judaism and Christianity in First Century Rome* (ed. K.P. Donfried and P. Richardson; Grand Rapids, Mass., 1998), 175–195; S. Spence, *The Parting of the Ways: The Roman Church as a Case Study* (Leuven, 2004); B. Green, *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries* (London, 2010), 57–59; M. Williams, "Jews and Christians at Rome: An Early Parting of the Ways," in *Partings: How Judaism and Christianity Became Two* (ed. H. Shanks; Washington, D.C., 2013), 151–178. See also J.M.G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, Mass., 2015), 455–456, with up-to-date bibliography.

3 On the dating issue, see Spence, *Parting* (see n. 2), 107–111; Williams, "Jews and Christians" (see n. 2), 154–155.

Christian Jews (the original dispute *impulsore Chresto* reflects clashes between believing and non-believing Jews), leaving a community of Christians in Rome with a largely gentile profile, inclined to distance themselves from Jews because of the latter's diminished reputation. In spite of the return of Christian Jews to Rome (after 54), Paul's epistle to the Romans gives voice to the possibly over-weaning status and position of gentile Christians in the city as indicated in Paul's discussion of the relationship of Jews to gentiles in Rom 11, where he seeks to defend the position of the Jews in God's scheme of salvation; and in Rom 14, where the so-called "weak," with their apparently scrupulous attitude to their diet, and so often identified with Christian Jews, appear to be a minority, whose position is less than vigorously defended by Paul.[4] The sense of Christians as loosened from their identification with Jews is further supported by the fact that in 64 CE Nero could initiate a persecution of the Christians without effecting non-Christian Jews. This event, so it is argued, would have led to a further distancing on the part of the non-Christian Roman Jewish community from the Christians.[5] At the endpoint of this narrative, at least as it relates to the first century, stands 1 Clement.[6] This epistle, written to the Corinthian church in the wake of a specific problem concerning governance, probably precipitated by the ousting of an established group of presbyters or leaders in favor of another group, argues its case in such a way as to assume a considerable Jewish heritage, seen not least in the interpretation of the scriptures, but can do so with no sense of a non-Christian Jewish opposition in his own city. So, for instance, the author can assume that the scriptures point to Christ, that their primary referent is apparently a Christian referent, that Christians are now God's chosen portion, without any sense that there may be those who object to that view, a position which in broad terms reflects what we find in 1 Peter, also thought to be a Roman text.[7] Its author

---

4 J.M.G. Barclay, "'Do We Undermine the Law?' A Study of Romans 14.1–15.6," in *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* (WUNT 275; Tübingen, 2011), 37–60.

5 Walters, "Romans" (see n. 2), 183, sees this process of non-Christian Jewish distancing as already beginning in the period following 49 CE: "However, it is clear that in the Julio-Claudian period non-Christian Jews had much to gain by distancing themselves from the Christians and making their autonomy as clear as possible. By 64 CE the distance was considerable, and Nero's attack on the Christians added no new incentives for interaction."

6 See Spence, *Parting* (see n. 2), 335–340; Green, *Christianity* (see n. 2), 56. Strangely, 1 Clement is not discussed by Williams, "Jews and Christians" (see n. 2), even though she endorses the standard position.

7 See Walters, "Romans" (see n. 2), 189. For similar comments on 1 Peter, see P.J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 1996), 166–167; and Spence, *Parting* (see n. 2), 334–335.

can do this because in the Rome of the late first century, if this is the period in which the epistle was written,[8] Jews and Christians barely interacted.

Two further supports to such a thesis can be presented. The first draws on the view that early Roman writers which mentioned Christians, such as Tacitus, Suetonius, and Pliny, failed explicitly to associate them with Jews, an observation which would support the view that Jews and Christians were, from an early date, thought of as separate by individuals with an association with Rome.[9] The second argues that Flavian Rome, for a variety of reasons, was a place hostile to Jews in the period following 70, and this would have provoked Christians into further distancing themselves from the former, entrenching a sense of the distinction between the two communities.[10]

It is the aim of this paper to look again at 1 Clement's position in what some take to be a historically tenuous narrative of early Christian history in Rome[11] by studying its implied attitude both to Jews and Judaism. An

---

8 This controverted matter cannot be discussed at length here. The epistle's *terminus a quo* is after the death of Peter and Paul, traditionally thought to have taken place in 64 CE. In spite of arguments to the contrary (see T.J. Herron, *Clement and the Early Church of Rome* [Steubenville, Ohio, 2007], 31–35), their death seems like an event, whose traumatic character has been softened by the passing of time, and so should not be thought to be a very recent experience. A *terminus ad quem* of around about 150 is secured by the fact that the epistle seems to have been known to Hegesippus (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.16; 4.22.1) and that it is quoted by Dionysius of Corinth (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.23.11). In the end a post-70 date seems most likely. Relevant is the point made about Peter and Paul as well references to apostles as people of the past, whose successors seem to be prominent, points in that direction (see 1 Clem. 44:2–3). An instinctive sense that the church betrays post-70 developments also informs my decision. A date somewhere between 80 and 140, seems reasonable. See further H.E. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief* (KAV 2; Göttingen, 1998), 75–78; and for a classic discussion, dismissing some previously assumed "facts" in the debate, see L.L. Welborn, "The Date of 1 Clement," *BR* 29 (1985), 34–54; repr. in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement* (ed. C. Breytenbach and L.L. Welborn; AGJU 53; Leiden, 2003), 197–216.

9 See Spence, *Parting* (see n. 2), 155–160; and J.M.G. Barclay, "'Jews' and 'Christians' in the Eyes of Roman Authorities c. 100 C.E.," in *Jews and Christians in the First and Second Centuries: How to Write Their History* (ed. P.J. Tomson and J. Schwartz; CRINT 13; Leiden, 2014), 313–326, without drawing conclusions pertinent to the subject under discussion.

10 See M. Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (London, 2007), 445–468.

11 For one of the most recent and detailed attempts to decimate what has come to be called the "Wiefel hypothesis" (see n. 2), see J.M.G. Barclay, "Is It Good News that God Is Impartial? A Response to Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*," *JSNT* 31 (2008), 91–94, which are broadly repeated in id., *Gift* (see n. 2), 456, esp. n. 16. He notes that our knowledge for Roman Jews in the 40s is at best minimal; that while Cassius Dio (60.6.6) suggests some sort of clamp down on Jewish synagogue meetings, he gives no hint that this had anything to do with Christians; that reference in Suetonius, *Claud.* 25, to the expulsion of the Jews *impulsore Chresto* cannot be so easily linked with Christians (Chrestus is a very

interest in this subject can be traced back to members of the Tübingen school,[12] a young William Wrede,[13] Adolf von Harnack,[14] and even occupied the latter's pupil, a still teenage Dietrich Bonhoeffer.[15] In more recent times it has continued to attract interest from a variety of quarters, though, as will be seen, with widely divergent conclusions.[16] Such scholarly interest in this subject might seem strange. After all, 1 Clement does not directly address a context which might be pertinent to a discussion of Jews and Judaism.[17] It is a parenetic work, written to persuade a body of Christians,

common name and at *Nero* 16.2, Suetonius is clear that there are people called *Christiani* [not *Chrestiani*]); that while reference to Prisca and Aquila being expelled from Rome (Acts 18:2) is valuable evidence for the date of the expulsion, it is not clear that they were Christians before the expulsion, and we cannot know how quickly they returned to Rome (Rom 16:3–5). Finally, there is no evidence that the expulsion of Jews from Rome in 49 CE had any effect upon the Christian churches in Rome, and if it had done so, why Paul would not have referred to this matter in Romans. My article could be taken indirectly to support Barclay's well-founded skepticism by another route, although it does not depend for its validity upon the falsity of the thesis Barclay opposes.

12 F.C. Baur, *The History of the Church in the First Three Centuries* (London, 1878), 140–141; A. Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung* (Tübingen, 1846), 129; and L. Lemme, "Das Judenchristenthum der Urkirche und der Brief des Clemens Romanus," *NJDTh* 1 (1892), 325–480.

13 W. Wrede, *Untersuchungen zum ersten Klemensbrief* (Göttingen, 1891).

14 A. von Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte: Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians (I. Clemensbrief)* (Leipzig, 1929); repr. in *Encounters with Hellenism* (see n. 8), 1–103 (pagination in this article according to repr.).

15 D. Bonhoeffer, "Seminar Paper on 1 Clement," in *Dietrich Bonhoeffer's Works: The Young Bonhoeffer 1918–1927* (ed. P.D. Matheny, C.J. Green, and M.D. Johnson; Minneapolis, 2003), 216–256.

16 See, amongst others, R. Wilde, *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers in the First Three Centuries* (Washington, D.C., 1949), 81. Also note P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (Cambridge, 1969); A. Jaubert, *Clément de Rome: Épître aux Corinthiens* (SC 167; Paris, 1971), 30–31; G.W.H. Lampe, "'Grievous Wolves' (Acts 20:29)," in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament* (ed. C.F.D. Moule and S.S. Smalley; Cambridge, 1973), 253–268, here 265–266; H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.–11. Jh.)* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990); P.J. Tomson, "The Centrality of Jerusalem and Its Temple as Viewed by Clement of Rome, Luke and Jesus," *AnBrux* 5 (2000), 97–112; and id., *The Centrality of Jerusalem and Its Temple in Earliest Christianity* (International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 11; Bar Ilan University, 2002); Spence, *Partings* (see n. 2), 335–340; P. Lanfranchi and J. Verheyden, "Jacob and Esau: Who Are They? The Use of Romans 9:10–13 in Anti-Jewish Literature in the First Centuries," in *Ancient Perspectives on Paul* (ed. T. Nicklas, A. Merkt, and J. Verheyden; Göttingen, 2013), 297–316, here 303–305, esp. 305; and J. Verheyden, "Israel's Fate in the Apostolic Fathers: The Case of 1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas," in *The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in Early Judaism and in the Sayings Source* (ed. M. Tiwald; Bonn, 2015), 237–262.

17 In this respect we might note the almost complete absence of mention of the law, justification and related matters in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians when compared

in Corinth, not in Rome, that they should revert to a form of self-govern-ance, which some have sought to overthrow. Insofar as the subject of Jews and Judaism is concerned, this is never directly discussed. This means that any conclusion reached about 1 Clement's relationship to Jews and Juda-ism is going to be inductive, based on things implied rather than things stated. Nevertheless, this need not be grounds for abandoning the subject. First Clement is nothing if it is not a work of exegesis, where citation of scripture or allusion to it is the dominant mode of argumentation. *Prima facie* this may imply certain things about the author's attitude to Jews and Judaism. Of course, the implied attitude is precisely that and it cannot be known whether in a different context, one in which questions relating directly to the relationship of Christians to non-Christian Jews, the matter would not have been dealt with differently by the author.[18] To some extent it is this situation which I am seeking to second guess with all the caveats involved. In the process I hope to open up new ways of looking at this text and through it, at the history of early Roman Christianity.

2 Scripture, Identity, and Covenant in 1 Clement

In the history of the interpretation of 1 Clement much has been written about the Jewish character of the epistle. In this context particular impor-tance has been attached to the author's knowledge of non-biblical Jewish traditions,[19] apocryphal Jewish texts,[20] Jewish prayer[21] and Levitical/cultic traditions.[22] The Christian community is seen as originating with Abra-

---

with Romans or Galatians or even 2 Corinthians. On this see P. Richardson, "On the Absence of 'Anti-Judaism' in 1 Corinthians," in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity* (ed. P. Richardson and D. Granskou; Waterloo, Ont., 1986), 58–74.

18 In this context see Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 87: "In der That macht man leicht Fehlschlüsse, wenn man das gerade im Briefe vorliegende Material für den ganzen Kle-mens nimmt. Der Brief zeigt uns keineswegs die ganze Welt religiöser Vorstellungen, in der der Verfasser lebte und dachte."

19 See, for instance, the association of Noah with penitence at 1 Clem. 7:6; and the claim that Isaac submitted himself knowingly and intentionally to being sacrificed at 31:3.

20 Inter alia see 1 Clem. 8:3 and the possible use of an Ezekiel Apocryphon. See also 1 Clem. 17:6; 23:3–4; 34:8; 46:2.

21 See esp. 1 Clem. 59–61; and H. Löhr, *Studien zum frühchristlichen Gebet: Untersuchun-gen zu 1 Clem 59 bis 61 in seinem literarischen, historischen und theologischen Kontext* (WUNT 160; Tübingen, 2003).

22 See A. Jaubert, "Thèmes lévitiques dans la Prima Clementis," *VC* 18 (1964), 193–203; and ead., *Clément* (see n. 16), esp. 48–50. See also Tomson, "Centrality" (see n. 16), 23–

ham and especially with Jacob,[23] and figures like Judith and Esther are regarded as part of its history.[24] Those addressed are identified with Israel,[25] and the language of its scriptures, in the form of the Septuagint, influences the manner in which the author expresses himself.[26] Moreover, the author sees the Jewish scriptures, understood principally as the Septuagint, as inspired documents,[27] and citation from them, almost always understood literally, dominates the epistle.[28]

Attempts to counter this set of data by pointing to clear evidence of Hellenistic influence, whether from Stoicism or elsewhere, are normally accommodated by referring to the now well-known viewpoint that distinguishing between Judaism and Hellenism in some absolute way is ill-advised. Just as Philo, the Jew, could accommodate views of an apparently

27, who focuses on 1 Clem. 40–41. He notes the specialized character of the language used for sacrifices, 1 Clement's use in 40:5 of λαϊκός, which occurs for the first time here in Christian literature, and probably betrays Jewish usage (arguing that it corresponds to Israelites in the ancient halakhic division of Israel into priests, Levites and Israelites); and the reference to the precise place where sacrifices are made, "facing the temple near the altar" (41:2), which comports almost exactly with m. Mid. 3.5, noting how this differs from what we find in Joel 2:17 and Ezek 8:16. Tomson refers also to the word at 1 Clem. 41:2, μοσκοπηθέν, translated as "having been inspected for blemishes," noting that this goes beyond the biblical claim that sacrifices should be without blemish (Exod 12:5; Lev 1:3), referring instead to a reference in m. Tamid 3.4, where the officiating priest must inspect the daily sacrifice of a lamb before slaughtering it. He also argues that the reference to the death penalty being inflicted upon those who do not carry out the sacrifices precisely is also non-biblical, here following Jaubert, but disagreeing with her efforts to explain such a claim by reference to 11QT\u1d43 35:1–8.

23 See esp. 1 Clem. 4:8 and the reference to Jacob as "our father". See also 1 Clem. 31:4–32:2.

24 1 Clem. 55:1–6.

25 See 1 Clem. 29:2–30:1 and discussion below.

26 See esp. 1 Clem. 59–61:3, but see also such phrases as "walk according to the precepts of God" (1:3); "to do justice and truth" (31:2): "what is good, what is agreeable in the face of him who has made us" (7:3; see also 21:1; 60:2; 61:2).

27 See 1 Clem. 45:2.

28 See O. Knoch, "Die Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zu Israel und zum Judentum," in *Begegnung mit dem Wort* (ed. J. Zmijewski and E. Nellessen; Bonn, 1980), 347–378, here 348–349: "Es ist einerseits das prophetische Offenbarungsbuch, das die Verheißungen Gottes enthält und auf Christus als den Vollender und universalen Mittler der Offenbarungszeit hinweist; andererseits das Buch der sittlichen und kirchlichen Vorschriften, die Gott erlassen hat." See also D.A. Hagner, *The Use of the New Testament in Clement of Rome* (NovTSup 34; Leiden, 1973), 120–121, reflecting sentiments found in Harnack: "For Clement the Old Testament is a thoroughly Christian book […]. Indeed so timeless is the Old Testament revelation for Clement that the adjective 'Old' would doubtless have seemed singularly inappropriate to him."

Greek origin in his own interpretation of scripture, so could the author of 1 Clement.[29]

Whether this indicates that Clement is a Jew, however, is a different matter. Some prefer to argue that the epistle gives voice to the strong influence of the Jewish synagogue upon the development of earliest Christianity in Rome rather than to the origins of its author, which are more likely to be gentile.[30] Clement, then, betrays the importance of Jewish influence but at a certain distance, though some contend that he may have been a god-fearer before he became a Christian.

However we assess these arguments about the origins of 1 Clement, the atmosphere of his epistle is both Jewish and strongly scriptural, and is so in an untroubled and confident manner with no sense that the Christian appropriation of the scriptures is a problem.

This comes out especially in what Clement implies about his understanding of Christian identity. Those he addresses have a direct association with Jacob, Abraham and other patriarchs, and this in spite of the fact that at least some of his addressees were probably gentiles with little sense of an alternative position.[31] This is especially striking in the case of the claim to being related to Jacob, himself the father of twelve children understood as the originators of the twelve tribes of Israel (1 Clement is the first Christian text to lay claim to Jacob as a father of the Christians).[32] 1 Clement makes this claim without engaging explicitly in arguments which exploit the younger status of Jacob to advocate the view that Christians are the rightful inheritors of the covenant, and not the Jews, whose status approximates to that of Esau. Such an argument is implied in Rom 9:10–13, but becomes explicit in Barnabas,[33] Irenaeus[34] and many later

---

29 Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 28–50.

30 Cf. esp. 1 Clem. 59:2, referring to the fact that we have been called from darkness to light, from ignorance to knowledge of the glory of his name. For the view that the author is a gentile who betrays the strength of Jewish influence upon earliest Christianity in Rome, see P. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (London, 2003), 76; and Spence, *Parting* (see n. 2), 337–338. For an earlier discussion see Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 107–111, here refuting Lightfoot's claim that the author was a Jew.

31 1 Clem. 4:8 (Jacob); 31:2 (Abraham).

32 "Clément ne songe pas, suivant le raisonnement de l'épître aux Galates, à faire directement de Jésus l'héritier de la benediction d'Abraham. La benediction suit les chemins auxquels est habitué le judaïsme; d'Abraham, Isaac et Jacob aux douze tribus d'Israël" (Jaubert, "Thèmes" [see n. 22], 200).

33 Barn. 13:2–3.

34 Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.21–23.

Christian writers.[35] Consistent with this view, Clement understands that the Christians are the people of God (λαός)[36] and the chosen (ἐκλεκτός),[37] terms reserved in the Septuagint for Israel.

This sense of identity between Israel and the church is strikingly expressed in 1 Clem. 29 and 30, where Clement, after emphasizing the all-seeing nature of God and the fact that no one can escape his judgment, asserts the need to approach him in the holiness of the soul because God has made "us" (the Christians), what Clement, using a term that is not found in any literature up to this time, calls his chosen portion (ἐκλογῆς μέρος), perhaps picking up on language which Paul uses in Romans to describe the Jews.[38] This assertion is supported with a quotation from Deut 32:8–9: "When the most high divided the nations, when he dispersed the sons of Adam, he fixed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the angels of God. His people, Jacob, became the Lord's portion, and Israel inherited his allotment." There then follows what looks like a mixed citation (Clement appears not to know where it comes from, introducing it with the vague reference to "in another place").[39] "Behold, the Lord takes for himself a nation out of the midst of nations (ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν), as a man takes the first fruits of his threshing floor; and the Holy of Holies will come forth from the nations." The first citation from Deuteronomy is left uninterpreted, and could be understood, as as referring to Israel in its present actuality; but the mixed citation which follows it with its reference to "the holy of holies" coming out of its midst,[40]

---

35 On this see Lanfranchi and Verheyden, "Jacob and Esau" (see n. 16), 307–113.

36 See 1 Clem. 8:3 (only in Codex Hierosolymitanus); 15:2; 16:9; 16:15; 29:2; 53:2; 55:5, 6; 59:4; 64:1). In 1 Clem. 59:4 and 64:1 it is used to refer to the Christians. Elsewhere its application seems to be to the Israel of old, or to lack specificity (cf. 16:15), though in some places it could apply to Christians (see 15:2). Löhr, *Studien* (see n. 21), 214–215, discusses these references. Noting that they are related to Israel and its history as represented in the Bible, he draws attention to the absence in any of them of reflection on the relationship of the church to contemporary Jews. See also the use of the word "flock" (ποιμνίον) at 1 Clem. 16:1; 44:3; 54:2; 57:2; 61:6.

