Ashworth, William David (2026) *Moses at Moab, Moses in Judaea: Second Temple interpretations of Deut 1-11 through wisdom, covenant, and mûsar/paideia.* PhD thesis.

https://theses.gla.ac.uk/86076/

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

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

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission from the author

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

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

Enlighten: Theses
https://theses.gla.ac.uk
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

Moses at Moab, Moses in Judaea: Second Temple Interpretations of Deut 1-11 Through Wisdom, Covenant, and *Mûsar/Paideia*

William David Ashworth

M. Div., MSt.

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Critical Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Glasgow

August, 2025

Abstract

Moses at Moab, Moses in Judaea: Second Temple Interpretations of Deut 1-11 Through Wisdom, Covenant, and *Mûsar/Paideia*

In this thesis, I investigate the interpretation of Deut 1-11 in Second Temple texts. I will examine Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, the works of Philo, selected works of Josephus, and the Qumran materials. Deut 1-11 is amply attested in the Second Temple period, not only through textual quotation and allusion but through three thematic lenses which are especially prominent in Deuteronomy. These lenses—wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia*—allow for additional thematic similarities between these Second Temple texts and Deut 1-11 to be observed.

I will first provide a brief review of relevant Deuteronomy scholarship. Then, I briefly review and define these lenses, providing scholarly background and delineating qualities by which they may be articulated. I will then show how these themes interact with Deut 1-11 before providing information on methodology. Then, I will show how these lenses encompass the entire pericope of Deut 1-11.

Next, I will analyze Ben Sira with respect to these lenses and Deut 1-11. Here, I show Ben Sira's understanding of wisdom as not only the pursuit of God, but the fear of God as well. Torah fidelity is also crucial for Ben Sira, as is right speech and Israel's possession of wisdom. For this point, Ben Sira makes use of covenantal themes, which he also uses to defend the priesthood of his day.

In 1 Macc, the highly theological treatment we find in Sir gives way to a political defense of the Maccabeans. The author makes use of Deut 1-11 and the thematic lenses to illustrate the military superiority of Judas Maccabeus, as well as the fitness of himself and his descendants to serve as priests. The author of 2 Macc will likewise appropriate Deut 1-11 and these lenses to a dfferent end; that of showing the complex factionalism of the Jerusalem priesthood, God's benevolence toward not only the Jerusalem temple but all temples of the diaspora, and the sanctity of the Jewish people.

In the works of Philo, we will find Deut 1-11, and these themes, used to generally emphasize a highly spiritualized view of the ideal life. Material possessions, and the material world, are minimized in favor of fellowship with God. The metaphor of the *kubernētēs* will emerge, as will thoughts on immortality and Israel's role among other nations. Philo will use covenant in a flexible way, especially regarding his writings on mind and senses.

Josephus will use these themes to highlight the applicability of the Jewish scriptures for all nations, not just Jews, and to promote his belief that the Romans have become the recipients of God's divine favor. The Qumran materials through Deut 1-11 and these themes will show a remarkable diversity of theology, as well as developmental interaction with predeterminism. Finally, I will show that these works may now be seen as inhabiting three categories: theological-transformative, historical-expositional, and theological-historical.

Table of Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements 5
Chapter 1. Introduction 10
1.1. Deuteronomy—General 13
1.2. Deuteronomy—History of Scholarship 15
1.3. Wisdom—General 19
1.4. Wisdom—Theological Aspects 23
1.5. *Mûsar/Paideia* 25
1.6. Deut 1-11 and Wisdom, *Mûsar/Paideia* 28
1.7. Covenant—General 31
1.8. Covenant—Deut 1-11 34
1.9. Method 38
1.9.1. Introduction: Deut 1-11 and Textuality 38
1.9.2. Deuteronomy: Quotations, Allusions, and Intertextuality 41
1.9.3. Intertextuality and Boundary: Other Voices and Approaches 50
1.9.4. Method as Applied to the Texts of the Thesis 55
1.10. Deut 1-11 and Wisdom, Covenant, *Mûsar/Paideia*—An Overview 59
1.11. Summary of Contents 66
1.12. A Note on Abbreviations and Languages 72
Chapter 2. Ben Sira and Deuteronomy 1-11—Wisdom, Covenant, *Mûsar/Paideia* 73
2.1. Introduction 73
2.2. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—Wisdom, Generally 77
2.3. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—Wisdom as the Fear of God 80
2.4. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—Wisdom as Torah Obedience 85
2.5. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia* 89
2.6. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia* as Right Speech 98
2.7. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—Covenant 106
2.8. Conclusion 119
Chapter 3. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Wisdom, Covenant, *Mûsar/Paideia* 124
3.1. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Phrasal and Linguistic Links 126
3.2. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: The Use of Power 128
3.3. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: Deuteronomic/Babelic Themes of Physical Fortifications and Name Establishment 127
3.4. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: Reaction to Military Intelligence 130
3.5. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: The Theological Monologue of Antiochus IV Epiphanes 133
3.6. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: Bravery of Judas Maccabeus 136
3.7. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: Oath-breaking 138
3.8. Interim Summary 145
3.9. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Covenant 146
3.10. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Wisdom 152
3.11. 1 Macc and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia* 156
3.12. Conclusion 163
Chapter 4. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11: Wisdom, Covenant, *Mûsar/Paideia* 165
4.1. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Nehemiah and Jonathan's Prayer 166