37 See 1 Clem. 1:1; 2:4; 6:1; 46:3, 4, 8; 49:5; 58:2; 59:2. See also 50:7; 59:3.

38 Cf. Rom 9:11; 11:5, 7 and 28. Note also the importance of the designation "chosen" (ἐκλεκτός) for Clement (see n. 37). The background to this term may be Jewish but the interest lies in Clement's use of the term to describe the Christians. On all of this see Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 50, esp. n. 3.

39 See Lona, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 8), 328, for discussion of this passage.

40 The phrase "holy of holies" (ἅγια ἁγίων) comes from the unknown citation in 1 Clem. 29:2. What it meant in the original citation cannot be known but it seems to refer to a new entity of holiness, and the reference to it "going out" (ἐξελεύσεται) must imply some kind of remnant. Jaubert, "Thèmes" (see n. 22), 202, suggested that the best parallel comes from 1QS 8:5 where we read that the community council

makes the reference unambiguously one to Christians, a point confirmed by 1 Clem. 30:1, where, reflecting 29:2, the author asserts that "we" (ποιή-σωμεν) are the portion of the holy one. The apparent assertion that the Christians are somehow chosen out of Israel, a restatement of the earlier claim that the Christians have become the portion of the holy one, is made without any sense that it might be opposed by those who would not accept such an assertion.[41] Indeed, as Oskar Skarsaune has noted, "The continuity between the two peoples is so complete as if to exclude the idea that there were ever two peoples"[42] – and related to this, there is little indication of how the others (the Jews) have forfeited that position, should such forfeiture be assumed.[43] Put differently, there is no explicit engagement with the idea of substitution in 1 Clement's view of salvation.[44]

"shall be founded on truth […] to be an everlasting foundation, a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron." Strictly speaking, the reference to "holy of holies" here does not refer to the community but the phrase comes close to asserting that, especially given its proximity to the phrase "holy house of Israel," and the description at 1QS 9:6 of the community as "a holy house for Aaron." See also 4Q174 and the reference to "the sanctuary of men that send up smoke." Tomson, *Centrality* (see n. 16), 23, makes this point, suggesting that the term resonates with such phrases as "the elect" and the "first fruits which are holy" of Rom 11:7 and 16 respectively, which, somewhat speculatively, he takes along with Rev 7:4–8 and its reference to the 144,000, to refer to Jewish Christians.

41 See Lona, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 8), 326: "Typisch für 1 Klem. ist die selbstverständlich anmutende Übernahme von solchen heilsgeschichtlichen Kategorien, ohne offenbar […] das Verhältnis zu Israel als Problem zu empfinden." Lona emphasizes the strangeness of 1 Clement's failure to engage with the "problem" of election by noting that the word ἐκλογή is used by Paul to describe the Jewish people, and in the context of an intense discussion of their ongoing status in a post-Christum setting (for references in Romans see n. 38 above).

42 See O. Skarsaune, "Ethnic Discourse in Early Christianity," in *The Christian Second Century* (ed. J. Carleton Paget and J. Lieu; Cambridge, forthcoming). See also Hagner, *Use* (see n. 28), 127–128: "The exact relation between Israel and the Church is nowhere expressed, but the implication of Clement's use of the OT is that the Church is virtually equated with Israel, and what is perhaps even more important, the religion of the OT is regarded as virtually identical with that of the Church." Note also Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte* (see n. 16), 171: "Das AT ist hier schon so ganz und gar ein Buch der Kirche geworden, dass dem vorchristlichen jüdischen Kultritual keinerlei eigenständige Bedeutung mehr geblieben ist, wie sie eine Schriftexegese vermitteln würde, die ein Gegenüber von Altem und Neuem Bund voraussetzt."

43 As a possible exception to this statement see 1 Clem. 16:9, but here we are dealing with a quotation from scripture (Isa 53) whose contents are not developed.

44 See Lanfranchi and Verheyden, "Jacob and Esau" (see n. 16), 304. Note also Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 89, who assumes an appropriation of language about Israel for the Christian church, but without any indication that what he terms a "Übertragung" has taken place.

Finally, and related to the preceding point, in making these assertions about scripture and Christian identity, the author gives no indication of a sense of salvation-historical progress, that is, there is no attempt to argue for a difference between what was and what now is, except in a mild and pallid way. While Christ has mediated salvation, associated with his death (7:4; 12:7; 21:6; 49:6) and with his resurrection (though this only in a muted way), he has not introduced a new and distinctive period in the world's history understood as liberating its beneficiaries from a previous condition or set of difficulties, associated with the law[45] or sin or some related entity.[46] The age post-Christum is broadly in accord with the best of what preceded it[47] and the qualities exemplified in Moses, or Noah or indeed Enoch, are exemplified in Christ,[48] even if all the prophets may look forward to his coming (17:1). Indeed, the values of the time before Christ seem to be continuous with the values of Christ (cf. 50:3; 55:3). Admittedly, the author at one point speaks of the time after Christ as exemplified by "a fuller knowledge" (41:4), and, as noted, assumes the sacrificial efficacy of Christ.[49] But the transition between times, the time before and after Christ, is only minimally highlighted in the epistle,[50] and there is no attempt to characterize that world before Christ by reference to a concept like law (in fact the law is not mentioned at all, though the commandments are, and here apparently uncritically, cf. 2:8b, 43:1 and 58:2),[51] as we find in Paul, or the flawed cult as we find in Hebrews, or by reference to the word for covenant. The last stage of the history of salvation is in continuity with what has preceded.[52] When 1 Clement speaks, then, about the norms

---

45 According to Jaubert, the law appears totally outside the horizon of the epistle (see Jaubert *Clément* [see n. 16], 60).

46 See Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 74: "[L]e Christ ne libère pas du régime ancien. La dernière étape de l'histoire du salut est en harmonieuse continuité avec ce qui l'a precedée."

47 Note 1 Clem. 7:4f. where Christ's precious blood is said to have brought with it "the gift of repentance" (μετανοίας χάριν), but in what follows the author seems to imply the possibility of that gift in previous generations associated with Noah and Jonah.

48 See 1 Clem. 9:2 where Clement instructs his addressees to fix their eyes on those (in this instance on Enoch and Noah) who perfectly (τελείως) fulfill his glory.

49 See 1 Clem. 7:4; 12:7; 21:6; 49:6. See 1 Clem. 2:1d for a reference to Christ's suffering without soteriological implications.

50 See Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 99: "Der Glaube ist das ewig giltige Prinzip des Heiles. Sein Objekt wird nicht spezifisch christlich bestimmt." The same point is put more provocatively by Lemme, "Judenchristenthum" (see n. 12), 408, where he describes the text as "reformirtes Judenthum."

51 See Harnack, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 14), 55.

52 This is well exemplified in 1 Clem. 42:5 where Clement is clear that the introduction of bishops and deacons is "not new," and he goes on to quote a notoriously discrepant version of Isa 60:17.

of our tradition (7:2), these should be understood in terms of the language of continuity, not of rupture. That sense of a single election may lie behind the presentation of the Christians' chosen status from 1 Clem. 29:2–30:1, where, as has been shown, there is no attempt to outline why the church has been chosen or whether Israel has been rejected. That sense of continuity can also be thought to be witnessed in the generally literal way in which scripture is interpreted.[53] In all of this the idea of two covenants seems muted, if not non-existent.[54]

1 Clement, then, would appear to be concerned with topics, which often elicited anti-Jewish sentiment among Christians (interpretation of scripture, identity of the people of God etc.) but lacks, at least explicitly, any sign of the latter.[55] As Annie Jaubert has noted, the Jews in the letter are "comme inexistant."[56] But in spite of this, the author seems to assume the

---

53 On the striking literal hermeneutic of Clement, see Hagner, *Use* (see n. 28), 128, though he notes that "(t)he most likely explanation of Clement's predominantly literal interpretation is the paraenetic purpose of his epistle" (ibid., 131).

54 For different characterizations of what I have written above see Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 98: "Es giebt für ihn überhaupt keine Geschichte, keine Entwicklung des Heils; die Gerechtigkeit eines Abrahams ist nicht eine Vorstufe des höheren christlichen; sie ist die christliche." See Harnack, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 14), 55, who states that "von einem effektiven Heilsbund mit diesem Volke, dem dann ein neuer Bund gefolgt sei, ist keine Rede." In a footnote Harnack goes on to note that we do not know about the circumstances in which such an opinion could have been formed but it can be assumed that they were ones in which the arguments which Paul had participated in are past. Knoch, "Stellung" (see n. 28), 349, argues for some kind of "Heilsgeschichte" but notes: "Aber zugleich bezieht er die Verheißungen an Israel unmittelbar auf die Kirche und beschreibt die Kirche mit atl Kategorien als das Volk Gottes, das Israel der Endzeit. Er tut dies aber keineswegs polemisch oder antithetisch, vielmehr synthetisch." He then notes, modifying his idea of a "Heilsgeschichte," that "Gott, der Herr und Schöpfer, ist Träger der Heilsgeschichte; Jesus Christus ist lediglich das letzte Werkzeug des Heilswillens Gottes." In such a view of "Heilsgeschichte," there is no break, only an extension, and Knoch argues against Harnack's view that 1 Clement ignores Judaism, playing up the point that there is no break in salvation history between the old and the new covenant but merely an unfolding of God's salvation. "Dadurch wird die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung Israels nicht negiert, sondern relativiert." The lack of an insistence on a break between the two religions arises, *pace* Knoch, from Clement's identity as a God-fearer. See also S. Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (WUNT 250; Tübingen, 2010), 142–143: "nowhere in his letter do we find a reflective distinction between two different covenants/testaments."

55 See Lona's description of "das unbelastete Verhältnis zum Judentum" (Lona, *Clemensbrief* [see n. 8], 77). See also Walters, "Romans" (see n. 2), 194: "Whereas the common approach to the Old Testament for the early Christian writers was to claim the traditions while attacking the Jewish institutions, *1 Clement* used both and attacked neither. He seems completely unconcerned that his approach might blur the boundary between Christianity and Judaism and result in defections to the synagogues or open doors to Judaizers."

56 Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 30.

heritage of Israel and to do so in a positive manner, that is, there is no explicit indication that Israel has lost her status as God's people, and indeed no indication that Christians have ever been in dispute with Jews.[57]

3 Different Approaches to 1 Clement, Jews, and Judaism

3.1 Negative Assessments

Inevitably, different conclusions have been drawn from the data presented above. Some have assumed that they imply that for the author Judaism is no longer an entity worthy of consideration, that it can simply be ignored. Adolf von Harnack, for instance, noted that while the position that 1 Clement adopted towards the Old Testament (one can as well read Judaism here) was different from that of Paul or the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews or Barnabas, "It represents the attempt […] simply to ignore Judaism as it had not been present in the past and was not present in the future, as if the church had been exclusively given the Holy Scriptures, and the ceremonial law need not be acknowledged."[58] In such a schema there was no longer any room for Judaism and so questions relating to it need not be considered.[59] The adoption of such a position, Harnack maintained, could only be the case if Christianity was fully separated from Judaism and if every national Jewish element, understood especially in terms of legal observance, had disappeared from the church.[60] But for Harnack such an assertion did not mean that the epistle was ideologically separate from Judaism – its essentially ethical-scriptural understanding of Christianity made it, at least in part, the product of what he termed "Spätjudentum."[61]

---

57 "In 1 Klem. ist keinerlei jüdische Polemik zu erkennen" (Lona, *Clemensbrief* [see n. 8], 47 n. 2). Some have seen the possibility that reference to zeal in relation to the deaths of Peter and Paul in 1 Clem. 5 might point to Jewish complicity in these actions and betray an anti-Jewish apologetic. See Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 30–31, esp. n. 5; and Lampe, "Grievous Wolves" (see n. 16), 265–266. On this passage see discussion below.

58 Harnack, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 14), 56.

59 Harnack can talk about Judaism as "kräftig abgestoßen" and "ganz und gar verschwunden" (Harnack, *Clemensbrief* [see n. 14], 57).

60 See Harnack, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 14), 55 n. 27: "Anders lässt sich die Haltung des Briefs nicht verstehen. Wie weit in der römischen Gemeinde das Verhalten gegenüber dem Judentum zurückgeht, ihm den Besitz des A.T. und den Bund mit Gott abzuerkennen, lässt sich nicht ermitteln."

61 Harnack, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 14), 57: "Dieses römische Schreiben gehört seiner Grundlage und seiner religiösen Haltung nach in die Geschichte der atlichen Religion und des Spätjudentums."

Wrede, like Harnack, assumes that there is a division between Jews and Christians, that the biblical text only has a Christian referent and that Israel is the true Israel, the church. But he can highlight the respect that 1 Clement has towards elements of Israel's past, including the cult,[62] and contrast this with other Christian writers like Barnabas, explaining the absence of polemic partly through the fact that Jews are not considered rivals, though he is clear that that past has lost its national aspect.[63] The tension in Wrede's comments reflect his own view that the relationship between the eternal Christian meaning of the past and its national Jewish one is not worked out by the author.[64] Horacio Lona is more definite. He assumes that the absence of anti-Jewish polemic and the kinds of concerns we find in the Pauline epistles and elsewhere, imply that separation from Judaism is a long way in the past. The Jews are no longer a problem for this writer.[65]

The position represented by Harnack and others has been taken further by Jos Verheyden. In a provocative article,[66] he is much clearer than the former about the implied polemical attitude of 1 Clement to Judaism and the Jews.[67]

Verheyden makes his case by examining the places in 1 Clement where the word "Israel" is mentioned. There are only six instances (4:13; 8:3; 29:2; 31:4; 43:5; 55:6) but each, in his opinion, has clear polemical resonance, especially when the context in which they appear is considered. So the reference in 1 Clem. 4:13 occurs as part of Clement's argument against

---

62 "Er lässt im Gegensatze zu Barnabas den jüdischen Gottesdienst als einen wirklichen und seiner Zeit berechtigten Gottesdienst gelten und redet von nationaljüdischen Dingen mit großer Achtung" (Wrede, *Untersuchungen* [see n. 13], 95).

63 Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 96.

64 Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 97, noting that the Israelite past is neither abolished nor preserved.

65 "Die Trennung von der römischen Synagoge liegt schon weit zurück und hat einen endgültigen Charakter angenommen, so daß das an sich problematisch gebliebene Verhältnis zum Judentum nicht mehr im Vordergrund steht. Nirgendwo läßt sich das Echo einer antijüdischen Polemik vernehmen. An keiner Stelle würde der unwissende Leser vermuten, daß Träger und Akteure dieser Geschichte, die mit der Schöpfung der Welt und der Bildung des Menschen anfängt [...] und die vielen Wohltaten des Schöpfers bezeugt [...], nicht die Christen sind, sondern die Angehörigen des jüdischen Volkes, über die kein Wort gesagt wird" (Lona, *Clemensbrief* [see n. 8], 65). For similar sentiments see Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte* (see n. 16), 171.

66 Verheyden, "Israel's Fate" (see n. 16), 237–262.

67 Harnack, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 15), 55, remains agnostic on the question of how Clement viewed the Jews. Verheyden's position finds some parallels in Lampe, "Grievous Wolves" (see n. 16), who argues for the view that 1 Clement gives voice to a resurgent Jewish mission against the church, a phenomenon he sees evidenced in Acts, 2 Peter, Jude, Hebrews and the Pastoral Epistles.

those who have rebelled against the existing governing authorities in Corinth, an argument he begins by showing the negative qualities of zeal or jealousy in the history of Israel, from the story of Jacob and Esau to that of David, persecuted by Saul, "the King of Israel." While Verheyden admits that this is not the whole story of Israel, it evokes scenes which are crucial to that history for "the reader must feel somewhat uncomfortable with the whole presentation, as if Israel and its history can only be recalled and told in a negative way."[68] Verheyden avers that such a presentation might bring to mind the fact that Israel did eventually fall.

Similar interpretations follow. The quotation at 1 Clem. 8:3, from a passage sometimes attributed to an Ezekiel Apocryphon[69] ("Repent, O house of Israel, of your iniquity; say to the children of my people: Though your sins reach from earth to heaven, and though they be redder than scarlet and blacker than sackcloth, yet if you turn to me with your whole heart and say 'Father', I will listen to you as a holy people"), presents Israel in a negative light, not least when it is followed by a quotation from Isa 1:16–20. Verheyden shows how we move from a citation addressed to an individual sinner (1 Clem. 8:2 and the quotation from Jonah 3), to one addressed to Israel, and how by the climax of the section the decision to repent is placed firmly in the hands of the people, with the outcome being described in negative terms if the wrong choice is made (the reference to the concluding words from the Isaiah quotation, "a sword will devour you"). For Verheyden attention to the context of the scriptural passages concerned indicates that in fact judgment has been passed,[70] as is clearly the case in Ezek 33:21 and Isa 1:24–27. While Verheyden concedes that it is not easy to know the extent to which the author wishes his addressees to read the passages cited within a wider context (clearly he leaves open the possibility of their own repentance),[71] he is clear that "Israel's fate looms

---

68 Verheyden, "Israel's Fate" (see n. 16), 241. Although Verheyden's argument supporting the anti-Jewish aspect of this chapter are distinctive, they reflect arguments in Lampe, "Grievous Wolves" (see n. 16). He argues that the examples of jealousy in 1 Clem. 4 find an echo in Stephen's speech in Acts 7, noting that Joseph's brothers, the Israelite opponent of Moses, and Aaron appear in Stephen's false succession list, and David in his positive one. At Acts 7:9 opposition to Joseph is associated with zeal. Stephen's speech concerns itself with a kind of anti-Jewish apologetic, which Lampe sees as implied in 1 Clement.

69 See Lona, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 8), 187–188.

70 Cf. Ezek 18 and 33; Isa 1:16–20.

71 "[…] they are not yet condemned and this is not a verdict but still a warning" (Verheyden, "Israel's Fate" [see n. 16], 242).

largely over them. What happened in the past will happen again. Israel's fate and history are used paedagogically; it is not evoked to undo it."[72]

Verheyden is clear that 1 Clem. 29:2–30:1, to which we have already referred, assumes the passing of the status of Israel to the Christian church,[73] finding suggestive the fact that the two previous chapters (1 Clem. 27 and 28) have been taken up with the theme of God's inevitable judgment. "Israel's fate is not the subject, but it is the preliminary for what has been made possible, and […] it remains […] a warning for those who now enjoy the Lord's favour."[74]

The reference in 1 Clem. 31:4 to the obscure "scepter of the twelve tribes of Israel"[75] is thought to have ominous resonances,[75] and to compromise the potentially more positive presentation of Jesus in 1 Clem. 32 where he is presented as related to the descendants of Jacob. And references in 1 Clem. 43, citing Num 17, but apparently highlighting Israel's jealousy, and in 1 Clem. 55:6, its potential to fall, prevented by Esther, is also seen to give voice to a negative understanding of Israel and her history.

For Verheyden Israel's fate may not be an issue for 1 Clement but the author implies that it is a negative one. The Jews are judged and the Christians are now the chosen people and exclusively so. Such a view, Verheyden asserts, comes close to the kind of opinion we find in Barnabas, even if the latter expresses the matter more vituperatively.[76]

Verheyden's argument could be supplemented. Oskar Skarsaune, for instance, has argued, albeit tentatively, that there may be signs of anti-Jewish traditions elsewhere in the epistle, some of which crop up later in the Christian tradition.[77] In this context he notes that 1 Clem. 51 contains a warning against hardening the heart like the transgressors of Num 16, and 1 Clem. 52 cites the argument that God does not require sacrifice but confession of sins, quoting a set of anti-cultic testimonies (Ps 69:31–33; 50:14f./ 51:19a). First Clement 53 presents a rewritten version of the story of the Israelites worshipping of the Golden Calf (see above), quoting from Deut 9:12–14 on the stiff-necked character of the Israelites. Skarsaune suggests that such a sequence of texts might orig-

---

72 Verheyden, "Israel's Fate" (see n. 16), 242.

73 See similar claims by Lampe, "Grievous Wolves" (see n. 16), 267, adding other evidence relating to appropriation of ideas of descent associated with Jews.

74 See Verheyden, "Israel's Fate" (see n. 16), 243.

75 Verheyden, "Israel's Fate" (see n. 16), 244, refers to the passage in 3 Kgdms 11:30–36 where the prophet Ahijah informs Jeroboam that his kingdom will be torn apart and that ten scepters will be given to him and two will be left over for the king, "because he has forsaken me," words which Verheyden takes to be ominous. He also suggests that the reference to twelve tribes might lead Clement's readers to recall Matt 19:28 and Luke 22:28–30, where judgment upon the twelve tribes is assumed.

76 See Verheyden, "Israel's Fate" (see n. 16), 261–262.

77 O. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition; Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 56; Leiden, 1987), 314–315.

inally have expressed a theory, first explicitly mentioned by Justin, that cultic practices were given to the Jews as an accommodation to the idolatrous tendencies they demonstrated in worshipping the golden calf.[78] The argument is hypothetical, as Skarsaune admits, but it supports Verheyden's position, and even if its specific claim is speculative, it pinpoints additional passages which imply negative things about the Jews, their practices and their history. A similar case, for instance, could be made for an originally polemical and possibly anti-Jewish setting for 1 Clem. 15,[79] as well as other chapters.[80]

How, then, to assess the positions outlined above? Both seem problematic but especially Verheyden's more radical position. Can we assume with him that the passages he discusses imply a negative view of Jewish history? As Cilliers Breytenbach has shown (and others),[81] the business of using exempla to make specific ethical points was a well-known Hellenistic trope and the employment of exempla from scripture would follow naturally from that. The use of such exempla need not be seen as a sign of a negative view of Israel's history but rather of a positive view of the didactic value of scripture. Jews, after all, made use of such exempla,[82] and Jewish works, not least the prophetic writing, are filled with negative accounts of what the Jews have done in their history without a sense of final judgment being passed. Indeed had 1 Clement wished to, given the circumstances he was addressing, it would have been helpful to his cause to show how *final* judgment had fallen upon Israel;[83] and certainly if he

---

78 See Justin, *Dial.* 19.5f.; 20.4; 22.127.2; 43.1; 67.8; 73.6; 102.6; 131.4. Skarsaune, *Proof* (see n. 77), 315, states that his theory remains pure hypothesis.

79 Note the combination here of Isa 29:13 (quoted in Matt 15:8 and Mark 7:6); Ps 62:4; 78:36–37; and Ps 12:3–5. See Lampe, "Grievous Wolves" (see n. 16), 267, for the view that "(t)he language of *1 Clement* 15, and its selection of Old Testament texts, suggests that these leaders may be dissembling Judaizers."

80 E.g., 1 Clem. 29. On this see esp. Skarsaune, *Proof* (see n. 77), 29–30, 189 and 348. He notes that when Justin quotes Deut 32:7–9, he does so probably from a Deuteronomy scroll, reading 32:8 "according to the number of the sons of Israel," as in the Septuagint. Justin does, however, know of another reading, "according to the numbers of the angels," and mentions it. As 1 Clement witnesses the latter reading (see 29:2), Skarsaune suggests that Justin may have gained knowledge of this non-Septuagint reading by reference to a source known to 1 Clement, not least because in *Dial.* 130.3, before his quotation of the Deuteronomy passage, he writes that from all the nations of the earth, he chose you for himself, words which come close to what we find in 1 Clem. 29:3. This could imply that 1 Clement had knowledge of such a source, which apparently claimed the status of God's people for the Christians.

81 C. Breytenbach, "The Historical Example in *1 Clement*," *ZAC* 18 (2014), 22–33.

82 See also Lona, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 8), 153–154, who notes that use of exempla is typically Jewish.

83 This might have been especially easy to do at the end of the list of citations in 1 Clem. 8:4 where Isa 1:16–20 is cited. Two further points need to be made in relation to this citation. First, the quotation is introduced vaguely implying that the kind of knowledge of the context which Verheyden assumes cannot be presumed. Second, when we look at

had believed such a thing, there was, if Verheyden is right, nothing to con-strain him from making that sentiment explicit.[84] Barnabas, after all, is clear about the judgment passed upon Israel and uses it as an example to show what might happen to the Christians.[85] Furthermore, in spite of Verheyden's efforts, it is difficult to take a passage like 1 Clem. 55:6 which praises Esther for saving "the twelve tribes of Israel" when they "were about to fall" (μέλλον ἀπολέσθαι) as anything other than positive. After all if one knew the story of Esther (Verheyden assumes a good bib-lical knowledge on the part of Clement's congregation), then one would have known that Israel's salvation was merited because its travails were not its own fault.[86]

Moreover, if Verheyden's interpretation is right, it is striking that not even a gratuitously negative comment about Jews is forthcoming, some-thing which we might expect if the tradition he was using was so laced with anti-Jewish sentiment; and equally rarely is the author concerned with collective misdeeds. The strength of Verheyden's case lies more in the ob-servation that the author implies that the Christians are now the rightful people of God, a point indicated by 1 Clem. 29 and 30.[87] If this is right, surely we have to consider how it was that that occurred and here judg-ment upon Israel must be assumed. This, of course, remains a possibility but is it an inevitability? The author is firstly clear that the church is more like Israel (there is no emphasis upon an identification with the nations); he makes no reference to the unfaithfulness of the "original" nation; and the manner in which he presents the idea of extraction plays up continuity ("a nation out of the midst of the nations").[88] The ring of supersessionism

---

uses of this citation subsequently, we see that the chronologically nearest reference oc-curs in Justin, *1 Apol.* 44 and 61, references which are not anti-Jewish (one relates to choice, the other to a call to baptism). Tertullian gives the earliest evidence of an anti-Jewish usage of this passage (Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* 13; *Marc.* 3.23.4).

84   E.g., in 1 Clem. 27 and 28, or in the passages on repentance.

85   See Barn. 4:14. Note also the interpretation of Barnabas recently advanced by J. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden Calf Incident* (WUNT 2/188; Tübingen, 2004), where the anti-Judaism of the text is seen as a kind of warning to Christians against complacency.

86   Note also how in 1 Clem. 12:1–7, Rahab, without comment, is praised for the help she gives Israel.

87   1 Clem. 32:2 could be taken to be a positive catalogue of Jewish advantages, not dissim-ilar to what we find in Rom 9:5, which may be echoed here when Clement refers to "Christ according to the flesh." For an attempt to contrast this passage with Rom 9, see Lanfranchi and Verheyden, "Jacob and Esau" (see n. 16).

88   See also Richardson, *Israel* (see n. 16), 15, who argues that the introduction at 1 Clem. 29:2 of the name Israel is incidental to 1 Clement's argument; and that the assertion that the Christians are Israel is not made explicit. In 1 Clem. 30 a part of the quotation is

seems mild. Moreover, need the author, simply because he identifies Christians with the elected part, to quote his own distinctive language (29:1; 30:1), assume non-Christian Jews to be judged?[89] If his is the language of remnantology, then, as noted, it is not a remnantology allied to explicit judgment, as, for instance, we find in Rom 10. Continuity might be assumed in an interpretation of 1 Clem. 32, where Jesus appears in almost undifferentiated style among kings and rulers and priests. To understand this passage negatively, as Verheyden does, involves much reading between the lines, and assumptions about the resonances of various references, not least "the scepters of the twelve tribes of Israel." But the passage, I would suggest, is striking precisely because it places Jesus where it does and in the manner it does.[90]

---

explicitly applied to the Christians ("seeing that we are made a special portion"), but not the reference to Israel. Richardson goes on to draw attention to 1 Clem. 8 where "all his beloved" whom he wants to repent include both Israel from the preceding sentences and the Christian flock in 1 Clem. 9. That the harsh quotation of Isa 29:13 in 1 Clem. 15:2 is not applied to Israel but the Christians, and the reference in 1 Clem. 59:4 to "wanderers of thy people," is a reference to Israel, further indicates respect for the historic people of God. Richardson's view that "Israel" is not referred to in 1 Clem. 30:1 could be thought questionable as both Israel and the Christians are described as μέρις (in the latter case at the beginning of 1 Clem. 29 and 30), and there is no obvious transition between verses 1 and 2, and 2 and 3. The question is, is verse 2 predictive of the identity of the Christians as God's portion or an indication that God makes these kinds of choices. All the difficulties arise from the failure of 1 Clement to describe any kind of transition from Israel to the church, in contrast to Justin. For Lemme, "Judenchristenthum" (see n. 12), 450, the Christians are a remnant out of Israel but in continuity with Israel, whose choice from among the nations remains, a view that comes closest to Richardson's.

89 Of some relevance here is the fact that Justin makes use of Deut 32:7 f. at *Dial.* 131. As we have seen (n. 80 above), Skarsaune, *Proof* (see n. 77), 29–30 and 189, has suggested that the citation may indicate knowledge of a similar testimony collection in favor of Christians being the people of God. Justin, interestingly, gives Deut 32:9 a double reference, both to the Jew and the gentile (i.e., Christians). But, as Skarsaune notes, he is not able to argue this point from the text itself but the double reference depends on previous arguments he has made (ibid., 348). Skarsaune argues that Justin is only able to make the case he does by using an argument from lesser to greater. If God could elect the unworthy and disbelieving Jews to become Jacob and Israel, how much more so the believing Christians (ibid., 189). The fact that 1 Clement, in contradistinction to Justin, *Dial.* 130–131, does not sense the passage's difficulty could point either to absolute appropriation, or to the sense that the Christians were a part of Israel. Lona, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 8), 327, points to the regular appearance of Deut 32 in Christian writings (see Clement, *Strom.* 7.6.4; and Tertullian, *Prax.* 17.3) and suggests, like Skarsaune, the possibility that the citation could have come from a collection, which was used in a catechetical or apologetic context.

90 It is interesting that in this chapter Clement shows knowledge of Rom 9. So the expression "from (Jacob) came the Lord Jesus according to the flesh" (ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, 1 Clem. 32:2) is close to Paul's "to them belong the Patriarchs, and of their race according to the flesh, is the Christ." Also the reference to "the priests and

The sense that there is a potentially much milder language of appropriation in 1 Clement is not only problematic for Verheyden's view, but also for the view of Harnack, Lona and others, which assume that 1 Clement simply ignores Judaism because it is no longer an issue for him. His is the silence of contempt because the Jewish-Christian question has somehow been resolved with the Christians assumed to be the exclusive rightful inheritors of Jewish promises.

This observation leads to another more general one. Verheyden in particular, but also Harnack and others, are only able to make the kind of inferences they do by assuming a good deal about the relationship between the author and the Jews which is extra-textual (to a much greater extent than is the case with Barnabas, with whom Verheyden sees a number of similarities) – namely that Jews and Christians in Rome have separated and that conceptions of their prior relationship would have been negative. But this is precisely the question.

Against this background, it is worth finishing this assessment of one approach to the question of 1 Clement's attitude to Jews and Judaism by examining the implications of 1 Clem. 5. Some have argued that the manner in which the deaths of Peter and Paul are reported in that chapter implies the complicity of non-Christian Jews. Supportive of this view is the claim that both apostles died διὰ ζῆλον in verses 2 and 3, a concept, which especially in Acts, is associated with the action of Jews against Christian missionaries.[91] Further support for this position is found by noting the context of the claim made, which Geoffrey Lampe thinks betrays similarities with what we find in Stephen's speech in Acts 7;[92] by the claim that hostility on the part of Jews towards Christians is witnessed in Rome, not only in Suetonius's account of their expulsion *impulsore Chresto* but by Luke's account of Paul's encounter with the Jews in Acts 28; and by

---

the Levites that serve at the altar of God" recalls one of the gifts that Paul claims that the Israelites have received from God (Rom 9:4 and its reference to "worship" [λατρεία]), and the "no small glory" of the twelve tribes could be seen as an allusion to Paul's "glory." "Promises" also takes up a gift referred to by Paul. What is important is that, in spite of showing knowledge of Rom 9, perhaps further supported when we note what he writes at 1 Clem. 32:4 about Christians as "being not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom and understanding," Clement gives little hint of endorsing Paul's typological understanding of the story of Jacob and Easu as we find that in Rom 9:10–13, possibly supporting our view of a less appropriative view of Christians' identity as children of Jacob. For this view see Lanfranchi and Verheyden, "Jacob and Esau" (see n. 16), 303–304. The fact that Verheyden is co-author of this article shows that his views on this matter have changed.

91 See Acts 5:17; 7:9; 13:45 and 17:5.
92 See Lampe, "Grievous Wolves" (see n. 16), 265–266.

claims in some later Christian literature that Jews were involved in the ex-ecution of Peter and Paul.[93] If such a view is right, it follows that Clement is aware of Jewish opposition to Christians, and that should incline readers to a more negative understanding of his views of Jews, making plain that any reconstructed background for his views would have been negative.[94]

But there are difficulties. An exclusive association of zeal with the Jews in this passage is not warranted. As David Eastman has shown, if one ex-amines the context of the passage, one notes that in discussing the negative effect of zeal in 1 Clem. 4, there are four examples of it operating within families and three of conflict within the Israelite community, supporting the idea, advanced in detail first by Oscar Cullmann,[95] that the zeal is an inner-Christian, and not external, Jewish one,[96] a position Eastman sup-ports with some additional arguments.[97] Furthermore, the passages cited as supporting Jewish hostility towards Christians are either overdone (as is the case with Acts 28:18–28) or favor a different interpretation.[98]

It is equally possible that the reference is to gentile zeal. This would comport with the well-established tradition that Peter and Paul died at the hands of Nero. Moreover, with the exception of Stephen and James, Jesus's brother, most of the executions of Christians were carried out by Roman authorities. And the text itself may justify such a view. Without the καὶ ἕως θανάτου ἤθλησαν at the end, the statement διὰ ζῆλον καὶ φθόνον οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιότατοι στῦλοι ἐδιώχθησαν could most natu-rally be read as referring to Jewish (non-fatal) persecution, but with the addition of reference to what must be executions, this could include the Roman legal system as well. In 1 Clem. 5:4 Peter's hardships are included in the καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας, which seem to have led to his death (ἐπο-ρεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης). And then one can take the whole of Πέτρον ὃς διὰ ζῆλον ἄδικον οὐχ ἕνα οὐδὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονας

---

93 See Commodian, *Carm. apol.* 845. For a presentation of this argument see H.W. Tajra, *The Martyrdom of St. Paul: Historical and Judicial Context, Traditions, and Legends* (WUNT 2/67; Tübingen, 1994), 79–84.

94 I am grateful for this point to Professor Adela Yarbro Collins and others in the seminar on 1 Clement held at SNTS 2015 in Amsterdam.

95 O. Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr; A Historical and Theological Study* (2nd ed.; London, 1962), 91–110.

96 See D.L. Eastman, "Jealousy, Internal Strife and the Death of Peter and Paul," *ZAC* 18 (2014), 34–53, here 43–47. He goes on to show that such inner-strife is reflected in Paul's life both in his epistles and Acts, arguing in particular for the importance of 2 Tim 4:14–15.

97 Eastman, "Jealousy" (see n. 96), 49–53.

98 See Eastman's interpretation of the passage in Suetonius, *Claud.* 25.4, in "Jealousy" (see n. 96), 49–51.

ὑπήνεγκεν πόνους καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης to mean: "Because of unrighteous zeal Peter endured not one, not two, but many labors, and these are the means by which or context within which (καὶ οὕτω) he made the testimony which led to his travelling to the place of glory he deserved." Again it seems that Clement is saying that Roman execution was the consequence of his bearing the testimony exemplified in the hardships – the οὕτω links the two halves of the sentence, the first half with the zeal and the second half with the execution. There may be Jewish involvement in both halves, but the execution is a Roman one. It is also the case that in the examples of zeal referred to 1 Clem. 4:10 and 13, it is the zeal of non-Israelites which is referred to.[99]

What is clear is that the passage is too ambiguous to sit clearly with one interpretation.

3.2 A More Positive Assessment

If there are difficulties with the broadly negative assessment of the evidence, can a more positive view be presented? Possibly. First, I draw attention to the points I have made above about the mild character of the language of inheritance in 1 Clem. 29, which need not be interpreted as appropriative in the traditionally negative sense.[100]

My second point relates to the issue of the temple. In chapters 40 and 41 of his epistle, Clement, in arguing for the need for order, points to the services held in the temple and the ordered manner in which these are carried out. The language is warm-hearted: "Those therefore who make their offerings at the appointed times are acceptable and blessed, for those who follow the example of the Master cannot go wrong. For to the High Priest the proper services have been given, and to the priests the proper office has been assigned, and upon the Levites the proper ministries have been imposed" (40:4). The section goes into some detail about the character of the offerings, and is clear about the need for these offerings only to be performed in the temple in Jerusalem.[101] Strikingly, the author understands these practices as still taking place,[102] and he interprets them literally.[103]

---

99 My thanks to Simon Gathercole for some of these points.

100 See pp. 234–235 above.

101 See Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 48, noting the remarkable nature of what is asserted.

102 The use of the present tense in these two chapters has been the subject of much discussion, and led some to posit a pre-70 date for the epistle (e.g., Herron, *Clement* [see n. 8], 11–21). As Lightfoot indicates, determining whether the use of the present here is an historic present, or an actual present, will be dictated by one's view of the date of the epistle on the basis of other sections of the epistle (J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic*

Indeed, there is a great respect shown towards Jewish cultic activity. No sign here of any negative critique of the temple cult as we find in Barnabas (see esp. Barn. 2:1 f. and 16:1 f.); no sense that the Levitical priesthood or the cult has been superseded as in Hebrews;[104] no hint of a typological or allegorical interpretation of the cult, together with its practices and festivals;[105] or that the reality being described is entirely secondary to the more

---

Fathers, pt. 1: *S. Clement of Rome* [2 vols.; London, 1890], 2.124–125). Certainly there are examples of the use of the present tense in discussions of the temple in works which are written after 70 (e. g., Josephus, *A.J* 3.151 f.; *C. Ap.* 2.77 and 102 f. [in the latter passage past and present tenses mix together]; Barn. 7 and 8, and Diogn. 3:3–5. A number of passages in the Mishnah could also be mentioned). Others solve the problem by noting that, just as with Philo's discussion of the cult, in *Spec.* 1, there is little real interest in the cult itself (it points to another reality), so this is the case with 1 Clement's usage (it points simply to the need for order, regardless of the reality of an actual cult; Lona, *Clemensbrief* [see n. 8], 439–440, partially following Wrede, *Untersuchungen* [see n. 13], 91, who argues that Clement doesn't expect his readers to recognize the value of the cult in itself but that when one understands its deeper meaning, it is not without importance). Löhr, *Studien* (see n. 21), 82–23, argues that the use of the present tense here need not support a pre-70 date. The temple in this section serves as a timeless example for the ordering of the Christian community, and it is especially noticeable that nothing in the text goes beyond what could have been read in the Bible, though this last observation is not strictly true (see our reference to Tomson, "Centrality" [see n. 16]). Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 167–168 n. 6, speculates that Clement could be reflecting the tense in which a source he was using was written, or some form of ongoing continuity of the law. Herron, however, insists that Clement must be pointing to an actual reality for when he speaks of order he is appealing to enduring and perennially valid examples of order (as he is in 1 Clem. 20 when referring to the Roman army). "Applying this to his reference to the Temple, one would have to admit that if the Temple, once quite an ordered affair, lay in ruins, *1 Clement* would have been better advised not even to mention the Temple in the first place" (Herron, *Clement* [see n. 8], 17). Herron takes too little account of Josephus's use of the present tense (along with Barn. 7 and 8, Diogn. 3 and the Mishnah) for his temporal point to stand but by referring to the reality of Clement's reference (here in comparison with Roman army in 1 Clem. 20), he draws attention to the fact that Clement surely takes the reality to which he is referring seriously.

103 The idea that Clement is presenting the new order of the Christians as a replacement, or more likely in continuity with the order of the temple, as described in threefold terms in 1 Clem. 40:5, seems unwarranted. On this see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* (see n. 102), 2.123; Lemme, "Judenchristenthum" (see n. 12), 418–419; and Lona, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 8), 436–437.

104 "When Clement proposes a comparison between the Levitical hierarchy and the order of the church, he does not suggest that the latter has replaced the old institutions" (Lanfranchi and Verheyden, "Jacob and Esau" [see n. 16], 304).