4.2. 2 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Widows' and Orphans' Deposits 174
4.3. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Wealth and Bribery 177
4.4. An Interlude: Friendship in 2 Macc as the Intersection Between Wisdom and Covenant 181
4.5. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Covenant: The First Epistle 186
4.6. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Immortality of the Martyrs 190
4.7. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Enslaved Jews 193
4.8. 2 Maccabees and Deut 1-11— Covenant: Conclusion 195
4.9. Excursus—*Sunthēkē* in 2 Macc 196
4.10. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: The *Gymnasium* 199
4.11. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Discipline 203
4.12. 2 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Martyrdom (Revisited) 205
4.13. 2 Maccabees and *Paideia*—Conclusion 208
4.14. General Conclusion 208
Chapter 5. Philo and Deut 1-11—Introduction 210
5.1. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Material Goods 218
5.2. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: The Ordered Cosmos 228
5.3. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Widows and Orphans 230
5.4. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Rightful Judges and Law 232
5.5. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Conclusion 238
5.6. Excursus: Immortality 238
5.7. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: The *Kubernētēs* 246
5.8. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: Chastisement 245
5.9. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: Proselytes 252
5.10. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: Growth and Training 253
5.11. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: Israel and Other Nations 260
5.12. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant 264
5.13. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Simple Exegesis and Motivic Repetition 265
5.14. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Higher and Lower Law 267
5.15. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Obedience and Grace 269
5.16. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Mind and Senses 271
5.17. Conclusion 279
Chapter 6. Josephus and Deut 1-11—Wisdom, *Mûsar/Paideia*, Covenant 282
6.1. Josephus: Intertexuality, Deut 1-11, and the Law in *C.Ap*. 285
6.2. Moses at Moab: Josephus's Recasting of Deuteronomy 1-11 in *A.J.*4.176-199 291
6.3. Conclusion 297
6.4. Josephan Speeches—Wisdom and *Paideia* Through Deut 1-11 298
6.5. Josephus—*B.J.* 3:362-382 299
6.6. Josephus—*B.J.*5:363-419 301
6.7. Josephus—*B.J.* 6.96-110 305
6.8. Titus—*B.J.* 3.472-484 306
6.9. Titus—*B.J.* 6:34-53 308
6.10. Titus—*B.J.*6.328-350 312
6.11. Agrippa II—*B.J.*2.345-407 314
6.12. Eleazar—*B.J.*7.320-388 319
6.13. Ananus—*B.J.*4.163-183 322

6.14. Jesus—*B.J.*4.239-269; Simon the Idumaean, *B.J.*4.272-282 327
6.15. Josephus and Covenant—The Biblical Text Compared With *A.J.* 329
6.16. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Rulership 332
6.17. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Human Agreements 334
6.18. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Liturgical Practice 341
6.19. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Obedience 346
6.20. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Inheritance of the Land 355
6.21. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of the Ark of the Covenant 360
6.22. Conclusion 370
Chapter 7. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—Wisdom, Covenant, and *Mûsar/Paideia* 372
7.1 Introduction 372
7.2. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—General 380
7.3. Excursus—Snow and Ice 388
7.4. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—Wisdom 389
7.5. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—Covenant 403
7.6. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—*Mûsar/Paideia* 416
7.7. Chapter Conclusion 423
Chapter 8. Conclusion 426
8.1. Theologically Transformative Texts—Ben Sira 429
8.2. Theologically Transformative Texts—Philo 430
8.3. Theologically Transformative Texts—Qumran Materials 438
8.4. Historically Explanatory Texts—1 Macc 442
8.5. Historically Explanatory Texts—Josephus 444
8.6. Theological-Historical Texts—2 Macc 447
8.7. Contribution and Further Work 449
Bibliography 453
Appendix: Philo and *Paideia* 474
A1. Introduction 474
A2. *Paideia* As Teaching Tool 486
A3. *Paideia* and Wisdom 493
A4. *Paideia* and Virtue 499
A5. *Paideia* and Reason 507
A6. *Paideia* and Discipline 514
A7. Conclusion 518