105 It is true that at 1 Clem. 41:4 Clement relates what he is saying about the cult to "fuller knowledge" (πλείονος […] γνώσεως) but there is no sense in which such knowledge implies an understanding of the text which is somehow typological or allegorical. It is precisely the existence of a hierarchy in the temple which is so important to the author and this constitutes the "fuller knowledge."

general point being made about order.[106] The tone and the manner of description seems closer to 1 Clement's likely contemporary, Josephus.[107] If Clement was living in a Rome dominated by images of Jewish defeat in which the temple and symbols associated with it played a significant role, whether on the arch of Titus or in the Temple of Peace where the priestly garments were displayed, his referencing of the temple shows little sign of that, just as Josephus's referencing of it showed little sign that the temple was destroyed and its destruction had, to some extent, become a kind of totem of the new Flavian regime.[108] In fact, Martin Goodman's assertion that Christians would have reacted negatively to such an assumed anti-Jewish environment by distancing themselves from non-Christian Jews is called into question by Clement's apparently warm endorsement of the temple. His presentation implies ongoing vitality and respect for customs still thought important and about which he, or the traditions he is following, appears to know a good deal.[109] Are these traits straightforwardly compatible with the ideas attributed by Verheyden to 1 Clement, or those of Harnack and others who assume that Judaism has ceased to exist for 1 Clement? Would we not expect the glimmer of an indication that the temple had fallen, or that it had been misunderstood by those who ran it? To some the calmness of the reference reflects the confidence of Clement's appropriation,[110] but even assuming that, would we expect such a positive reference,[111] and one that contrasts with references in

---

106 See n. 102. The attempts made by Lona and Löhr to explain away the present tense of 1 Clem. 40 and 41 by noting the precedence of its timeless meaning over anything specific, are equally attempts to scotch the idea that the author is attributing any value to the temple in itself, a point hinted at by Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 90. But this view can only be arrived at through assumption, not by a straightforward reading of the text, whose delineation of the running of the temple in such uncritical detail, remains striking.

107 See Josephus, *A.J.* 3.151 f.; *C. Ap.* 2.77, 102 f. For comments see J.M.G. Barclay, *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary*, vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary* (ed. S. Mason; Leiden, 2007), 210 n. 267.

108 For this view see F. Millar, "Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome," in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives; New York, 2005), 101–128; and Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem* (see n. 10), 449–463.

109 See Tomson, "Centrality" (see n. 16).

110 See Green, *Christianity* (see n. 2), 55.

111 Some have emptied the passage of any significant "Jewish" content by arguing that Clement is borrowing the idea of order in ritual from pagan writing on the subject. But such a view fails to take account of evidence in Jewish sources of the importance of order in the temple cult. On this see Jaubert, "Thèmes" (see n. 22), 194 f., who argues for a Levitical background to ideas of order. She points to post-biblical passages like 3 Esd 1:5; Let. Aris. 92–95, as well as passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls (cf. 1QS 1:23;

Paul and Hebrews to cultic times?[112] It is also true that Clement can refer to a set of testimonies, already mentioned (see 1 Clem. 52), that seem anti-cultic. But in his hands they are not so, becoming exhortations to certain forms of behavior. Had the anti-cultic aspect been to the fore, surely Clement would have found it difficult to write chapters 40 and 41, or would have at least given some indication that he no longer adhered to a literal interpretation of the passage?[113]

A third point in favor of a more positive understanding of the implications of 1 Clement for the attitude of its author to Jews and Judaism concerns sources. We have already referred to the possibility that 1 Clement had access to an anti-Jewish source which argued for the view of the law as an accommodation to the idolatrous tendencies of the Jews manifested at the incident of the Golden Calf. If he did, then he has very successfully denuded it of its anti-Jewish hue, transforming it into a call for repentance or something equivalent. The case is speculative and, even if correct, need not mean that Clement disagreed with the anti-Jewish character of the original source, simply that he was able to adapt such sources to very different circumstances.

The issue raised becomes more interesting in the case of some New Testament texts. The author of 1 Clement knows some of Paul's letters.[114] He explicitly refers to 1 Corinthians (1 Clem. 47:1) and on a number of occasions seems to show knowledge of Romans.[115] What form this knowledge

---

2:14; 2:22). In the first two of these passages there is a particular emphasis on the Levites as regulating matters. See n. 22.

112 See Gal 4:10; Col 2:16 and Rom 14:5–6, where Paul claims the liberty of Christians from fixed days. On this see Jaubert, "Thèmes" (see n. 22), 198.

113 Note Tomson's pithy characterization of the argument in 1 Clem. 40 and 41: "This was Rome correcting Corinth – with Jerusalem at the centre" (Tomson, "Centrality" [see n. 16], 103).

114 See discussions in Hagner, *Use* (see n. 28), 195–237, for a maximalist position in which the author is seen as showing knowledge of a collection of Pauline letters. A.F. Gregory, "*1 Clement* and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. A.F. Gregory and C.M. Tuckett; Oxford, 2005), 129–157, here 142–151, argues for knowledge of Romans and 1 Corinthians, but thinks that knowledge of other Pauline letters is sparse. Lona, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 8), 48–51, posits knowledge of Romans and 1 Corinthians and the Pastorals, at least in terms of religious atmosphere, but not of other Pauline letters. A relatively uncontroversial list of parallels might look like this: 1 Clem. 47:1–4 = 1 Cor 1:12; 1 Clem. 37:5–38:2 = 1 Cor 12:12, 14 = 1 Cor 12:20–28; 1 Clem. 49:5 = 1 Cor 13:4–7; 1 Clem. 24:1 = 1 Cor 15:20, 23; 1 Clem. 10:6 = Rom 4:3; 1 Clem. 35:5–6 = Rom 1:29–32; 1 Clem. 32:4–33:1 = Rom 5:21–6:2a; 1 Clem. 32:2 = Rom 9:5.

115 For the most recent discussion see A.F. Gregory, "Disturbing Trajectories: *1 Clement*, the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Development of Early Roman Christianity," in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church* (ed. P. Oakes; Carlisle, 2004), 142–166, here 148–151.

took, whether it implied an intimate knowledge of those texts, is difficult to say.[116] In discussion of the text, and in spite of this apparent knowledge of Paul, many have urged that 1 Clement should not be read as if somehow linked to Paul because, for various reasons, this would give a false reading of the epistle.[117] At one level this is correct just as it might be correct not to read James as if it is a debased form of Paulinism, especially when judgments are made on the type of religiosity witnessed in the epistle.[118] What is interesting, however, is that the author shows knowledge of Paul's doctrine of justification, in 1 Clem. 32:4, as manifested in Rom 5, and seems to show knowledge, at least in terms of the manner in which he argues, of Rom 6, where he seeks to head off the implication that because we are justified by faith we should somehow fall into sinfulness (1 Clem. 33:1). This may imply a level of knowledge of Paul that is more expansive than some have thought. What is interesting is that if Clement knows Paul's doctrine of justification, he does not relate it to the question of Jews and gentiles nor to the law. In fact, as already noted, he nowhere refers disparagingly to the law, or seeks to differentiate between the era of Christ and the era preceding it in nomistic terms.[119] He may see Christians as a remnant like Paul, chosen from Israel, but he does so with little of Paul's polemic as found in Rom 10. He mentions the figure of Jacob on a number of occasions (see 1 Clem. 4:8 and 31:4), but without apparent knowledge of Paul's typological interpretation of the story of

---

116 See C. Rothschild, "Reception of First Corinthians in First Clement," in *New Essays on the Apostolic Fathers* (WUNT; Tübingen, forthcoming), where she argues that 1 Clement knew 1 Corinthians well and frequently alludes to it.

117 See Lona, *Clemensbrief* (see n. 8), 62, esp. n. 3, here taking to task those who would judge the author in relation to Paul and so distort his theology.

118 Both Baur, *History* (see n. 12), 140–141, and Baur's pupil, Albert Schwegler, along with a number of others, compare 1 Clement directly with Paul in coming to their judgment that he stands somewhere between a "Jewish Christian" position, as reconstructed by themselves, and a Pauline one. See Schwegler's judgment: "Diese äusserliche unvermittelte Verknüpfung der Gegensätze, diese alternirende Betonung bald der πίστις, bald der ἔργα, die Halbheit, beiden Parteien zugleich Recht zu geben, macht die Eigentümlichkeit unseres Briefs aus, dessen dogmatische Gepräge man nur als ein verwaschenes, abgestumpftes, charakter- und individualitätsloses bezeichnen kann" (Schwegler, *Zeitalter* [see n. 12], 129). For a strongly "Jewish Christian" interpretation of 1 Clement, see Lemme, "Judenchristenthum" (see n. 12).

119 He also does not repeat, in strict terms, Paul's doctrine of justification by faith as he fails consummately to refer to Christ as the object of that faith. The faith rather is a gift of God who has justified people in such a way since the beginning. As Jaubert, "Thèmes" (see n. 22), has argued, this makes his view of faith closer to one we would identify with the wisdom tradition. His ideas are perhaps closer to those of the writer of Hebrews in ch. 11. Note how for this author it is not only Abraham who is magnified by faith but also Rahab and Esther.

Jacob and Esau in Rom 9:10–13, and this in spite of betraying knowledge of Rom 9.[120] Clement seems to know of Paul's use of Abraham but again shows little knowledge of the polemical edge with which Paul used this figure in his battles with the so-called Judaizers.[121] Like Paul in Rom 4:7–8, Clement cites Ps 32:1–2 (here adding the final line of verse 2, omitted by Paul), but rather than concluding like Paul, by referring to the blessedness of the circumcised *and* the uncircumcised, he talks more generally about blessings coming to those who have been chosen by God.[122]

What does all this imply? That 1 Clement reads Paul for what is important to him in his very specific context?[123] Or that there were aspects of Paul which he did not find conducive?[124] Or that the arguments of Paul

---

120 For the evidence see n. 89, following Lanfranchis and Verheyden, "Jacob and Esau" (see n. 16).

121 At 1 Clem. 10:2, the author refers to Abraham as someone who inherits the promises of God (this is in fact the purpose of him leaving his home). The language could be said to reflect Gal 3:18 and more particularly Rom 4:13. But the issue of Christian inheritance is not developed and can appear as at best "Sprachreste" (Lona, *Clemensbrief* [see n. 8], 197), which is distant from its original context. A similar argument could be advanced to explain Clement's use at 1 Clem. 10:6 of Gen 15:6, so important to Paul in his argument with so-called Judaizers, but lacking any such character in 1 Clement. Lampe, "Grievous Wolves" (see n. 16), 265, takes a different view. Referring to Acts 7:2–8, he notes that, in contrast to that passage, Clement does not want to emphasize that Abraham left a settled abode to become a homeless wanderer, "but that he went out from 'a scanty land, a feeble kindred, and a mean house' to inherit the richness of God's promise," and Lampe asserts that the implication of this is that the true Christian descendant of Abraham has left the poverty of Judaism to gain the riches promised to the true Israel of faith, and, *pace* Lampe, it is to be inferred should not be tempted back to them (here alluding to his own view that 1 Clement is addressed to a crisis caused by an insurgent anti-Christian Jewish mission). Ingenious interpretations of Lot (1 Clem. 11) and Rahab (1 Clem. 12) follow. Elsewhere in the same article (ibid., 267), after enumerating places in the epistle where the Christians appear to be the true Israel (cf. 29:2–3; 31:2–4; 30:6–7; and 32:2), Lampe notes that Clement seeks to defend the view, found in Romans, that "the authentic Israel are those who share Abraham's true righteousness of faith." But if Lampe is right, the absence of any of Paul's polemical language in relation to the law, circumcision and other matters, is strange.

122 Wrede, *Untersuchungen* (see n. 13), 89, who notes the failure of 1 Clement to indicate how those blessings come to him.

123 This is the view of Hagner, *Use* (see n. 28), 349, which could equally be applied to Clement's knowledge of any other New Testament or Old Testament text: "Clement's use of the writings of the Apostles is controlled [...] by the immediate purpose of his epistle."

124 Lemme, "Judenchristentum" (see n. 12), 418–423, after noting that "[j]edes Sensorium für die paulinische Gedankenwelt fehlt ihm [Clement]," thinks that the high status accorded to Moses (43:1, 6; 53:5), and the predominant sense, as he sees it, of the scriptures as a law book (see 2:8; 3:4; 20:5; 35:7; 37:1; 40:5; 50:5; 58:2), implies a conservative attitude to the law. The term νόμος does not occur in the letter, and Lemme can only arrive at the position he does through a good deal of eisegesis but his position is

were irrelevant to the changed situation in which he found himself, either because Christians and Jews were no longer in communication (Harnack and others' position), or because he conceived of the relationship with non-Christian Jews more eirenically.[125] Or might it be the case that he simply displays his only partial knowledge of Paul?[126] Or all, or some of these?[127]

The same questions are relevant to 1 Clement's use of Hebrews. The arguments about the dependence of 1 Clement upon this text have rumbled on with no absolute resolution. The best evidence for dependence lies in the parallels between 1 Clem. 36:1–5 and Heb 1:3f. While "the pattern of striking parallels and possible allusions, but only limited verbal identity, means that it is difficult to exclude altogether the possibility that Clement and the author of the letter to the Hebrews might each have drawn on a common source or tradition, most would see some level of literary dependence,"[128] a view which receives support when we examine the other list of possible allusions to Hebrews.[129] But what might be the importance of this observation? It may lie in the fact that if Clement knew Hebrews, while keen to affirm the High Priestly identity of Jesus, he does not follow Hebrews in asserting such an identity through an attack upon the Jewish cult. In fact, as we have indicated, the contrary is true, a point seen not only in what Clement says about the temple but also in what he asserts

---

correct insofar as 1 Clement's attitude to the Jewish law cannot be understood negatively.

125 Broadly the position of Lanfranchi and Verheyden, "Jacob and Esau" (see n. 16).

126 See Lona's idea of "Sprachreste," referred to in n. 121 above.

127 See Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 65, noting that Clement does not follow Paul in his insistence on the opposition of two regimes, that of law and that of faith, going on to argue that Clement is more like the man of tradition and that this tradition is Jewish conveyed through sapiential values honed in contact with what she terms "Hellenism."

128 See Gregory, "*1 Clement*" (see n. 114), 149, and P. Ellingworth, "Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Traditions?" *BZ* 23 (1979), 262–269, here 265–267, who examines the parallels, arguing in favor of literary dependence (rather than dependence of thought) and accounting for differences by reference to different theological positions.

129 See Hagner, *Use* (see n. 28), 179–195, esp. 179: "It seems certain that Clement read, loved, was taught by, and made use of, the Epistle to the Hebrews in writing his pastoral letter to the church at Corinth." He rejects Goodspeed's suggestion that 1 Clement was written in response to the rebuke found in Heb 5:12, preferring to see the use of the epistle as determined by the circumstances of the Corinthian community (ibid., 195). A conventional list of citations or allusions by 1 Clement to Hebrews might look like this: 1 Clem. 36:2–5 and Heb 1:3f.; and 1 Clem. 36:1–2 and Heb 9:8; 10:20. Other passages: 1 Clem. 17:1 = Heb 11:37; 1 Clem. 17:5 = Heb 3:2; 1 Clem. 19:2 = Heb 12:1; 1 Clem. 27:1 = Heb 10:23; 1 Clem. 27:2 = Heb 6:18; 1 Clem. 36:1; 61:3; 64 = Heb 2:18; 3:1.

about the relationship of Jesus to the Levites, and indeed the warm-hearted way in which he refers to the Levites.[130] This may, as Paul Ellingworth has suggested, account for his failure to refer to Melchizedek in his account of Jesus's High Priesthood.[131] The failure to indicate that Jesus has brought about a form of forgiveness better than the cult, the failure to assert that this constitutes a better covenant, the failure, as we noted in the case of a comparison with Paul, to make plain the difference between the current dispensation and the previous one, stands in striking contrast to Hebrews.[132]

Again we need to be cautious before drawing any conclusions. What precisely of Hebrews the writer of 1 Clement knew is not clear. Andreas Lindemann has suggested that he only knew Heb 1, or even an interme-diary source, a point apparently supported by the supposed differences in theology between the two writings.[133] But this, of course, merely begs the question and one might wonder whether it is believable to posit such an intermediary source. Again, however, even if we accept that 1 Clement knew Hebrews, it is difficult to know whether he was judging the theology of that text or simply making use of it in a manner which suited his specific purposes. Ellingworth's view that 1 Clement is literarily dependent upon Hebrews, but displays no dependence of thought,[134] presents more diffi-culties than it solves.

What is clear, however, is that 1 Clement potentially presents us with a different set of assumptions about scripture, the Jewish cult and the cov-enant to Hebrews, and so with the possibility that different views on this matter were present among Christians in the Rome of the late first century, even among Christians who shared traditions in common. Peter Lampe

---

130 See esp. 1 Clem. 43:2 and reference to the glorious title, which goes to Aaron and so to the Levitical priesthood.

131 Ellingworth, "Hebrews" (see n. 128), 266–267, noting that Melchizedek is on the side of Jesus and over against the Levitical priesthood, whereas Hebrews approach to the Lev-itical priesthood is comparative (1 Clem. 40–41), not contrastive.

132 See Jaubert's comments on their respective attitudes to the cult: "Les deux régimes ne sont pas definés par contraste [as in Hebrews] mais par resemblance" (Jaubert, "Thèmes" [see n. 22], 199). A similar comment could be made about Clement's attitude to Moses. So, while in Heb 3:4–6, where the author contrasts Moses' role as a servant (θέραπων) with that of Christ's role as a son, Clement's reference to Moses' role as a faithful servant in 1 Clem. 43:1 (again θέραπων is used) is understood positively, and he is seen as the primal figure whom the prophets bearing witness to the laws he enacted. See also 1 Clem. 53:5.

133 A. Lindemann, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, vol. 1: *Die Clemensbriefe* (HNT 17; Tübingen, 1992), 17–19.

134 See Ellingworth, "Hebrews" (see n. 128), 262.

has spoken of a fractionalized community in Rome and sought in various ways to justify that view.[135] This is certainly a possibility. Unless we are to assume that the epistle to the Hebrews spawned no theological followers, that his views withered on the vine, then its attitude to the Jewish heritage of Christianity and that of 1 Clement constitute a study in contrasts, contrasts perhaps implying distinct and separate groups, which could share each other's opinions while not precisely reflecting them. Some have argued, not without reason, that the kind of position evidenced in 1 Clement, that is one that shows no awareness of the presence of Jews, assumes a single covenant, or at least feels no need to discuss this matter, is also witnessed in Hermas,[136] implying a more widely held position.[137]

The thesis argued above is vulnerable, not least in relation to the question of 1 Clement's supposed use of his sources. But it highlights the degree to which the opposing position, in its different forms, arises from a set of presuppositions, which assumes a particular, and questionable, trajectory of Jewish-Christian interaction in Rome. This paper has done little more than ask what happens if 1 Clement is read differently, without reference to the supposed development of Jewish-Christian relations in Rome generally assumed, whether on the basis of assumptions drawn from scraps of information in ill-informed pagan sources (ill-informed that is about Christianity, and probably Judaism) or particular interpretations of the epistle to the Romans, or on the basis of what we believe was the inevitable trajectory of Jewish-Christian relations more generally (that is, an essentially negative view)?[138] What, for instance, would a comparison of the epistle with Josephus reveal? Would the two not seem more like each other than different? Both loathed "stasis," saw the Roman order as broadly beneficial, had an elevated view of the Jewish scriptures and apparently of the Jewish cult. And how might that affect the way we look at the implied identity of the author of 1 Clement? Could we see 1 Clement as an inner-Jewish work, for instance, or as a Jewish Christian one with all the caveats

---

135 Lampe, *Paul* (see n. 30).

136 Hermas makes no mention of the Jews at all and seems, like Clement, to show almost no evidence of a distinction between the age before and after Christ. At Herm. 8.3.2 there is no distinction between the law and Christ; at Herm. 9.17.1 the twelve tribes and the Christian church appear to be one; and at Herm. 9.15.4 the prophets who precede Christ with no sense of disruption between the two. The same kinds of questions raised about 1 Clement are raised here, too.