Preface and Acknowledgements

This prefatory section will end in a customary manner, giving credit where credit is due to the person whom, in nearly every academic endeavor of this type, would receive the lion's share of acknowledgement. The manner in which this typical outcome emerged, however, was anything but typical. It concerned a worldwide crisis for which media outlets unilaterally adopted the watchword "unprecedented"; while this is not precisely true, given the outbreak of Spanish flu almost exactly one hundred years prior, no other event could, in most living memories, equal the chaos and uncertainty which this crisis produced. Therefore, to provide this introductory note with appropriately dramatic suspense given the equally dramatic circumstances that surrounded this project, I will reveal this chief recipient of my gratitude only at the end.

Having concluded a Master's degree at an Presbyterian seminary in the United States (M.Div) followed by another Master's at the University of Oxford in Classical Hebrew, I began my PhD at the University of Glasgow after visiting an Oxford seminar on the exemplarity of Abraham where I spoke with the current head of New Testament and Ancient Culture at Glasgow. This professor became my doctoral supervisor, and I began doctoral studies in October 2019. Four months later, the world would become a very different place, and I found myself essentially stranded in Oxford. My plan to use the Bodleian library facilities while commuting to Glasgow for supervisory meetings was immediately halted by suspensions of public transit, as was my use of the Bodleian itself which thanks to the mandatory closures of the COVID period had been, if I may synthesize a pun and contemporary computing slang, "bricked", or put completely out of commission. Nor did a return to the United States seem wise,

as the UK government informed all non-UK citizens that, should they leave the UK for any reason, they would be denied re-entry.

Therefore, I spent the better part of a year and a half—possibly more, but the period is still a blur— without normal access to scholarly resources. Because of this, my thesis did not organically develop from the interests I had begun to explore at the beginning of this project. I held a strong interest in the documentary theories of Wellhausen and his followers, and had begun to conceive of using his ideas as an explanation for what I considered to be unusual interpretations of Deuteronomy in the works of Philo. I maintained this stance for many years, but failed to see that a much richer and much more easily demonstrated universe of influence upon Philo could be found in his peers within the Second Temple period. I am deeply grateful to Jonathan Birch and Joan Taylor for their insightful feedback and assistance in this. Their input radically changed the course of my dissertation and I believe exponentially improved the final product.

This global disruption also meant that normal supervisory meetings were indefinitely halted, another major blow to my work. During this period, Mark W. Elliott was kind enough to informally meet with me in outdoor settings, and his guidance at that time allowed me to endure that period and remain productive in very trying circumstances. Mark continued to provide assistance, first as a secondary supervisor and then more informally once my work moved in different areas. I also appreciate Sarah Nicholson's advice who suggested I not neglect the social circumstances that surrounded these ancient authors.

I am also grateful for the assistance I received from a University of Glasgow scholarship, as well as from Midway Presbyterian Church and Grace Church Canton, American institutions which provided me with emotional and financial support. Their senior pastors, David W. Hall