137 Gregory, "Disturbing Trajectories" (see n. 115), esp. 161, for the idea that 1 Clement and Hermas give voice to different conceptions of authority and the possibility that they witness to contrasting views of different house churches.

138 For such a reading see Schreckenberg, *Adversus-Judaeos-Texte* (see n. 16), 171.

and ryders that go with the use of such a term? It is worth recalling that Clement was to become the hero of the Pseudo-Clementine corpus. Why he was selected for such a role is not immediately clear, though some have, inter alia, suggested a church-political purpose, inspired by his position as first bishop of Rome.[139] But it could also have been because he was seen as a law-abiding early Christian, as in fact a "Jewish Christian," a position inspired by now unknown traditions about him, and even, and here we become perhaps unduly speculative, by the contents of his first eponymous letter?[140] And even if we reject such an identity, what might his epistle imply about his relationship with the non-Christian Jewish community? As closer and more eirenic than usually assumed, embodying perhaps an aspect of what Paul implies in Rom 11? I don't propose to answer those questions but they reveal the difficulty that arises from assuming too much, and then interpreting a text on the basis of such fragile assumptions.

4 Conclusion

This paper could be attacked for addressing a non-subject. After all, 1 Clement is clearly not about Jews or Christians in Rome, but about the problem of the governance of the Christian church in Corinth.[141] What it might, then, tell the reader about the attitude of the author to Jews and so by extension the state of Jewish-Christian relations in Rome is ostensibly minimal. Yet that has not stopped scholars from making observations on this matter, and using the epistle as part of a more all-consuming narrative about Jewish-Christian interaction in that city. *Prima facie* there may be some justification for such an approach, not

---

139 See F.S. Jones, "Clement of Rome and the *Pseudo-Clementines*," in *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Essays* (Leuven, 2012), 172–193, here 187–191. He argues that Clement is presented, especially in the so-called *Epistula Clementis*, as the guarantor of the genuineness of the "Jewish Christian" tradition the author is commending to his readers.

140 Jones, "Clement" (see n. 139), does not consider the possibility that earlier works attributed to Clement may have influenced decisions to make Clement the hero of the theological novel. In fact, according to him (ibid., 172), 1 Clement, 2 Clement and the *Epistle to the Virgins* have "little or nothing to do with" the Pseudo-Clementines.

141 This is not the position of Lemme, "Judenchristentum" (see n. 12), or Lampe, "Grievous Wolves" (see n. 16). Both think that 1 Clement is either an attempt to wrest Corinthian Christianity back for the Jewish Christian cause (Lemme), or the diametrically opposite position in the case of Lampe, to argue a case against anti-Christian Jewish missionaries. The fact that we can have two scholars arguing for such different positions is an indication of the complexity of the subject.

least because the essentially parenetic 1 Clement makes extensive use of the Jewish scriptures and by doing such a thing, *hints at* an attitude towards Jewish-Christian interaction.

What is striking about 1 Clement's approach to scripture is that he views it in Christian terms with little sense of an alternative view, even when, for instance, he claims that the Christians are God's chosen portion (29:2). And he gives little sense of a transition between the time before Christ and the time after, omitting, for instance, any reference to the issue of law and covenant. Comparative language in the context of a discussion of a period before and after Christ is absent, a striking fact given the author's apparent knowledge of Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews, texts intent upon articulating a difference between a pre-Christian and Christian dispensation. This point becomes more telling when it is realized that 1 Clement is a text which hints at a deeper Christological profile even if it lacks discursive Christological passages,[142] in contrast to a text like Theophilus's *Ad Autolycum*. Assertions about Christ do not lead to negative assertions about those who do not believe in him or negative references to what he has saved us from.

Interpretations of these data have differed. For many they point to the absolute character of the separation between Christianity and Judaism, to a set of changed circumstances which make the need to discuss the law, the covenant and related subjects unnecessary, superfluous. In such a view appropriation is absolute and, for some, a careful reading beneath the surface of the text, not least in relation to the manner in which Jews are presented in Old Testament citations in the epistle, can reveal a negative picture of Judaism.[143]

Others have argued differently. They have seen the absence of any overt polemic as striking, in part because the author appears to know some polemical traditions, or at least to imply knowledge of them. Moreover, even though he may be able to use some negative exempla from Jewish history, he never throws in a polemical remark about the Jews, and never, where he might have done, does he declare a final judgment upon them, indicating a break with a covenant they once possessed or a dispensation they once en-

---

142 Christ appears to be pre-existent (16:2; 22:1) and the son of God (36:4) and Lord (12:7; 16:17; 23:5), is proclaimed by the prophets (17:1), and himself proclaims scripture (22:1–8), has looked into the heavenlies (36:2); and having arrived in the flesh (32:2), has given his blood for us (7:4; 12:7; 21:6; 49:6). Note also his presence within doxologies (58:2; 61:3; 64; 65:2).

143 This position is implied to some extent in Harnack and others, but asserted boldly by Verheyden.

joyed (something the circumstances he was addressing might have tempted him to do). What is striking about his references to Jacob or Abraham as the Christians' father is that he does not assert that they were once the father of the Jews who have now forfeited the right to that relationship. In spite of the fact that he may have been a reader of the epistle to the Hebrews, he speaks of the Jewish cult in positive tones, assuming its ongoing existence, and never hinting at its destruction. He does this, supposedly, in a Rome where the temple's destruction had become a part of a triumphalist anti-Jewish iconography, an image along with other images that aggrandized the reputation of the upstart Flavian dynasty. When this is coupled with the evident openness of the text both to the Jewish heritage of Christianity, and indeed to pagan influences, 1 Clement looks less like a polemicist and more like a man of eirenic character, a possible erstwhile God-fearer, who retained a respect for his Jewish heritage and whose disposition approximated more to that of Paul in Rom 11, than to the same man in 1 Thess 2, Galatians or other parts of Romans.[144] How he understood the relationship of the church to non-Christian Judaism is not easy to categorize but ideas of supersession, and those related to them, seem inappropriate ways of describing his understanding of this matter.

Adjudication between these positions is difficult, and prudence might incline one to suspend judgment. I would, however, support those who see Clement's view as less negative, who interpret the silence less polemically, and who would prefer not to speak of a kind of contemptuous ignoring of Judaism. I think this position better accounts for the tone and content of 1 Clem. 40 and 41, for the absence of gratuitous polemic, or even the slightest reflection of a Pauline or Hebrews-like comment on the previous covenant and its deficiencies, texts which were known to the author. But in the end certainty is not possible for we are dealing with the implications of a text which does not directly address the question under discussion; and the same investigation could be played out with 1 Peter,[145] 2 Clement,[146]

---

144 This position is adopted by Knoch, "Stellung" (see n. 28), 349–350, who presents his reader with a picture of a Clement, who was grateful both to the synagogue and to the Christian church. This in a sense accounts for his synthetic thinking when it comes to Jews and Christians, best seen in the less ruptured vision of *Heilsgeschichte*. First Clement is proof of the fact that there were at the time in Rome leading men who took a positive and benign attitude towards Judaism, which picked up on views found in Rom 9–11.

145 See n. 7 above.

146 C. Tuckett, *2 Clement: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Oxford, 2012), 74–75 and 140–141, touches upon this matter in relation to 2 Clement. He notes the total absence of Jews from the text and at the same time the untroubled appropriation of scripture by

Hermas, and even Theophilus of Antioch's *Ad Autolycum*, all of which seem to appropriate Jewish categories for themselves without ever engaging overtly in anti-Jewish polemic.

What all this shows is that it is more difficult than some have suggested to fit 1 Clement into a particular history of Roman Jewish-Christian relations, the supporting pillars of which are in any case secure than is often recognized.[147] In the end the epistle's content is too ambiguous to allow us to speak with certainty on this matter and can only be made to support such a narrative on the basis of a number of assumptions, all of which are questionable. Certainly what we have with 1 Clement is a snapshot of the views of its author, views which can only be partially and fragmentarily represented, not only on this subject but others, too;[148] and only one voice among a number of voices on the subject of Jews, not least if we are to assume the fractionalized community of Christians, posited by Lampe and supported by others. Understanding what he thought is in the end determined by other wider considerations about Jewish and Christian interaction in this period, in Rome, or more widely in the empire, considerations which themselves will always be contending with inadequate evidence.

James Carleton Paget
Peterhouse
Cambridge, CB2 1RD
UK
jncp@cam.ac.uk

the author of the epistle. This can appear striking in some places (e.g., 2 Clem. 2:1 where Isa 54:1, a verse which in Paul and Justin is used in an aggressive way to defend a Christian position against a non-Christian Jewish one [see Gal 4:27; Justin, *1 Apol.* 53.5; *Dial.* 13.8], is quoted but with no trace of such a polemical usage). Tuckett concludes from this that the author of the epistle is living in a context where non-Christian Jewish members were almost non-existent and where scripture could be used without any need being felt to defend it against non-Christian Jewish interpretation (ibid., 75).

147 See n. 11 above.

148 Jaubert, *Clément* (see n. 16), 69 and n. 19. For instance, 1 Clem. 12:7 implies a more complex hermeneutical background than might seem to be the case.

Zachary B. Smith

Of Firstfruits and Social Fixtures

How Didache 13 Uses Torah to Reform Roman Patronage[1]

Der Artikel vertritt die These, dass Did. 13 (über die Versorgung von Propheten) die Bestimmungen der Tora über die Erstlingsgabe aufgreift, um die soziale Hierarchie des römischen Patronatssystems umzukehren, was zur Umstrittenheit der Leitungsstruktur in der Gemeinde der Didache führt. Im ersten Teil wird Did. 13 mit Cicero und Seneca verglichen, um zu zeigen, dass die Erstlingsgabe an die Propheten eine Form des Patronats ist. Der zweite Teil widmet sich der Frage, wie die herkömmliche Sozialstruktur des Patronatssystems durch die Bestimmungen der Tora ins Gegenteil verkehrt wird. Im dritten Teil wird behauptet, dass die Unterstützung der Propheten zu Konflikten um die Leitung (durch Propheten und Bischöfe) in der Gemeinde der Didache geführt hat.

Keywords: Didache, patronage, prophets, firstfruits, Cicero, Seneca, Torah

1 Introduction

The social structure of patronage permeated the Mediterranean world during the early Roman Empire.[2] Public displays and inscriptions of pa-

---

2 I rely on the rough outline of the parameters of patronage by R.P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (New York, 1982), 1: it was a non-commercial, personal exchange of goods or services that created an extended relationship between two socially unequal individuals. This understanding relies on examining the activities of patronage instead of a technical vocabulary (e. g., *patronus* and *cliens*), since no truly technical vocabulary exists due to the fluidity of the terms and the euphemisms employed (ibid., 7–39; R.P. Saller, "Patronage and Friendship in Early Imperial Rome: Drawing the Distinction," in *Patronage in Ancient Society* [ed. A. Wallace-Hadrill; Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 1; New York, 1989], 49–62). S.N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger, *Patrons, Clients, and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society* (Cambridge, 1984), 43–49, use thirteen brief case studies from across the modern world to create a definition similar to Saller's (to Eisenstadt and Roniger's point regard the [at best] semi-legal status of patronage, see P. Garnsey and G. Woolf, "Patronage of the Rural

tronage were scattered throughout the cities of the empire.[3] The very lay-
out of the homes of wealthy Roman patrons speaks to the widespread ideal
and practice of patronage.[4] Given its pervasiveness in the cities of the em-
pire, it is no wonder that early Christianity – and Judaism in the Hellenistic
and Roman eras – adopted forms of the patronage system.[5] Uniquely,
Did. 13, a passage on the maintenance of prophets, presents a new kind
of patronage, one that is reformed by Torah precepts and inverts the social
structure of traditional Roman patronage.[6] Comparing the precepts of

---

Poor in the Roman World," in *Patronage in Ancient Society*, 153–170, and their argument
that patronage was not enforceable in the ancient world).

3 F.W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Se-
mantic Field* (St. Louis, Mo., 1982).

4 A. Wallace-Hadrill, "Patronage in Roman Society: From Republic to Empire," in *Patron-
age in Ancient Society* (see n. 2), 63–65; id., *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Hercula-
neum* (Princeton, 1994), 10–12, 29–30, 38–61.

5 Examples from the New Testament include Prisca and Aquila patronizing a Roman con-
gregation (Rom 16:3–5 and 1 Cor 16:19; Rom 16:23 mentions another individual pa-
tronizing a church), Lydia purportedly patronizing Paul's preaching in Thyatira (Acts
16:14–15), and the Philippian Christians patronizing Paul (Phil 4:10–19). B.W. Winter,
Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens (Grand Rapids, Mich.,
1994), argues that Christians were highly socially and politically engaged, and that many
passages in the New Testament should be interpreted in light of patronage. J.A. Kelhoffer,
"Reciprocity as Salvation: Christ as Salvific Patron and the Corresponding 'Payback' Ex-
pected of Christ's Earthly Clients according to the *Second Letter of Clement*," *NTS* 59
(2013), 433–456, interprets reciprocity in 2 Clement as reflecting the culture of patronage
present in the Mediterranean. Bishops eventually take over as patrons for the needy of the
Christian community (cf. C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Chris-
tian Leadership in an Age of Transition* [Transformation of the Classical Heritage 37;
Berkeley, 2005], 172–234). Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman eras patronized both
their local communities or synagogues and their local civic structures; see the inscrip-
tions and literary evidence, with select commentary, in M.H. Williams (ed.), *The Jews
among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook* (Baltimore, Md., 1998),
II.68–75 (47–48), IV.21–22 (92), V.18–19 (112), V.38 (119), VI.31–39 (150–151),
VII.17 (168); B.J. Brooten analyzes specifically women's patronage of their synagogue
communities in *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and
Background Issues* (BJS 36; Chico, Calif., 1982), 141–144 (analysis), 157–165 (inscrip-
tions). The evidence for Jewish adoption of Roman patronage, however, is not as straight-
forward as the inscriptions seem to indicate (cf. S. Schwartz, *Were the Jews a Mediterra-
nean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism* [Princeton, 2010]).

6 For the text of the Didache, I use the edition in B.D. Ehrman (LCL 24). A. Milavec, *The
Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville, Minn., 2003),
xi–xvi, displays significant reluctance to edit the single Greek manuscript of the Didache
from other translations or fragments, an exercise that Ehrman undertakes in the Loeb
edition. I do not find Milavec's argument particularly convincing. In either case, accord-
ing to both Ehrman's edition and the analysis of the potential sources by K. Niederwim-
mer, "Der Didachist und seine Quellen," in *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text,
History and Transmission* (ed. C.N. Jefford; NovTSup 77; New York, 1995), 15–36, there
are no substantive changes to the rules concerning prophets in Did. 13:1–7 in any of the

Did. 13 to prescriptive treatises on patronage by Cicero (*De officiis*) and Seneca (*De beneficiis*) demonstrates how Did. 13 functions as a prescriptive text on patronage in the new Christian πολιτεία.[7] The ubiquity of Roman social structures during the time of the Didache's production influenced Christian communities; thus the presence of patronage in Did. 13 is not unpredictable.[8] The surprise lies in the author's inversion of pa-

fragments or translations. All translations from the Didache are my own. N. Pardee, *The Genre and Development of the* Didache: *A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (WUNT 2/339; Tübingen, 2012), 92–93, 140, argues that Did. 13:1–7 is a cohesive unit that ends a larger section starting with Did. 11:4 on hospitality toward itinerants and how to treat itinerants who choose to settle. A. Milavec, *The* Didache: *Faith, Hope, & Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York, 2003), 41, 58–59, 426–525, separates Did. 13:1–2 and posits 13:3–7 as the cohesive conceptual unit. I follow Pardee, *Genre and Development*, 184–185, who argues based on her textual-linguistic reading of the Didache that even if 13:1–7 has undergone redaction, the entirety of Did. 13 is linked conceptually and should be taken together. While Pardee does not assign Did. 13:1–7 any particular date, she does place it in the third (and final major) stage of the Didache's redaction history in the late first or early second century (ibid., 100, 157–58 n. 64, 159, 184–90).

7 The edition of Cicero, *De officiis* is H.A. Holden's (8th ed.; Cambridge, 1899). The edition of Seneca, *De beneficiis* is the Budé edition (ed. F. Préchac; 2 vols.; Paris, 1926; repr. 2003). All translations from Cicero and Seneca are my own. Cicero, as a senator and consul during the Republic and Civil War, was intimately familiar with the patronage system. Influential patrons helped the *novus homo* Cicero to attain the highest level of the Roman *cursus honorum*, though he did not choose the most direct path to the consulship, nor did he always choose the most obvious (or important) patrons (cf. T.N. Mitchell, *Cicero: The Ascending Years* [New Haven, 1979]; id., *Cicero: The Senior Statesman* [New Haven, 1991]). Seneca was an eminent political figure in the early empire, serving for a period as an advisor to Nero. That Seneca was extremely wealthy and patronized others put him in a good position to prescribe forms of patronage, though his prescriptions on benefits may be abstracted from his own political reality (cf. M.T. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* [Oxford, 1976], 286–314; ead., *Seneca on Society: A Guide to* De Beneficiis [New York, 2013], 15–87). These prescriptions may indicate instead his view of his own wealth, his reception of imperial patronage, and his conflicts over his role in the imperial court (cf. E. Wilson, *The Greatest Empire: A Life of Seneca* [New York, 2014], 140–153).

8 I am not the first to argue that patronage is in view in Did. 13. Milavec, *Faith, Hope, & Life* (see n. 6), 176–227, views the directions on giving in the Didache as creating a new economic system cut off from and in opposition to exploitative imperial economics, such as patronage. Contrary to Milavec, the restructuring of intellectual, social, economic, or religious systems was not always in opposition to Hellenistic or Roman structures. The evidence from Late Antiquity (as demonstrated, e. g., by Kelhoffer, Winter, and Rapp; see n. 5) indicates that many Christians continued to operate within these systems, sometimes wholesale and sometimes reformed. It is not necessary to see restructuring as rejection, nor is it true to the evidence of Christian communities participating in the economic and social systems of the empire, including patronage. There is a small body of literature that examines the issues of firstfruits and prophets in Did. 13, such as: D.E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Eugene, Oreg., 2003), 208–209; M. Del Verme, Didache *and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work*

tronage's implicit social order, which he supports by incorporating Torah – in the Didache's patronage of prophets, the client supersedes the patron.[9] Privileging the prophet makes him a new source of authority for a Christian community that can no longer rely on Jewish sources of authority or the authorities from the Jesus movement. By reforming Roman patronage with Torah commandments, the author of Did. 13 grounds the Christian prophet's support in two established systems (Roman patronage and Jewish Torah), granting the Didache community a mechanism for supporting external spiritual authorities.

In outlining a new type of authority, Did. 13 inadvertently undermines the more traditional authority of bishops and deacons. Didache 15 attempts to resolve this potential conflict by reminding its readers of their obligation to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Uncovering Roman patronage in the text of Did. 13 reveals some of the conflicts over authority that occurred in the Didache community.

2 Reading Patronage in Did. 13

(Did. 13:1) Πᾶς δὲ προφήτης ἀληθινὸς, θέλων καθῆσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ. (2) ὡσαύτως διδάσκαλος ἀληθινός ἐστιν ἄξιος καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ. (3) πᾶσαν οὖν ἀπαρχὴν γεννημάτων ληνοῦ καὶ ἅλωνος, βοῶν τε καὶ προβάτων λαβὼν δώσεις τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῖς προφήταις· αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσιν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ὑμῶν. (4) ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχητε προφήτην, δότε τοῖς πτωχοῖς. (5) ἐὰν σιτίαν ποιῇς, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν λαβὼν δὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν. (6) ὡσαύτως κεράμιον οἴνου ἢ ἐλαίου ἀνοίξας, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν λαβὼν δὸς τοῖς προφήταις· (7) ἀργυρίου δὲ καὶ ἱματισμοῦ καὶ παντὸς κτήματος λαβὼν τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ὡς ἄν σοι δόξῃ, δὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν.

(New York, 2004), 189–220; J.A. Draper, "First-Fruits and the Support of Prophets, Teachers, and the Poor in *Didache* 13 in Relation to New Testament Parallels," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. A. Gregory and C. Tuckett; New York, 2006), 223–243; id., "Social Ambiguity and the Production of Text: Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, and Deacons and the Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Community of the *Didache*," in Didache *in Context* (see n. 6), 284–312; S.J. Patterson, "*Didache* 11–13: The Legacy of Radical Itinerancy in Early Christianity," ibid., 313–329. Surprisingly, only Milavec explores the patronage connection in Did. 13.

9 Winter, *Seek the Welfare* (see n. 5), 15–23, similarly approaches a passage from 1 Peter, arguing that the author of 1 Peter draws on the command in Jer 29:7 to tend to the well-being of the diaspora community's city in order to suggest that Christians in the Roman Empire should do the same. Tending to the welfare of their environment, Winter notes, would include Christian participation in patronage. Danker, *Benefactor* (see n. 3), 317–392, likewise, demonstrates that Christians shared in the collective Mediterranean consciousness of honoring patrons and encoded the language of patronage in the writings of the New Testament. Moreover, Danker ties the language of virtuous patrons to the Christian melding (from Judaism) of personal virtue with religion (ibid., 26–29).

(1) Each true prophet who wishes to settle with you is worthy of his food, (2) just as a true teacher is worthy of his food, like the worker who is worthy of his food. (3) Therefore take every firstfruit of whatever is produced from the winevat and threshing floor, and the firstfruit of cattle and sheep, and you should give the firstfruit to the prophets. For *they* are your high priests. (4) But, if you have no prophet, give them to the poor. (5) If you bake bread, take the firstfruit and give it according to the commandment. (6) In the same way, when opening a jar of wine or oil, take the firstfruit and give it to the prophets. (7) But take – as you see fit – the firstfruit of money, clothing, and all possessions, and give it according to the commandment.

The portrayal of the patronage of prophets in Did. 13 strongly resembles Cicero and Seneca's prescriptions on patronage.[10] Differences arise between the Didache and the Roman writers when the author of Did. 13 melds Torah commandments to the Roman patronage system. In its basic orientation, patronage in Roman society entailed the giving of gifts or favors from one person to another, thereby placing the recipient in a subordinate relationship to the giver and creating the necessity of reciprocity. An unequal relationship is intrinsic to the act of giving. If two parties previously had no ties but were socially unequal, the act of giving creates a relationship. If a relationship already existed between social equals, the act of giving creates disparity and inequality between the two. Wherever there is a non-commercial exchange of goods or services, we can find (as in Saller and in Eisenstadt and Roniger) the reciprocal system defined as patronage.[11]

---

[10] Some scholars differentiate between "Greek" and "Roman" patronage systems in the early Roman Empire; see the arguments, with rebuttal, outlined by C. Osiek, "The Politics of Patronage and the Politics of Kinship: The Meeting of the Ways," *BTB* 39 (2009), 144–146. Following Osiek, Kelhoffer, "Reciprocity as Salvation" (see n. 5), 433–456, and P. Millet, "Patronage and Its Avoidance in Classical Athens," in *Patronage in Ancient Society* (see n. 2), 15–47, I reject the strong distinction between the Greek East and Latin West in the Roman imperial period of the Didache's composition. Moreover, Did. 13 participates in the structure of patronage because its activities are either identical or analogous to Roman social and political patronage as found in Cicero and Seneca, the prescriptive authors on the subject.

[11] Patronage remains difficult to define, both in modernity and antiquity, and difficult to identify in a text; however, with the borders outlined by Saller, Eisenstadt, and Roniger (see n. 2), we can say that patronage exists wherever there is an exchange between unequal parties even if the inequality exists *as a result of* the good or service being given by the first party to the second party with the expectation of reciprocity. Some have argued that the reciprocal exchange between friends – at the heart of much of the literary (Cicero's *De officiis* and Seneca's *De beneficiis*) and epistolary evidence for patronage – was not "patronage" as such, but instead represented a deeper relationship (e. g., Griffin, *Seneca on Society* [see n. 7], 30–87). However, at the point at which one person needs something from another person, their dynamic shifts to one of an unequal rela-

In Cicero's *De officiis* and Seneca's *De beneficiis*, generosity towards others – the euphemism for the act of the patron toward the client in the patronage system – is both a function of virtue and a necessary part of preserving the social order and performing one's duties to Roman society. Because it is the virtuous thing to do and because it is part of what holds society together, the proper giving and receiving of benefits forms a crucial aspect of Roman life. In Cicero and Seneca, patronage is expressed in terms of the giver, gift, and recipient, and the relationship between the three.

Cicero viewed patronage, the giving the receiving of benefits, as an expression of personal integrity that derives from society's organization and preservation.[12] In other words, patronage is a fundamental part of the Roman social order, and participating in this system is a form of virtuous living. In fact, patronage is the highest form of personal virtue and should be prioritized above all other forms of personal virtue.[13] Cicero outlined three criteria for giving benefits to others:[14] (1) the benefit must be benign to both the recipient and to others; (2) the benefit must lie within the means of the giver (i. e., the patron ought not to offer more than he can responsibly give after he considers his duties first to country and parents, then to children and household, and finally to neighbors[15]); (3) the benefit should match the merit of the client (i. e., the giver should consider the morals of the recipient, the recipient's attitude toward the giver, the recipient's position in the giver's circles of acquaintances, what mutual relationships they share, and what favors the recipient may have provided the giver in the past[16]).

Moreover, Cicero wrote, the giver should consider the recipient's need.[17] Cicero also advocated giving favors over money – favors are theoretically inexhaustible – but considered both valid forms of patronage.[18]

---

tionship, regardless of their previous state. The act of giving, even between friends of equal social station, creates disparity. Moreover, as Saller asserts in response to criticisms of his definition of patronage, the lines between "friend," "patron," and "client" are not clearly defined, and a variety of friendly relationships (even using the term *amicus*) constitute patronage ("Patronage and Friendship" [see n. 2], 49–62).

12 *Off.* 1.5.15, 1.7.20, 1.14.42–18.60, 1.43.152.
13 *Off.* 1.43.152–45.160.
14 *Off.* 1.14.42.
15 *Off.* 1.17.58.
16 *Off.* 1.14.45.
17 *Off.* 1.15.49.
18 *Off.* 2.15.52–53.

Favors are also preferable since they are more easily repaid,[19] even though the recipient's ability to repay the gift should not be a consideration when giving a gift.[20]

Seneca, like Cicero, wrote that the giver should give only within his means,[21] and should consider both the character and the need of the recipient.[22] Seneca expanded on the idea of giving what is necessary, writing, "We ought to give necessary things first, then useful things, then things that delight – at any rate, things that endure."[23] The emphasis on enduring gifts owes to Seneca's preoccupation in *De beneficiis* with the ideal of proper repayment – a benefit was, for Seneca, both the gift itself (either a physical object or a favor with a physical representation) and the mental shift that takes place in the recipient as a result of the gift.[24] However much he emphasized repayment, Seneca wrote that repayment should not be expected by the giver.[25] Participation in this reciprocal exchange was, for Seneca as for Cicero, an expression of personal virtue.[26]

Roman society treated patronage as an expression of virtue with three primary concerns: the gift, the giver, and the recipient. The gift should be useful and not harmful to the recipient; the patron should not give beyond his means and should consider the worthiness of the client; the client should feel compelled to reciprocate the gift. Participating in the patronage system of the Roman Empire ensured the proper functioning and preservation of the social order. Seneca's extreme emphasis on repayment and one's proper attitude when repaying a gift likely reflects his belief that the correct ordering of society requires the correct operation of patronage.[27] These elements find expression in the rules concerning the support of prophets in Did. 13.

---

19 *Off.* 2.20.69–70.
20 *Off.* 2.15.52–53, 2.6.21.
21 *Ben.* 2.15.1.
22 *Ben.* 4.9.5, 1.2.4.
23 *Ben.* 1.11.1: *Prima demus necessaria, deinde utilia, deinde iocunda, utique mansura.*
24 *Ben.* 1.4.3, 1.5.2, 1.12.1, 2.25.3, 2.34.5.
25 *Ben.* 1.1.9, 1.10.5, 2.33.1.
26 *Ben.* 4.
27 A brief examination of a few letters of Cicero (D.R. Shackleton Bailey, LCL 205, 216, 230) and Pliny the Younger (B. Radice, LCL 55, 59) demonstrates the reality of the ideals presented in *De officiis* and *De beneficiis*. Pliny asks for votes for a client (*ep.* 2.9, 6.9; see also his complaint in 4.25 that an unknown person has filled in his ballot with the name of the candidate's patron instead of the candidate), patronizes an entire province (3.4), indicates that there is the indebtedness involved in patronage (4.15, 7.31, 10.4, 10.13), pays for a client's elevation to knighthood (1.19), and praises one who gives patronage with no thought of the debt's repayment (9.30; in this letter Pliny gradates giving in a

Rules and suggestions concerning prophets, both genuine and false, appear throughout the Didache, and the rules in Did. 13 parallel the prescriptions on patronage detailed by Cicero and Seneca.[28] The Didache's first mention of prophets appears at the end of two sections on the Eucharist, when Did. 10:7 exempts prophets from the rules regarding the Eucharistic celebration. Didache 11:7–12 considers the reception of true and false prophets. Apart from their behavior and doctrine – always the test for a true or false prophet according to Did. 11:8–10 – false prophets reveal themselves by their requests. If a prophet asks for money[29] or orders a meal "in the spirit"[30] and then proceeds to eat it, that person is a false prophet. Given that Did. 11:1–6 (on traveling teachers and apostles) and 12:1–2 (on traveling Christians) frame the rules for prophets in 11:7–12, it is likely that the prophets under consideration there are itinerant. The rules in Did. 11 and 12 on traveling leaders and Christians, including prophets, demonstrate a willingness on the part of the Didache to support apparent members of the broader Christian movement until they either continue traveling or decide to remain with the community.

Whereas Did. 12 asserts that Christians who move to another location must find a way to support themselves, Did. 13 establishes a system of rules for allowing prophets to remain with the community, adopting a system of patronage. Didache 13:3 prescribes giving the firstfruits of recently harvested and slaughtered foodstuffs to the prophets, while Did. 13:5–7 expands this to include prepared foods, clothes, money, and all other possessions. The local prophet of Did. 13 receives anything that will ensure the maintenance of his prophetic lifestyle – food, clothes, money – for as long as he lives with the community.

---

manner similar to Cicero: first to country, then those close to him, then those bound to him, then friends). Cicero's letters contain an entire grouping that outlines the reciprocal exchange of favors and debts between Cicero, his clients, and his friends (*Fam.* 13.1–79). When Cicero requests something on another person's behalf, he highlights the individual's moral worth as a client. Cicero also frequently writes that granting a favor to a third party at Cicero's behest puts both the recipient and Cicero in the grantor's debt.

28 Aune's *Prophecy in Early Christianity* (see n. 8) is an excellent treatment of the development, role, and work of prophets in Late Antiquity. Aune notes that the categories "prophet" and "prophecy" are difficult to define in late antique Christianity (ibid., 231). It is sufficient that the individuals and communities involved in the production and consumption of the Didache knew what they meant by "prophet," such that they could legislate for the prophet's patronage.

29 Did. 11:12.

30 Did. 11:9: ἐν πνεύματι.

Patronage in both the Didache and Roman society involves a reciprocal exchange, though the repayment is not always identical to the patronage provided. While the patron in Did. 13 provided the prophet with goods or money, the prophet provided the patron and the community with a variety of intangible items: access to the divine, enhanced communal status, perhaps even esoteric knowledge. Likewise, in Roman patronage, the client might provide intangible services to the patron, such as the enhancement of the patron's station or the honor of underwriting an artistic production. The relationship was reciprocal, with the prophet providing the patron with a variety of services or intangible goods in exchange for material sustenance.[31] The reciprocal relationship that represents the client's concern is implied by the context of Did. 13. Didache 12:3–4 explains that it is necessary for a Christian visitor who wishes to remain with the community to find work, either to provide for his or her own sustenance or to prevent the individual from falling into the sin and vice of idleness. Since Did. 12:4–5 condemns idleness for the non-prophetic Christian, it must also be condemned for the prophet. Thus, the prophet must provide something to the patron or community as a function of his prophetic position. The reciprocal exchange of goods and services between patron and prophet is necessary to prevent idleness, though (as is often the case in Cicero and Seneca) the gift returned does not match exactly the gift given.

---

31 Literary patronage is perhaps analogous to the relationship between prophet and patron in Did. 13. The patron provided the client with the means necessary to produce or present his literary products (e.g., money, protection, social standing), and the client produced literature that praised the patron to those who heard, read, or saw performed the literary product. The benefits were of a very different kind – the client generally received material goods (e.g., money, housing) or services (e.g., support for reading or performance), and the patron received an immaterial benefit of prestige, public acclaim, or literarily secured immortality; see esp. B.K. Gold, *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1987); P. White, *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993); and P.L. Bowditch, *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage* (Classics and Contemporary Thought 7; Berkeley, 2001). Likewise, the prophet receives material support in exchange for providing his patron with something immaterial (Georg Schöllgen, reading the Didache as an institutional rule, acknowledges that the contribution of the prophet to the community is unmentioned in the text and lost to history: "The *Didache* as Church Order: An Examination of the Purpose for the Composition of the *Didache* and Its Consequences for Interpretation," in *The* Didache *in Modern Research* [ed. J.A. Draper; AGJU 37; New York, 1996], 43–71, here 59). I am not convinced by Gold's contention that literary patronage differed substantially from other forms of patronage, based largely on her perception of "public" and "private" relationships (*Literary Patronage*, 39–40). Saller, *Personal Patronage* (see n. 2), 41–78, includes relationships that operated primarily in the public sphere, especially those that feature the emperor as patron.

As in Cicero and Seneca, the gifts given to the prophet are useful – indeed, it is only items used for the maintenance of daily life that the patron gives to the client-prophet (wine, grain, meat, bread, oil; also money, clothing, and possessions as the patron deems proper). The caveat given to money, clothing, and possessions (that these are given according to what the patron considers right) may reflect both Cicero's concern that the gift should do no harm and Seneca's hierarchy of giving the necessary, then the useful, then the delightful. Food is necessary and reasonably harmless. Money, clothing, and possessions are useful or delightful, but could cause vice if given in too great of quantities or without considering the actual need of the prophet.

In both Roman and Did. 13 patronage, the giver also must consider the worthiness of his potential client. However, Did. 13 expresses this worthiness not in Roman social terms (as in Cicero and Seneca), but in terms of the client's adherence to the common beliefs of the community. The test for a prophet's suitability for patronage is not one of social relations (family, friend, or acquaintance) or of hierarchy in the social setting, but of the orthodoxy of his teachings and rightness of his conduct.[32] Thus, the prophet receiving patronage could be a complete stranger in personal terms, but he merits patronage by virtue of his prophetic position and orthodox conduct and teachings.[33] A test of orthodoxy, like the character of a Roman client (in Seneca) or his worthiness based on social station (in Cicero), forms the analogously careful consideration in the Christian system.

Thus, the commandments regarding patronage in Did. 13 reflect the three concerns (gift, giver, recipient) found in Cicero and Seneca, as well as their emphasis on patronage as an expression of virtue and social order. Virtue, as Christianized in Did. 13, means adherence to the commandment referenced in Did. 13:5, 7. That patronizing prophets maintains the community's social order is demonstrated by the fact that patronage is *owed* (ἄξιός ἐστι) to the "true prophet" (προφήτης ἀληθινός) of Did. 13:1 because he wishes to remain with the society, with "society" defined as the community adhering to the Didache's precepts. The Didache expresses the giving of patronage as something owed to the prophet who wishes to remain, implying that this system is how the Didache commu-

---

32 Did. 11:7–12.

33 Roman clients could also be unknown to their potential patrons, receiving introduction from a mutual friend (cf. Saller, *Personal Patronage* [see n. 2], 24–25). However, giving and receiving goods and services creates intimate relationships where none existed previously, relationships that carry with them duties and requirements for support and repayment (cf. M. Griffin, "*De Beneficiis* and Roman Society," *JRS* 93 [2003], 97–113).

nity must operate. Even the very language of Did. 13 implies patronage – by using κάθημαι in 13:1, the author prescribes that the prophet "settles" or "sits" with the community and "is worthy of his food" (ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ).

Despite these many similarities, Did. 13 diverges from Roman patronage in its subordinate relationship of patron to client, and in prescribing patronage regardless of the financial and social considerations outlined by Cicero and Seneca. Both of these differences stem from Did. 13's analogy between the prophet and the Torah priest. The Roman patron-client relationship accorded more power to the patron, whereas the Didache's system places the client (the prophet) above the patron (the one supporting the prophet) with the command to give the best of all goods to the prophet. The prophet assumes an honored position, even though he serves as the client in this relationship. Because of this inversion of the social dynamic of patronage, Did. 13's author does not limit the patron to giving only within his means, as Cicero and Seneca both advocate. Indeed, with the command to give the first portion to the prophet, the primary Christian consideration when examining one's wealth should be how to give first to the prophet. The command to give the first portion κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν[34] and comparing the prophets to high priests[35] invite the patron to consider Torah commandments that modify the social dynamic of patronage by placing the client-prophet above the patron in preference of provision.

3 Reforming Did. 13's Patronage with Torah

The adjustment of the Roman patronage system in Did. 13 relies on the introduction of a new element: the Jewish commandments. By identifying the prophet with the high priests, and by prescribing the firstfruit gift κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, Did. 13 induces the reader to remember the Torah commandments regarding the support of priests and Levites.[36] The firstfruits

---

34 Did. 13:5, 7.

35 Did. 13:3: αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσιν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ὑμῶν.

36 The location of the "commandment" is disputed. The appeal to authority κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν in Did. 13:5, 7 may refer to a logion of Jesus in Did. 13:1, here as ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ; see, e.g., K. Niederwimmer, "An Examination of the Development of Itinerant Radicalism in the Environment and Tradition of the *Didache*," in Didache *in Modern Research* (see n. 31), 321–339, here 336; the logion is part of the Q tradition and found in Matt 10:10; Luke 10:7; and Dial. Sav. 53 from Nag Hammadi; for a consideration of the varied meanings of this logion in the early Christian tradition, see A.E. Harvey, "'The Workman Is Worthy of His Hire': Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early

offering is prescribed in Exod 22:29–30, expanded in Num 18:12–20, given specific rubrics in Lev 23:9–14, and summarized in Deut 18:4–5. Rules regarding firstfruits comprise part of the general rules for supporting the priests and Levites – a portion of what was offered on the altar was reserved for the consumption of the priests, and priests and Levites received a yearly portion of all agricultural profits.[37] Although some scholars dispute the nature of "firstfruits" in Did. 13,[38] understanding Did. 13 as an inversion of the social hierarchy of Roman patronage helps explain how the passage's author viewed and used the Torah precepts on firstfruits and tithes.[39]

By placing the prophets in an analogous position to the high priests, the author of the Didache impresses upon his readers the importance of a prophet's place in the Christian community – prophets stand as a link between the people and the divine. High priests in the Torah managed the tabernacle and directed temple worship, and it was the high priest who yearly interceded with God on behalf of the people in the innermost sanc-

---

Church," *NovT* 24 (1982), 209–221. It could also refer to the rules of Torah regarding firstfruits (cf. Milavec, *Faith, Hope, & Life* [see n. 6], 494–498). Another possibility is that the reader is intended to understand what s/he wishes from κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, with the Jewish-Christian reader seeing Torah and the gentile-Christian reader seeing the logion (cf. Del Verme, Didache *and Judaism* [see n. 8], 192; Del Verme, though, emphasizes the Torah connection). Given the references to firstfruits and priests in Did. 13, I agree with Milavec and Del Verme that the commandment invites the reader to remember Torah.