and Robie Hembree, were enormously influential on my intellectual and theological development. I should also thank my instructors who, along the way, have shaped my thought: Bruce Lowe, William Fullilove, Derek Thomas, John Screnock, Allison Salvesen, Alinda Damsma, Hindy Najman, Glenn W. Most, Arjen Bakker, and Joel Rasmussen. Special thanks should be given to Bill Davis who most clearly recognized my future interests and scholarly strengths. Normal family visits were out of the question for many years, but I am indebted to my mother Rita and brothers Brent and Brandon for their moral support. I am also thankful to Trinity Partick Church, Glasgow, for their encouragement, and to David and Kirsten Miller for their friendship, humor, hospitality, and unforeseen technological assistance in the form of what I still believe to be an extravagant gift, an upgraded desktop computer that often did double duty as blessing and curse, being powerful enough for gaming! Robin and Viola McDade also invited me to their home for many much appreciated breakfasts, and I am grateful to them as well. Bill and Ruth Stephens also provided hospitality and friendship, as did Alan and Wilma Paton. I cannot ignore my friends Jamieson Woerner and Thomas Bjorlie who, despite extreme limitations in time and resources, drew from both to arrange visits in Michelstadt and London that provided much needed respite from study. My friend and colleague Rubin Yi-McClain, along with Michael Wong, lived nearby and were extremely hospitable as well on several occasions. Jim and Connie Wolff also visited in London, providing the chance to see several Imperial War Museums, a highlight of my time in the UK thus far. Warren and Holly Kinney visited me in Edinburgh as well and I am thankful to them. I would also be remiss to fail to mention cinema enthusiast Graham Darnell, who often invited myself and others to his home for "MUBI night".

However, it is my primary supervisor whom I must chiefly thank. The PhD journey has not been an easy one, and he showed incalculable patience as I struggled with not only how much I really did not know, but how especially little I knew about academic procedures and methodology, biblical knowledge notwithstanding. Equally incalculable is the time he must have spent reading and commenting on drafts, which he was always more prompt in returning than I was in submitting. As the years passed, we became friends and I learned he was in possession of considerable musical talents as a singer and guitarist. As a conservatory trained and former professional pianist, I feel am not entirely unqualified to assess his abilities as likewise professional and have had the pleasure to perform with him on many occasions. His academic achievements of course need no elaboration here and are world-class in their own right. It was also a joy to meet his wife, Megan, and children William and Claire. This dissertation, then, is dedicated to my *doktorvater*:

Sean A. Adams

Chapter 1. Introduction

In this thesis, I will investigate the interpretation of Deut 1-11, through the lenses of wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia*, of the following Second Temple works and authors: Philo, Josephus, Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, and the Qumran materials. I selected these *corpora* due to their well-established provenances and substantiality of size.[1] Deuteronomy is a key text, arguably *the* key text of the Jewish scriptures. Its use in the Second Temple period is well attested by its presence in the Qumran materials and, as we will see in this thesis, the degree to which other Second Temple authors alluded to its material, creating a complex "intertextual" fabric in their own works.

As we will soon see, the themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant are also well attested in Deut 1-11. This presence may be briefly characterized as wisdom comprising the *content* of instruction, *mûsar/paideia* the *means* of instruction, and covenant as the *terms* under which instruction is received. Yet in the Second Temple period, the Jews experienced a new situation from that described in Deut 1-11. Having returned from exile, the Jews could once more worship in a rebuilt Temple, but first under Persian rule, then Greek dominion. It was not until the rise of the Hasmoneans that the Jews would regain their sovereignty, but this political victory was marred by the ascension of the Hasmoneans to the priesthood, opposed by many Jews. Finally, the Jews were deeply affected by Hellenistic society, including the influence of the *enkuklia paideia*. The marks of Hellenization may be seen especially in the works of Philo and Josephus, highly influenced by, respectively, Hellenistic philosophy and historiography. Were these historical, theological, and cultural circumstances powerful enough to influence the interpretation of Deut 1-11? This is the question I propose to answer.

[1] For this reason I omitted Wis, which is half the length of the shortest work studied herein (2 Macc).

Admittedly, *any* work produced by a Jewish author during the Second Temple *might* show evidence of interaction with surrounding and possibly competing social, cultural, and political considerations. I selected works that were likely to interpret Deuteronomy due to the commitment of their authors to Jewish practice, yet also showed clear signs of intercultural complexity. If the influence of social, political, and cultural factors is to be shown in the interpretation of Deuteronomy, texts without these factors would return false negatives and suggest that the influence cannot be found. I will primarily focus on works written in Greek as this suggests interaction with the Greek-diaspora, as well as works written in Hebrew but translated into Greek and preserved largely as Greek texts. Being written in Hebrew and preserved in Hebrew at Qumran, Ben Sira is something of an exception, but its intersection with the Hasmonean priesthood qualifies it for inclusion by way of the Maccabean interaction with the Greek world, as well as its translational preface. On the other hand, I omitted Daniel chiefly due to its lack of explicit interaction with scripture, especially Deuteronomy, and its apocalyptic emphasis. Wisdom of Solomon was omitted as it primarily interacts with Exodus traditions and the Psalter. Therefore, the concerns of spatial limitations and likelihood of Deuteronomic interaction governed my selection of texts.