37 E.g., Lev 2:3, 10; 6:15–18, 26, 29; 7:6–36; Num 18:8–32; Deut 18:1–8.

38 Milavec, *Faith, Hope, & Life* (see n. 6), 494–508, argues that the firstfruits offerings were distinct from the tithe offerings in the Second Temple period, and that only a token offering is intended in Did. 13; Milavec does not want the prophets supported beyond subsistence. However, Aune, *Prophecy* (see n. 8), 208–209; Del Verme, Didache *and Judaism* (see n. 8), 190–198; and H. van de Sandt and D. Flusser, *The* Didache: *Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (CRINT 3/5; Minneapolis, 2002), 360–364, link the tithe offering and firstfruit offering in the Didache, and demonstrate how they have expanded to include non-agricultural and commercial products. Draper, "First-Fruits" (see n. 8), argues that the firstfruits in the Didache gave gentile-Christians a way to mirror Jewish-Christian practices of sending firstfruits offerings to the temple in Jerusalem.

39 The divergences from Torah in Did. 13 support the contention that it relies on both Roman patronage and Torah commandments. Whereas firstfruits in Torah were the products of agricultural or livestock production, Did. 13:5–7 expands giving firstfruits to already prepared foods (bread, bottled wine just opened, and bottled oil just opened in Did. 13:5–6) and to non-foodstuffs (money, clothes, and all other things in Did. 13:7). All of these items were what patrons provided for their lowest-classed clients, not what Torah commanded for support of the priests. Whereas the priests and Levites took both food and skins from the sacrifices for their support, these were not necessarily part of the firstfruits offering.

tuary on Yom Kippur.[40] The Christian prophet likewise serves as a connection between his society and the divine.

The Christian prophet's connection with the divine explains why the Didache inverts the Roman patronage system with the application of Torah precepts. A client-prophet provides, through his connection to God, something greater than the Christian patron can offer for the maintenance of the prophetic life. Because the client's repayment dwarfs the patron's gift, Christianity inverts the social hierarchy of patronage. As a result, the rules in Did. 13 prioritize the client over the patron or the patron's family, further undermining the Roman ideal found in Cicero and Seneca. Moreover, the connection to the firstfruits gift recalls the harvest festival in Torah, during which Israelites presented the perfect portion of the first part of the harvest to the priests for sacrifice.[41] This presentation instantiated the precept that all sacrificial offerings should be perfect.[42]

The commandment in Torah to sacrifice, then, translates into the giving of an inverted patronage: as sacrifices were perfect in Torah, so also should the gifts of patronage to prophets be perfect. The priests derived their sustenance from the sacrificial offerings presented by the Jewish people. In like fashion, the author of Did. 13 commands that the prophets, as analogous to the priests, receive the same treatment.[43] The use of firstfruits is neither a token gift to subsisting itinerants[44] nor a halakhic maneuver around gentiles giving possibly tainted offerings to God,[45] because the passage induces the patron to remember the perfect gifts given to priests for the maintenance of their religious life.[46] The firstfruits of Did. 13 reveal how prophets survived on a patronage that inverted the Roman social norms by appealing to Torah.

As a consequence of inverting the Roman social hierarchy, the Didache also redraws the political landscape of the patronage system. Cicero's argument for withholding patronage beyond one's means is that it does in-

---

40 Lev 16.

41 Lev 23:9–14.

42 E.g., Lev 1:3, 10; 2:1, 4–7; 3:1, 6; 4:3.

43 As prophets received their clothing from Christian patrons, Lev 7:8 allows the priests to take the skins from the sacrifices for their own use. Such skins could be traded or used, and provided for the priests beyond just their daily food. The Didache is not alone in drawing analogies between Jewish and Christian leaders – a letter, supposedly from the emperor Hadrian, identifies parallels between the leaders of Jewish and Christian communities (cf. Brooten, *Women Leaders* [see n. 5], 23).

44 As Milavec, *Faith, Hope, & Life* (see n. 6), 494–508.

45 As Draper, "First-Fruits" (see n. 8).

46 As Aune, *Prophecy* (see n. 8), 208–209; Del Verme, Didache *and Judaism* (see n. 8), 190–198; and van de Sandt and Flusser, Didache (see n. 38), 360–364.

justice to those for whom prior duty is due, namely, the patron's own family. The patronage system in Did. 13 upends this hierarchy of duties. Instead of first considering the inheritance that the patron owes his children or what should be fed to his family and household, the Christian patron gives first to the prophet. The author of Did. 13 does not question the concept of duties, but his prioritization of duty-requiring institutions diverges from the traditional Roman prioritization. The first duty of a Roman was to his country, according to Cicero. In Did. 13's reformation of patronage, duty to one's country and countrymen is replaced by duty to the new body politic – the Christian community broadly construed. Therefore, the duty to patronize prophets takes precedence over the consideration of inheritance or household.

4 Who Were the Patrons?

Who were these inverted patrons of prophets in Did. 13? There is no evidence from antiquity that a community patronized individuals (the opposite, however, occurred frequently). Since we understand the Didache as a composite community rule, two possibilities exist: prophets were patronized by individuals within the community (following the usual order of patronage), or prophets were patronized by the entire community (an innovation in patronage). The text may identify the patrons by revealing a communal problem in Did. 15:1–2, which instructs the community not to disregard the leadership of bishops and deacons, identified by Draper as the community's existing wealthy patrons, who were threatened by the newly arrived prophets.[47] Apparently bishops and deacons had fallen in the esteem of the community, which needed reminding that these leaders shared in the ministry of prophets and teachers,[48] and were, like prophets and teachers, worthy of honor.[49] It appears that the community, in honoring the prophets, failed to honor fully its original leadership, the bishops and deacons. Perhaps because the community's leaders served as the prophets' patrons, the new inversion of patronage's social hierarchy grant-

---

47 Draper, "Social Ambiguity" (see n. 8), 291–294. Pardee, *Genre and Development* (see n. 6), 185, dates Did. 15:1–2 to the same redactional stage as Did. 13, a stage in which community issues require codified solutions, though she also cites an early iteration of Milavec's work to argue that Did. 15:1–2 may be later than this third redactional stage and represent a further layer of issues in the community.

48 Did. 15:1.

49 Did. 15:2.

ed more honor to the prophets, thereby undermining the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the eyes of the community. The previously honored bishop, when becoming patron to a prophet, places himself in a socially subordinate position by remembering the Torah precepts and putting the needs of the prophet before all else.

Understanding Did. 13 as a melding of Roman patronage and Torah solves Draper's problem of the "ambiguous position" of the community's bishops in the face of the patronized prophets.[50] The complicated power dynamics between prophets and their patrons does not necessarily mean that prophets were the new source of leadership for the communities.[51] However, the honor ascribed to the prophet-clients by the inverted social dynamic of Did. 13 clearly presented the community with a problematic relationship between patron and client. While the application of Torah precepts inverts the social dynamics of Roman patronage, it does not invert the basic reciprocal relationship – one side gives to another side and receives something in return. Should the patron decide to withdraw benefaction from the prophet, then the prophet has no recourse because he has neither inherent power nor ascribed authority within the community. The prophet's circumscribed authority was charismatic, granting him some privilege without necessarily giving him leadership. Moreover, the community policed the teachings of the prophet, demonstrating that while Did. 13 inverts some of the dynamics of patronage, the prophet still performs a function in the community that is subject to oversight. The prophet is not necessarily a leader, but is necessarily a client of both the divine and his patron.

---

50 Draper, "Social Ambiguity" (see n. 8), 292. Draper elsewhere argues that the differences between the rules concerning prophets in Did. 11 (itinerant) and 13 (located) are explained if the author of Did. 13 wrote "at a time when prophets have obtained an increased importance in the community" ("Apostles, Teachers, and Evangelists: Stability and Movement of Functionaries in Matthew, James, and the *Didache*," in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Setting* [ed. J.K. Zangenberg and H.W.M. van de Sandt; Atlanta, 2008], 139–176, here 161). Pardee, *Genre and Development* (see n. 6), 92–93, 133–140, 156–186, argues that Did. 11:4–13:7 are from a thematically consistent literary unit from the same redactional period. Pardee also provides a plausible historical setting (questions over authority in the community) that unites Did. 11 and 13 (ibid., 185, 189–90). In either case, Draper's basic point remains valid – prophets and the local leaders of the Didache community found themselves at odds, which I argue is because of the inverted social order of patronage.
51 A viewpoint argued by D. Horrell, "Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity," *Sociology of Religion* 58 (1997), 327–328.

Although Did. 13 does not prescribe leadership roles for prophets, it inadvertently removes honor from the patrons, who were the established leaders of the community. The community, then, needs to be reminded in Did. 15 that these bishops and deacons are as honorable as the prophets whom they patronize. Moreover, bishops, deacons, prophets, and teachers all form part of the same ministry and service in the community, and all deserve the same honor. By inverting the social dynamic of Roman patronage with the application of Torah precepts, Did. 13 creates a situation in which the community needs to be reminded of the honor it owes to its established leaders – and of the authority that these leaders hold.

5 Conclusion

If we take Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's argument that patronage functioned "to provide a connection between the centre of power and the peripheries which the centre sought to control,"[52] then the inversion of the social dynamic becomes even more striking in Did. 13. Patronage of prophets serves to relocate power and authority in the prophet from its origin in the patron, possibly a bishop or deacon. The admonitions to honor bishops and deacons in Did. 15:1–2, then, represent a complete collapse of the power dynamic that Roman patronage instilled in society, a collapse brought about by the application of Torah and the inversion of the social hierarchy.

Didache 13 reflects its community's reassessment of authority. The support of authority figures preoccupied writers in even the earliest period of Christian development, as evidenced by Paul's defense of his support for himself.[53] Christians eventually hold bishops – mainly from wealthy backgrounds, thus able to support themselves and their bishoprics – as their primary authorities.[54] The synthesis of Jewish (priesthood) and Roman (patronage) models in Did. 13 represents a unique development along this trajectory of authority, a development that suggests the pressures of a community trying to locate the source of its legitimacy in the face of a changing social and political landscape. The new Christian πολιτεία inverts the Roman social order and supersedes (at least in the mind of the Didache's redactor) the Jewish religious hierarchy. Didache 13 demon-

---

52 Wallace-Hadrill, "Patronage in Roman Society" (see n. 4), 85.
53 1 Cor 9:1–18; 2 Cor 11:7–11; 12:13–15.
54 Rapp, *Holy Bishops* (see n. 5), 172–234.

strates the syncretic capability of early Christianity to hybridize a Roman social fixture with Jewish firstfruits commandments to create a new Christian patronage of prophets. Client-prophet replaces priest and patron as one stage in the evolving landscape of Christian authority.

Early Christian communities worked to locate sources of authority and legitimacy. Admitting gentiles into Christian communities – coupled with the destruction of the Jewish temple – necessitated an early reassessment of authority in Christian communities. Christianity here reconsidered its links to Judaism and ultimately found itself as the heir to Jewish tradition.[55] But Christians needed leaders separate from the leaders of Judaism, and it found them in the apostles (among other first-generation Christians) who knew the earliest Jesus movement. As these leaders died in the late first and early second centuries, Christians again had to reassess their sources of authority. Because Christianity required a link to the past, it established the texts of the apostles and early followers of the Jesus movement as the location of authority, and further established rules for understanding who could interpret these texts. Here the Gospel accounts develop that tie Jesus to Jewish antiquity through fulfilled prophecy (Matthew, in particular), the Pastoral Epistles are written with their rules for determining authority in Christian communities (authorities that are appropriate for interpreting the texts), and 2 Pet 3:15–16 links the authority of the early apostles to the texts written by them or in their names. Didache 13 likely slots into this period as well.

The author of Did. 13, in trying to establish rules for supporting spiritual leaders who originate outside the community, reaches into the Jewish past and analogizes the prophets to priests in order to establish their legitimacy in the Christian community. Likening prophets to priests may also have dampened potential criticisms of the relative newness of Christianity. In establishing support for these prophets, the author of Did. 13 finds in the Roman patronage system readily appropriable structures. Blending Torah and the Roman system creates the unique Christian patronage of prophets found in the Didache, fulfilling Christianity's need to develop new authority figures and textual interpreters. Eventually, the prophets supplant the existing leadership (bishops and deacons) in the eyes of the Didache community, and the community needs to be reminded of the leaders' honor and ministry among them.

---

55 Indeed, as L.H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, 1993), 196–200, notes, Christianity needed to maintain certain links to Judaism in order to fend off attacks that Christianity was inferior because it had no link to the past.

The Christian client-prophet in the Didache receives his patronage in a fashion similar to the high priests in Torah: as the best was given to the sacrifice (and, in turn, consumed by the priests), so the best is given to the prophet. While appropriating the Roman patronage system, Did. 13 reforms it by melding it with the ancient Jewish laws regarding sacrifices, thereby creating a Christian patronage of prophets. Didache 13 demonstrates that Christianity's roots in Judaism were a driving force in early Christian reformations of Greco-Roman culture. By appropriating and melding both patronage and priestly systems, Christianity created a new hybrid commandment for the patronage of the Christian priestly client-prophet.

Zachary B. Smith
Creighton University
Department of Theology
2500 California Plaza
Omaha, NE 68178
USA
zacharybsmith@creighton.edu

George M. Hollenback

An Overlooked Backdrop to the Coining of ἀρσενοκοίτης

Der Artikel untersucht die umstrittene Bedeutung des Wortes ἀρσενοκοίτης in 1 Kor 6,9 und 1 Tim 1,10 durch Analyse und Vergleich mit dem ähnlichen Ausdruck ἀνδρο-κοιτέω, der älter ist und in Rechtsverträgen im römischen Ägypten Verwendung findet.

Many authorities believe that the word ἀρσενοκοίτης, which occurs in the vice lists of 1 Cor 6:9–10 and 1 Tim 1:9–11, may have been coined by Paul himself or earlier by some other Hellenized Jew based on the occurrence of the constituent parts of the word – ἀρσενο- ("male") and κοίτη ("a lying down") – in the Levitical prohibitions of male-on-male sex in the Septuagint:[1]

καὶ μετὰ ἄρσενος οὐ κοιμηθήσῃ κοίτην γυναικός· βδέλυγμα γάρ ἐστιν.
And with a male you shall not lie down a lying down of a woman; for it is an abomination. (Lev 18:22)

καί ὃς ἂν κοιμηθῇ μετὰ ἄρσενος κοίτην γυναικός, βδέλυγμα ἐποίησαν ἀμφότεροι· θανατούσθωσαν, ἔνοχοί εἰσιν.
And if a male lies down with a male a lying down of a woman, they have both done an abomination. Let them be put to death; they are guilty. (Lev 20:13)

In addition to its literal meaning of "bed," κοίτη may also mean the act of going to bed, sleeping, or lying down, sometimes with a sexual connotation. Thus an ἀρσενοκοίτης would be a male who goes to bed with a male,

---

[1] For discussion of the Hebrew on which the fairly literal Septuagint translation is based, see S. Olyan, "'And with a Male You Shall Not Lie the Lying Down of a Woman': On the Meaning and Significance of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5.2 (1994), 179–206, and J.T. Walsh, "Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13: Who is Doing What to Whom?" *JBL* 120.2 (2001), 201–209.

sleeps with a male, or lies down with a male, the connotation being that of a male who has sex with another male.

Although the meaning of the word would appear to be fairly straightforward and to fit the contexts of the cited New Testament passages, that meaning has been challenged. According to John Boswell, for example, the ἀρσενο- prefix doesn't represent the object of what the word describes but rather the subject: An ἀρσενοκοίτης isn't someone who has sex with a male but rather a male who has sex with someone else, an "active male prostitute" who services both female and passive male clientele.[2] Taking another approach, Dale B. Martin maintains that any definition of ἀρσενοκοίτης that derives its meaning from its components is "naïve and indefensible" and that no one really knows what the word actually meant. Because it occurs in some vice lists purportedly dealing with sins of economic exploitation apart from specifically sexual sins, Martin concludes that it may have had something to do with some sort of economic exploitation by means of sex.[3]

This short paper calls attention to another word and its usage which very likely could have served as the backdrop for the coining of ἀρσενοκοίτης. The lexical form of the word is ἀνδροκοιτέω ("sleep with a man," LSJ), a combination of ἀνδρο- ("man") and the κοιτ- stem suffixed with a verbal ending. The word is well attested in wet nursing contracts from the first century BCE into the second century CE in which a household taking in an abandoned infant to raise as a slave contracts with a wet nurse or leases a lactating female slave from another household to nurse the infant. Conditions in most of these contracts specify that the wet nurse is not to sleep with a man or become pregnant during the term of the contract, the context here leaving no doubt that sleeping with a man means having sex with a man. Of the dozen extant contracts employing some form of the

---

2 J. Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (Chicago, 1980), 344; for a critique of this view, see D.F. Wright, "Homosexuals or Prostitutes? The Meaning of ἀρσενοκοῖται (1 Cor. 6:9, 1 Tim. 1:10)," *VC* 38.2 (1984), 125–153. While essentially agreeing with Wright's critique of Boswell, W.L. Peterson, "Can ἀρσενοκοῖται Be Translated by 'Homosexuals'? (1 Cor. 6.9; 1 Tim. 1.10)," *VC* 40.2 (1986), 187–191, takes issue with translating ἀρσενοκοῖται as "homosexuals."

3 D.B. Martin, "Arsenokoitês and Malakos: Meanings and Consequences," in *Biblical Ethics and Homosexuality: Listening to Scripture* (ed. R.L. Brawley; Louisville, Ky., 1996), 117–136, here 119–120; for a critique of this view, see G.R. Jepsen, "Dale Martin's 'Arsenokoitēs and Malakos' Tried and Found Wanting," *CurTM* 33 (2006), 397–405.

word, eight were dated well before the first known appearance of ἀρσενο-κοίτης in 1 Cor 6:9.[4]

The most common contractual formula employs the participial form of ἀνδροκοιτέω, six of those usages dated before 1 Corinthians, two after:[5]

μήδ᾽ ἀνδροκοιτοῦσαν μήδ᾽ ἐπικοῦσαν μήδ᾽ ἕτερον παραθηλάζουσαν παιδίον
and not having sex with a man, and not becoming pregnant, and not nursing another child.

Two contracts, both dated before 1 Corinthians, employ the infinitive:[6]

καὶ οὐκ ἐξέσται […] ἀνδροκοιτεῖν οὐδὲ οὐδὲν δυσένθετον προσφέειν
and it will not be allowed […] to have sex with a man or to take any additional child

καὶ μὴ ἀνδροκοιτεῖν […] μήδ᾽ ἐπικυεῖν μηδὲ ἕτερον σωμάτιον παραθηλάζειν
and not to have sex with a man and not to become pregnant and not to nurse another child

The last two contracts, both dated after 1 Corinthians, employ the finite form of the verb:[7]

καὶ οὐκ ἀνδροκοιτήσει […] οὐδ᾽ ἄλλο παιδίον συγγαλακτοτροφήσει
and she will not have sex with a man […] and she will not nurse another child

---

4 Contracts are from M. Masciadri and O. Montevecchi (eds.), *I contratti di baliatico* (Corpora Papyrorum Graecarum 1; Milan, 1984), also accessible online in the Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri. Excerpts are referenced as *C.Pap.Gr.* 1 followed by document number, line number, page number, date, and parenthetical notation of any known English translation. Other sources consulted on the subject of wet nurse contracts include K.R. Bradley, "Sexual Regulations in Wet-Nursing Contracts from Roman Egypt," *Klio* 62.2 (1980), 321–325, and A. Aly, "The Wet Nurse: A Study in Ancient Medicine and Greek Papyri," *Vesalius* 2.2 (1996), 86–97.

5 *C.Pap.Gr.* 1.4.30–31 (p. 58), 13 BCE (J. Rowlandson [ed.], *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt: A Sourcebook* [Cambridge, 1998], 275); 5.29–31 (p. 62), 13 BCE (M.R. Lefkowitz and M.B. Fant [eds.], *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook in Translation* [3rd ed.: Baltimore, 2005], 270); 6.13–14 (p. 66), 13 BCE (Lefkowitz and Fant, *Women's Life*, 271); 9.14–15 (p. 81), 5 BCE; 10.18–19 (p. 87), 5 BCE; 13.18–19 (p. 95), 30 BCE–14 CE; 22.22–23 (p. 125), 70 CE; and 26.26–27 (p. 135), 111 CE (commentary on Greek text in G.A. Petropoulos, "A[n] Unpublished Greek Papyrus of the Athens Collection," *Aeg* 13.3/4 [1933], 563–568). There are slight variations in the formula: ἄλλο may take the place of ἕτερον; παιδίον may precede rather than follow παραθηλάζουσαν; and μήδ᾽ ἐπικοῦσαν may be omitted altogether (perhaps considered superfluous since becoming pregnant would be the result of already having violated the terms of the contract by having sex with a man).