These texts are Ben Sira, 1 Macc, 2 Macc, works of Philo which engage with Deuteronomy, the works of Josephus, and the Qumran materials. Ben Sira is a document generated in Judea, likely by the priesthood, during a period of unchallenged Greek rule, and preserved most significantly in a Greek translation which is attested within Ben Sira itself. Although 1 Macc was originally written in Hebrew, this edition has been lost and only the Greek survives, preserved in the canonical scriptures of the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches. It is a record of the period when, frustrated by Greek dominance and religious oppression, Judas

Maccabeus and his brothers overturned their Greek rulers and established their own kingdom. Another account of the Maccabean uprising, 2 Macc is likely written originally in Greek and emphasizes the pious motivations of the Maccabeans, as well as including divine miracles. Philo is a well-established interpreter of Scripture who not only shows evidence of a strong commitment to Jewish belief and practice but also the influence of Alexandrian scholarship and exegesis. Josephus is another author who not only re-presented the Jewish scriptures, showing a commitment to Jewish practice, but also wrote several historical works, including a defense of the antiquity of the Jewish people (*C.Ap.*). He also wrote in Greek and occupied a precarious political position between the Judean client kingdom and Roman rulers.

Finally, not only do the Qumran materials reveal authors *highly* committed to Jewish life and practice, they also interact substantially and demonstrably with Deuteronomy. Although these texts are written in Hebrew, these texts themselves as well as the *pesharim* indicate that these texts were generated by a complex assortment of authors, for communities and audiences that existed in relationships with the wider Judean diaspora that have not yet been fully understood by scholarship. It seemed essential, then, to include the Qumran materials, as a study of this nature would not only shed light on the interpretation of Deuteronomy within these texts, but the circumstances of their generation about which so much remains unknown.

1.1. Deuteronomy—General

Deuteronomy is the fifth of the "five-fifths of the Law", or *ḥămišâ ḥumšê ha ṭôrâ*, also possibly called חומשים ספרים at 1Q30 col.1 l.4.[2] This division of the Torah occurred no later than the Second Temple period.[3] Its author is attested in antiquity to have been Moses, with the exception of the last eight verses which many held to have been composed by Joshua, and Josephus also attests Mosaic authorship while admitting that Moses's text was scattered and later restructured.[4] In the LXX version of Deut 17:18, the word *deuteronomion* occurs, signifying the copy of the law the king is to make; this copy was understood to be the scroll itself and hence the name *Deuteronomion* in the Greek.[5] Its Hebrew name is *Dêbārîm*, using the first word of the Hebrew text for its title as do the other Pentateuchal books.[6] The most reliable LXX critical edition is the Göttingen; for Hebrew, *BHS* is also in wide use, supplemented by *BHQ* prepared by Carmel McCarthy.[7] However, there are no notable variants and the text of Deuteronomy is exceptionally stable.

This stability includes the Qumran materials. There are between thirty-two and thirty-five fragments of Deuteronomy at Qumran.[8] Notably, the fragments found in *mezuzot* (door decorations) and phylacteries are taken exclusively from chapters 1-11, with the exception of

---

[2] Jack R. Lundbom, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013), 1.
[3] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 1.
[4] *b.B.Bat* 14b-15a; Josephus, *A.J.*4.196-197; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 1.
[5] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 1-2.
[6] This practice is also observed in other ANE materials, e.g., *Enuma Elish* (Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 274); *Ludlul Bel Nemeqi* (Takayoshi Oshima, *Babylonian Poems of Pious Sufferers*, ORA 14 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021)); Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, AB 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 2.
[7] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 2.
[8] Florentino García Martínez, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, VTSupp 53 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 66; Sidnie White Crawford, "Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period", in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library*, SBLSymS 30, eds. Kristin de Troyer and Armin Lange (Atlanta: SBL Press,2005), 316; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 4.

portions from the Song of Moses (Deut 32).[9] Deuteronomic material is also seen in the Nash Papyrus, a Hebrew text found in Egypt and dated by William F. Albright (1891-1971) to the mid- to late-second century BC, and the Roberts Papyrus, a Greek text with the same provenance. The Nash papyrus preserves the Decalogue and the Shema (Deut 5:6-21; 6:4-5).[10]