6 *C.Pap.Gr.* 1.30.74 (p. 145), 140 CE; 31.316–317 (pp. 148–149), 140 CE.

7 *C.Pap.Gr.* 1.7.56–57 (p. 70), 8 BCE (S.M.E. van Lith, "Lease of Sheep and Goats/Nursing Contract with Accompanying Receipt," *ZPE* 14 [1974], 145–162, here 152); 14.18–19 (p. 98), 26 CE.

The significance of these usages is that they indisputably show that the ἀνδρο- portion of these ἀνδροκοιτ- stem words is the *object* of their meaning and the κοιτ- portion is a description of the activity of the *subject* of the word – the wet nurse is not to *have sex* (κοιτ-) *with a man* (ἀνδρο-). The meaning of the words as indicating sexual congress between two parties is straightforward and unambiguous.

The use of the participial form of the ἀνδροκοιτ- stem with a feminine ending would have suggested to Greek speakers of the time the potentiality of a participial form with a masculine ending as well that would describe a male having sex with a man; it would have also suggested the potentiality of the coinage of noun forms that would have the meaning of a female who has sex with a man or a male who has sex with a man. The question then arises as to why Paul or whoever it was who coined ἀρσενοκοίτης simply didn't suffix the ἀνδροκοιτ- stem with the first declension masculine -ης ending to get ἀνδροκοίτης if it was an available option to describe male-on-male sex. Although ἀνδροκοίτης seems straightforward enough, ἀνδρο- can also have the meaning of "husband," and some of the wet nursing contracts actually mention the wet nurse's husband by name. These spousal, conjugal connotations of ἀνδροκοιτ-, along with its usage in the specialized context of wet nurse contracts, perhaps made it a less suitable choice where a more generic connotation of maleness was called for, especially in the context of male-on-male sex.[8]

The appropriate nuance could have been achieved by substituting ἀρσενο- ("male") for ἀνδρο- ("man") and suffixing the κοιτ- stem with the -ης ending to give ἀρσενοκοίτης, which on the analogy of the ἀνδροκοιτ- stem words could have no other meaning than *a male who has sex with a male.* The point is driven home all the more forcefully by the occurrence of the words ἄρσενος and κοίτην in conjunction with one another in the Levitical prohibitions against male-on-male sex.

In conclusion, there is a well-attested usage of words based on the ἀνδροκοιτ- stem, their meaning clearly and unambiguously indicating

---

8 Only centuries later does the word turn up describing male-on-male sex, the plural ἀνδροκοῖται appearing in John Malalas 18.18 where severe penalties are meted out to those engaging in the practice (J. Thurn [ed.], *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* [CFHB 35; Berlin, 2000]). Commenting on the terminology in this passage, S.D. Smith, "Agathias and Paul the Silentiary: Erotic Epigram and the Sublimation of Same-Sex Desire in the Age of Justinian," in *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World* (ed. M. Masterson et al.; London, 2015), 500–516, here 502, states that ἀνδροκοιτέω refers to men sleeping with adult men, παιδεραστεύω to men having desire for boys, and ἀρσενοκοιτέω to "sexual activity between males, regardless of age or sexual role."

that the party described by the word is having sex with a man. After the establishment of the use of these ἀνδροκοιτ- stem words, someone looking for a more generic word to describe a male who has sex with another male – and well acquainted with the vocabulary of the Levitical prohibitions in the Septuagint – could have simply substituted ἀρσεν- for ἀνδρο- and coined the noun ἀρσενοκοίτης.

George M. Hollenback
5401 Rampart St.
Houston, TX 77081
USA
gmh616@yahoo.com

Peter J. Williams

The Greek New Testament, Produced at Tyndale House

Since 2007, scholars at Tyndale House in Cambridge, UK, have been preparing a new edition of the Greek New Testament. This edition presents a new eclectic text which has been produced by a thorough revision of the edition of Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, one of the most significant nineteenth-century editions to have no directly descendent editions in the twentieth century.

The edition has been led by Dirk Jongkind as Editor, with Peter J. Williams as Associate Editor and Peter M. Head and Patrick James as Assistant Editors. Head played a particular role in the conception of the edition and in the decisions on the Pauline Corpus while James undertook with Williams a major review of the spelling of the New Testament. Jongkind has done the majority of the work, with all editorial decisions reviewed by Williams. We also enlisted more than two dozen scholars to be involved in the project as a whole in research and peer review.

The overall conception of the edition has been to combine eclecticism with a radical documentary approach, defined as allowing the Greek documents themselves to play as significant a role as possible in the guiding of an eclectic edition. The attempt to develop such an approach has resulted in the following editorial choices:

(1) Using as a base text for revision the edition of Tregelles which of all the nineteenth-century editions placed the greatest weight on proven antiquity in deciding between variant readings.

(2) Seeking to decide between variant readings as far as possible on the basis of scribal habit, preferring explanations which appeal to documented scribal processes wherever possible.

(3) Insisting that any printed reading should be attested in more than one Greek witness, to ensure that scribal aberrations are not treated as *lectiones* (what was likely to have been read) and that readers can have confidence in a certain minimal level of attestation across the entire edition.

(4) Using Greek manuscript witnesses exclusively, while acknowledging great historical interest in both the ancient versions and patristic citations. After concluding our editorial work, while we maintain that versional and patristic citations add valuable geographical specificity to our knowledge of transmission history, we still cannot think of any case where their witness would actually have changed our textual decision.

(5) Placing the Catholic Epistles after Acts and before the Pauline Corpus.

(6) Presenting only paragraph marks which are found in witnesses of the fifth century and earlier. Outside the Apocalypse we in fact only accept paragraph marks attested by two such witnesses.

(7) Presenting forms of spelling which have never previously been adopted in print.

(8) Rejecting the equation between the Hebrew letter aleph and a smooth breathing in Greek and the Hebrew letters he, heth and ayin and a rough breathing.

(9) Reviewing all accents against the manuscript tradition and making significant revisions, especially in the area of enclitics.

(10) Assimilating somewhat the appearance of the printed page to that of a manuscript, using *ekthesis* for paragraph marks, limiting punctuation and eliminating critical signs from the main text.

The editors believe that the main significance of the edition is its text, not its apparatus. The apparatus is limited both as to the number of variants considered and the range of witnesses cited. Nevertheless, for the variants covered it seeks to provide consistent positive citation of all extensive papyri and majuscules, as well as of one of the earliest and one of the later minuscule pandects: 1424 and 69 respectively. The apparatus often includes specific information on the lacunae or unique readings of these manuscripts.

We do not claim to have achieved as thoroughgoing a documentary approach as we initially intended. Reintroducing *nomina sacra* and conforming all punctuation to documented systems have proven tasks too large at this stage.

I shall now attempt to give three specific examples of these features so that readers can gain some appreciation of the value of the new edition.

1 Example Paragraph: Mark 4:3

In Mark 4:3 the Parable of the Sower begins ἀκούετε ἰδοὺ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπεί-ρων. Modern editions and translations often place punctuation after ἀκούετε but do not generally treat it as a separate paragraph. However, among our earliest witnesses we see that both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus treat ἰδού as beginning a new paragraph, and this is probably also the intention of Codex Vaticanus. Our edition reflects this division, which marks the perceived onset of the parable one word later and allows a clearer distinction between the call to listen (ἀκούετε) and the invitation to imagine (ἰδού). While it is possible that Mark's Gospel was at first written without visible unit delimitation, based on extant ancient documents generally and extant New Testament manuscripts specifically this is less likely than that it was written with some paragraph marking. This being the case, it should not be ruled out that the agreement between two (or three) of our earliest witnesses in this paragraph mark could be a shared inheritance from a much earlier point in transmission. Even if this does not represent the paragraphing of an "authorial" edition of the text, it does at least represent a way of dividing the work far closer to its textual origins than any modern editor. The presentation of such ancient boundary markers also presents an opportunity for the training of modern exegetes to avoid anachronistic ways of thinking.

2 Example Spelling: γείνεται in Luke 12:54–55

Luke 12:54–55 reads in NA[28]: Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις· ὅταν ἴδητε [τὴν] νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε ὅτι ὄμβρος ἔρχεται, καὶ γίνεται οὕτως· καὶ ὅταν νότον πνέοντα, λέγετε ὅτι καύσων ἔσται, καὶ γίνεται. Consider the sequence γίνεται … γίνεται, shared by numerous other editions, such as Westcott and Hort, SBLGNT and the Textus Receptus. Here our edition reads γεινεται … γεινεται. The first point to make is that the letter sequence γεινεται is attested throughout the early tradition: 𝔓[45] 𝔓[75] ℵ A B D W, i. e., our two earliest papyri (third cent.) and our four earliest majuscules (fourth–fifth cent.), plus Codex Freerianus (W) (fifth–eighth cent.). The second point is that this is not merely an isolated spelling feature whereby a number of manuscripts coincidentally contain a shared itacism. Rather this is part of a pattern for the entire Gospel of Luke, in which instances of the verb γίνομαι are overwhelmingly spelled with the initial syllable γειν- in the earliest witnesses. In Luke 6:36; 13:17;

15:10; 19:19; 20:33; 21:7, 28 *none* of these early witnesses has the spelling with γιν-. The third thing to note is that this pattern forms part of a yet wider pattern whereby etymological long /i/ came to be spelled with some consistency with ει for certain lexemes in Koine of the time of the New Testament – a pattern which is reflected in some of our early witnesses for some of the books of the New Testament. We will publish separate documentation of this matter. However, this example is enough to demonstrate that previous editions of the Greek New Testament have sometimes standardized spellings against the pattern of the manuscripts. While we recognize that there is much senseless spelling variation shown in manuscripts, we nevertheless believe that amid the arbitrary variations some patterns may be found which have a better chance than the spellings of modern editions of reflecting spellings of the earliest authors, editors, or amanuenses.

3 Example Breathing and Accents: John 8:58

In John 8:58 Jesus famously says πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί (Westcott and Hort; NA[28]; SBLGNT). Here our edition reads πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμι, furnishing Abraham with a rough breathing and making εἰμι enclitic so as to transfer its accent to the preceding word. Both of these decisions are based on manuscript evidence. Although some weighty witnesses (e. g., Codex Claromontanus for the Pauline epistles and minuscule 1424) provide evidence for a smooth breathing on the name Abraham, we were more impressed by the quality of the witnesses for the rough breathing (B[accentor] 35 69) as well as by their numerical preponderance (we sampled 44 manuscripts). For the accentuation of εγω ειμι we sampled B[accentor] 560 771 788 1424 and 2907 and found that they all took εἰμι as enclitic. Having completed our decision making process we then observed that our resultant text πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμι is not an innovation, but simply what was earlier printed in Erasmus's and Stephanus's editions of 1516 and 1550 respectively. Those editions were, of course, made at a time when editors still sought to follow manuscripts in such matters.

Our edition is not intended to rival the Nestle-Aland edition, which will generally have a fuller apparatus and an array of information on manuscripts, citations, and cross-references for which we offer no counterpart. Nevertheless we believe that this edition is sufficiently different in its conception and in the information it provides that it should be an essential

part of the Neutestamentler's reference library. For study of the orality or poetics of the New Testament we believe our edition should be the starting point.

The edition is due for release by Crossway in November 2017 as well as on the major platforms for Bible software. It will also be available freely online.

Peter J. Williams
Tyndale House
36 Selwyn Gardens
Cambridge, CB3 9BA
UK
principal@tyndale.cam.ac.uk

AnneMarie Luijendijk, *Forbidden Oracles? The Gospel of the Lots of Mary* (STAC 89; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), xxi + 208 pp., ISBN 978-3-16-152859.

Forbidden Oracles is an outstanding contribution to the study of late antique religion. Luijendijk focuses on a single codex, a miniature *sortes* manuscript that provided ready answers to the inquiries of seekers of divine advice, but her fascinating monograph has much broader implications, not only for the study of divination but also for the history of the book, developing notions of "sacred scripture," and our understanding of the everyday lives of Christians in Egypt. The Gospel of the Lots of Mary calls attention to the complexity of religious and scriptural authority, demonstrating the wide appeal of sortilege and bibliomancy in Christian contexts and calling into question any simplistic linear account of progress toward a single Christian "orthodoxy."

The monograph begins with an introduction to sortilege and divination and then proceeds in two parts: Part one provides a detailed contextual analysis that places this manuscript and its text within a broader terminological, theological, codicological, palaeographical, and ecclesial framework. The second part presents a critical edition of the manuscript, complete with an edited Coptic text, English translation, and comprehensive apparatus. A full set of images follows, after which one finds the bibliography, indices, and a vocabulary list that enables cross-checking of the oracles for specific terms. The technical excellence of the edition is exemplary, a quality that is made even more valuable when combined with the eloquent and thorough historical section found in the first half.

The Gospel of the Lots of Mary survives in only a single copy, but it illuminates a world of divinatory practices with a long history and an eager clientele. *Sortes* books survive in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Syriac, Provençal, and Coptic (4); they are mentioned by Lucian of Samosata (5–7), Augustine of Hippo (9), and Athanasius (88–89), among others; and they were employed by religious experts at numerous shrines, including at Christian martyria (47–51). Comparable to ticket oracles (inquiries submitted at shrines across Egypt and elsewhere) and ἑρμηνεῖαι (sentences inserted into manuscripts employed for divination), they were part of a rich religious heritage that extended from the Pharaonic period well into the Middle Ages. Even so, this miniature codex is unique: proclaiming its status as a "gospel," its oracles are attributed to Mary, the "author" of the revelations, and linked to Christ by means of her role as Jesus's mother (28–32). The emphasis in the oracles themselves is on God as the ultimate source of the promises or warnings that will, these oracles proclaim, cer-

tainly take place. Individual oracles combine scriptural allusions with, for example, admonitions about enemies, reassurances about the angels, cautions against being of "two minds," and exhortations to trust God (35–37, 98–144). The important fifth-century title θεοτόκος is omitted from the introductory ascription to Mary (98), which may indicate either a late fourth or early fifth-century date for the production of the manuscript (31–32), but Luijendijk's codicological, palaeographical, and socio-historical analysis pushes the date of the codex's manufacture into the fifth or sixth century.

Copied by a skilled scribe on deluxe parchment, the beauty of the manuscript's execution, Luijendijk observes, likely enhanced its status as a sacred and authoritative book (47). Quite small, it could easily be hidden, which may have protected it from the disciplinary interventions of those less inclined to welcome Christian divination (53–54). Still, this Gospel resembles other tiny liturgical and biblical books, including a copy of 4 Maccabees found at the Shrine of Saint Collutus in Antinoë (45, 50). Miniature size could lend legitimacy to Christian books as easily as point to their position as forbidden objects. Bishops reprimanded those who engaged in private divination (54–55), an activity made convenient by this manuscript's small format, yet intimate consultation with a local priest in a side chamber at a shrine or monastery is an equally possible setting for the use of this book (53). Indeed, material features, together with theological and oracular content, makes a Christian shrine a promising candidate for provenance, particularly the martyrium dedicated to Saint Collutus (49–51). A popular pilgrimage destination known for ritual bathing, dream incubation, and book and ticket divination, visitors to the saint often sought healing and divine revelation from resident priests. Other shrines, churches, or monasteries are also possible; as David Frankfurter and Arietta Papaconstantinou have shown, sortilege and ticket oracles were institutionalized Christian practices,[1] despite denunciations of "magic" in canon law and heresiological literature. Bishops objected to the consultation of local "pagan" astrologers, diviners, and enchanters (80–86) and associated the use of "magic" illicit books with "heretics" (88–91), but they were well aware of the enduring popularity of bibliomancy, which they also practiced (62–65). Sortilege may have been more contro-

---

[1] D. Frankfurter, "Dynamics of Ritual Expertize in Antiquity and Beyond: Towards a New Taxonomy of 'Magicians,'" in *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World* (ed. P. Mirecki and M. Meyer; RGRW 141; Leiden, 2002), 159–178; id., *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance* (Princeton, 1998), 194–195; A. Papaconstantinou, "Oracles chrétiens dans l'Égypte byzantine: Le témoignage des papyrus," *ZPE* 104 (1994), 281–286.

versial but, as the example of Bishop Anastasius of Sinai shows, it could also be accepted as legitimately "Christian" if the circumstances were right (86–88). The Gospel of the Lots of Mary, an object of significant value painstakingly produced, confirms that divination was a central rather than a peripheral activity, irrespective of institutional censure. Sortilege worked.

By making this previously unknown "Gospel" available to readers, Luijendijk's exceptional monograph adds to a growing body of scholarship that challenges historians to avoid the traps left by bishops eager to enforce their visions of "orthodoxy." Instead of tracing the "development of canon," we might do better by investigating what David Brakke has called "scriptural practices," which could include the use of scriptural amulets, *sortes* books like this Gospel, "apocryphal" works read as sacred texts, and the composition of esoteric or philosophical literature designed to supplement existing scripture.[2] Instead of cataloging disparities between "heretics" and their "orthodox" counterparts, we might notice striking commonalities, overlapping interpretive commitments, and controversies that were often more rhetorical than real.[3] Instead of viewing institutional contexts like monasteries, churches, and shrines as bastions of Christian exclusivity and difference, we might attend to shared reading and educational practices,[4] a collective appreciation for divination,[5] and rites that were

---

2 D. Brakke, "Scriptural Practices in Early Christianity: Towards a New History of the New Testament Canon," in *Invention, Rewriting, Usurpation: Discursive Fights over Religious Traditions in Antiquity* (ed. J. Rüpke, A.-C. Jacobsen, and D. Brakke; Frankfurt am Main, 2012), 263–280; cf. J. Knust, "Miscellany Manuscripts and the Christian Canonical Imaginary," in *Ritual Matters: Material Residues and Ancient Religions* (ed. J. Knust and C. Moser; Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome; Ann Arbor, Mich., forthcoming).

3 Important studies include: A. LeBoulluec, *La notion d'hérésie dans la literature grecque, IIe–IIIe siècles* (2 vols.; Paris, 1985); D. Brakke, *Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, 2011); K.L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, 2003); and M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, 1996).

4 See, e. g., E. Iricinschi, "'Souvenez-vous aussi de moi dans vos prières': Scribes et codex dans l'Égypte du IVᵉ siècle," in *Le savoir des religions: Fragments d'historiographie religieuse* (ed. A.-C. Rendu Loisel et al.; Geneva, 2014), 169–202; L. Larsen, "The Sayings of the Desert Fathers and the Monostichs of Menander: Learning a New Alphabet Using Classical Models," in *Early Monasticism and Classical Paideia* (ed. S. Rubenson; StPatr; Leuven, 2013); P. Rousseau, *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt* (Berkeley, 1985).

5 In addition to Frankfurter and Papaconstantinou (see n. 1), see W. Klingshirn, "Christian Divination in Late Roman Gaul: The *Sortes Sangallenses*," in *Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination* (ed. S.I. Johnston and P.T. Struck; RGRW 155; Leiden, 2005), 99–128, and id., "Inventing the *sortilegus*: Lot Divination and Cultural Identity in Italy, Rome,

remarkably similar to "pagan" precedents. As material artifacts, early Christian books rarely, if ever, fit a priori beliefs about canon, liturgy, and theology. Instead, they provide evidence of an ever-shifting repertoire of local practices that invested any number of surprising books with sacred significance.[6] The Gospel of the Lots of Mary provides one particularly striking example of this phenomenon. Professor Luijendijk is to be congratulated for her important addition to this discussion.

Jennifer Knust
Boston University
745 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
USA
jknust@bu.edu

---

and the Provinces," in *Religion in Republican Italy* (ed. P.B. Harvey and C.E. Schultz; Cambridge, 2006), 137–161.

6 For further examples, see E.J. Epp, "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: 'Not without Honor except in Their Hometown'?" *JBL* 123.1 (2004), 5–55, and A. Luijendijk, "Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus," *VC* 64 (2010), 217–254.