Regarding Deut 1-11, the work begins with 1:1-5, a titular statement that locates Moses's speech in place and time. The next division is 1:6-4:40, which include a historical narrative that describes the journey of Israel from Horeb/Sinai to Moab and the events that transpired along the way, followed by Moses's sermon that stresses God's singularity and exhorts the Israelites to remain loyal to this God who brought them safely to Moab. Next, in 4:41-43 Moses establishes three cities of refuge. 4:44-49, the "second introduction", also locates Moses's speech in place and time.[11] The final division, 5:1-11:32, serves to exhort the Israelites to loyalty and obedience.[12] This is driven by the inclusion of the Decalogue in Deut 5, which in its first two commandments justifies the constant Deuteronomic demand that Israel wholly love and serve God.

Deuteronomy may be considered Moses's farewell speech before his death; in this sense, the LXX use of *diathēkē* to render *bəriyṭ* becomes especially poignant in the LXX version of Deuteronomy.[13] This links Deuteronomy to the Egyptian wisdom tradition and didactic wisdom literature in general, as these materials are often delivered by a king and preserved through kingly manuals.[14]

---

[9] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 4.
[10] Stanley A. Cooke, "A Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus", *PSBA* 25(1903):34-56; W.F. Albright, "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabaean Age: The Nash Papyrus", *JBL* 56 (1937): 145-176; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 5-6.
[11] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 9.
[12] For the foregoing see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 3.
[13] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 4.
[14] Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature vol 1: The Old and Middle Kingdoms* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973-1976); Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 4.

1.2. Deuteronomy—History of Scholarship

Deuteronomy is an "Archimedean point" that anchors other attempts to date the Pentateuchal materials and the books of Josh-2 Kgs.[15] Wilhelm M.L. de Wette (1780-1849) built upon the work of Jean Astruc (1684-1766) and first proposed that King Josiah's "book of the law" as detailed in 2 Kgs 22:8, was in fact Deuteronomy; while this had been noted earlier by church fathers, de Wette argued that the book had been *composed* shortly before its discovery by King Josiah.[16] There are ANE parallels for this sort of rediscovery; in the 14th and 13th centuries BC, the Hittite king Mutawalli prays for repentance and promises to recover the lost covenant of the gods.[17] To ground Deuteronomy in the Josianic reform, scholars relied upon the frequent mention of pillar destruction, not found in earlier Pentateuchal literature, as well as Deuteronomy's prohibition of astral worship which is not mentioned in earlier portions of the Pentateuch.[18] It is this destruction of the pillars which, according to Weinfeld, would create a vacuum in the lives of Israelites outside Jerusalem, who would replace sacrifice with prayer and study and lay the foundation for the establishment of synagogues, first appearing in the archaeological record in Hellenistic Egypt, beginning from the third century BC.[19]

This argument for Deuteronomy's creation in the court of Josiah would be contested in 1924, however, by Adam Welch (1864-1943), who argued that Deuteronomy originated in the northern kingdom on the grounds of the Ebal sanctuary having greater status, a view that would

---

[15] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, ix.
[16] W.M.L. de Wette, "Dissertatio critica qua a prioribus deuteronomium pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur", in *Opulus theologica* (Berlin: Reimerum, 1843), 2:150-54; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 6.
[17] *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghasköi* 11.1; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 18-19.
[18] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 16-17.
[19] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 80.

be championed by many but ultimately abandoned.[20] It would also be challenged not due to its location of the text in place, but in time, as Robert H. Pfeiffer (1892-1958) held that not only was the previous king Manasseh opposed to the religious sentiments expressed in Deuteronomy, but that the time period between his death, i.e. the ascension of Josiah, and the discovery of the book was too short for such a work to have been written.[21] Jack Lundbom also challenges this, incorporating more recent views *contra* Wellhausen that Chronicles should be viewed as reliable; this being the case, Lundbom argues that the Chronicles account for legal reform should take precedence over the Deuteronomic account, prohibiting the document composed/found by Josiah from being the law code. Instead, Lundbom holds this discovered document to be the Song of Moses (Deut 32), based on textual and rhetorical grounds.[22]

de Wette also viewed Deuteronomy along with Josh-2 Kgs as a literary unity, styled "Deuteronomic".[23] This separation of Deuteronomy from the other Pentateuchal texts prepared the ground for Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) in 1878, who understood Deuteronomy to be a

---

[20] W.F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 2nd ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1957), 315; Gerhard von Rad, "Deuteronomy", *IBD* 1:831-838; *Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs*, BWANT 26 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938), 94; E.W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1967), 58-82; Georg Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. David E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), 175; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 11; on the importance of Ebal, as well as Ibn Ezra's obervations, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 10-11. Also, astral worship, as a northern phenomenon (Amos 5:26), tends to support Welch's ideas; see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 45.

[21] Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), 180; but see also Nicholson, *Deuteronomy*, 1967, 101-102; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 12.

[22] Albright, *Stone Age*, 273; W.F. Albright, *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 76-77; John Bright, *A History of Israel*, 3rd ed. (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1981), 229; Frank M. Cross, Jr., and David Noel Freedman, "Josiah's Revolt against Assyria", *JNES* 12 (1953): 56-58; Jack R. Lundbom, "The Lawbook of the Josianic Reform", *CBQ* 38 (1976): 293-302. I find Lundbom's argument unconvincing for two reasons: 1) the textual evidence he presents offers no justification for the destruction of the high places, a key feature of the Josianic reform, and 2) his evidence supports the inclusion of the Song of Moses in the Josianic temple discovery, but not the *exclusion* of the *legal* material. This final point, I suspect, is grounded in an attempt to ultimately harmonize Chronicles with 2 Kings. While in no way is this an unworthy goal, I argue that the validity of Chronicles must be more substantially demonstrated before it can be used as evidence for another argument, which Lundbom does here. Weinfeld finds no discrepancy between Chr and 2 Kings but relies upon source-critical arguments within 2 Kings for this: see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 70-71.

[23] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 6.

self-contained literary unit, earlier than the P source and distinct from J and E.[24] It was Samuel R. Driver (1846-1914) who brought this German scholarship to the English-speaking world in his ICC commentary, *Deuteronomy*, which used vocabulary lists to supply additional proof for de Wette and Wellhausen's ideas. By the mid-1960s, the seventh century view of Deuteronomy's composition had been widely accepted by the academy.[25] This would be elaborated upon by Lewis Bayles Paton (1864-1932) in 1928, and later, Artur Weiser (1893-1978) and Ernest W. Nicholson (1938-2013) in 1961 and 1967, respectively, by finding strong correlations between the Josianic reform detailed in 2 Kgs 23:4-20 and Deut 5-26, 28.[26]

With that being said, it may be asked, why specifically study Deut 1-11 when Deuteronomy, considered in its canonical form, has such a well-attested scholarly record of source unity? The question begins once more with Wellhausen. Building on his previous work, Wellhausen argued in 1889 that, due to its length, the canonical form of Deuteronomy could not be the *exact* document uncovered by Josiah. The document which Josiah uncovered, claimed Wellhausen, was Deut 12-26, a document which had been issued in two editions and with two separate introductions: one comprising Deut 1-4, the other 5-11.[27] S.R. Driver, who proved so effective in disseminating Wellhausen's other ideas to the English-speaking world, did not however follow him in this. According to Driver, not only did 5-11 appear to be from the same hand as 12-26, but 1-4 appeared to be from the same hand as 5-11, despite the obvious presence

---

[24] Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (New York: Meridian, 1957); Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 6.
[25] H.H. Rowley, *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy* (London: Nelson, 1963); Otto Eissfeldt, *Das Lied Moses, Deuteronomium 32, 1-43, und das Lehrgedicht Asaphs, Psalm 78, samt einer Analyse der Umgebung des Mose-Liedes* (Berlin: Akademie, 1965), 173; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 6.
[26] Lewis Bayles Paton, "The Case for the Post-Exilic Origin of Deuteronomy", *JBL* 47 (1928): 322-357; Artur Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formulation and Development*, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (New York: Association, 1961), 127-128; Nicholson, *Deuteronomy*, 3; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 7.
[27] Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1889) 191-195; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 369; J. Estlin Carpenter, "The Book of Deuteronomy", *Modern Review* 4(1883): 252-281; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 8.

of two introductory passes in 1:1-5 and 4:44-49; *ergo*, Driver found a case of source unity with minimal editorial activity in the form of superscriptions.[28] Further, Weinfeld holds that Deut 1-11 hold historical and homiletic material, while 12-26 hold legal material.[29]

Martin Noth (1902-1968) offered a solution by returning to de Wette and arguing that, if Deuteronomy was in fact the preamble to a longer historical saga, the first introduction was intended to preface that saga in its entirety, while the second had served the text of Deuteronomy as a prelude.[30] If Driver was correct, however, Noth had to contend with the singular authorship of the work, leaving the conclusion that the entire Deuteronomic saga is composed by the same hand, or at least Deuteronomy plus the prelude to the Deuteronomic saga. Noth disputed this and held the writing of the saga to be 562 BC.[31] A series of studies examining the use of second-person singular and plural pronouns considered if this pronoun variance could indicate source division in Deuteronomy, but these studies ultimately proved inconclusive, with scholarly consensus holding the differences to be rhetorical devices that did not necessarily show separate authorial hands.[32]

There is no consensus, then, regarding the relationship of Deut 1-11 with respect to the remainder of canonical Deuteronomy, or even to itself. These chapters do, however, comprise introductory material, and can be considered the introductory material *of* Deuteronomy, if not

---

[28] S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 7th ed. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1898), 71-72; Albright, *Stone Age*, 319; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 8; Nicholson, *Deuteronomy*, 18; Fohrer, *Introduction*, 171; Norbert Lohfink, *Lectures in Deuteronomy*, transcr. Sean McEvenue (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), 7; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 10.

[29] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, ix.

[30] Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup 15 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981); Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 8-9. Weinfeld notes that even if the Deuteronomistic history was composed in the exilic period, from the standpoint of genre, chapters 1-4 should be considered part of Deuteronomy itself; see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 14.

[31] Noth, *History*, 1981; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 9.

[32] Willy Staerk, *Das Deuteronomium: Sein Inhalt und seine literarische Form* (Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1894), 76-93; Carl Steurnagel, *Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums* (Halle: Krausse,1894); Gerhard von Rad, "Deuteronomy", *IDB* 1:831-838; Delbert R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*, BibOr 16 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964), 32-33; Minette de Tillesse, "Sections 'tu' et sections 'vous' dans le Deuteronomie", *VT* 12:1(1962): 29-87; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 9-10; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 15-16.

necessarily all composed specifically *for* the canonical Deuteronomic text. It is as introductory material, then, that I propose the study of Deut 1-11 in its own right.

1.3. Wisdom—General

"Wisdom" is the English word used to translate the Hebrew *ḥākmâ ḥākmâ* and the Greek *sophia*. Within the Jewish scriptures, it is most often found in Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Sir, and Wis.[33] According to Lundbom, wisdom has three prerequisites: 1) it must build on knowledge; 2) it requires discernment; and 3) it is not only information, but an acquired faculty. Wisdom may be broadly defined as "an intellectual capacity or quality of the mind enabling one to live well in the world, to succeed, and to counsel others in the way of success".[34] Wisdom emphasizes individuality, and the mutual respect between all created beings.[35] It is associated with magic and dream interpretation, but also practical skill.[36] Wisdom can be both cunning competence and practical cleverness or "street smarts".[37] Wisdom writings often feature commands, as well as pairs of opposites in parallel, and is "a postexilic phenomenon, even if its origins are in the preexilic period".[38] These parallelistic lines typically describe a useful truth about the world. They can occur as negative admonishments or as poems, but in Job often take the form of speeches.[39] As wisdom teachings describe the way life should be lived, they also allude to the presence of punishments. According to Klaus Koch (1926-2019), it is the

---

[33] Roland E. Murphy, "Wisdom in the OT", *ABD* 6:920-931; Roland E. Murphy, *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002), 1.
[34] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 44; Blank, "Wisdom", *IDB* 4:852-861.
[35] O.S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1964), 14.
[36] Gen 41:8; Exod 7:11; Dan 2:27; Exod 36:2,8; Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9429 (e-copy).
[37] 2 Sam 13:3; 2 Sam 14:2. Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9429-9430.
[38] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9430.
[39] J. Crenshaw, "Wisdom" in *Old Testament Form Criticism*, ed. J.H. Hayes (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1974), 253-255; Murphy, *Tree*, 4.

disinterested orderliness of the world that, according to the governing principles of wisdom teachings, administers punishment.[40] Hartmut Gese, however, claims that this theory is more akin to ANE thought in general, and wisdom ideas in Israel do not remove a personal God from the equation, who is personal from the beginning.[41] This conforms to David Daube who asserts that, while wisdom teachings are predominantly concerned with life in the world, the religious element always undergirds and enables them.[42] Another well-known wisdom motif is the care for widows and orphans.[43] Wisdom texts also warn against bribery.[44] They also warn against the temptations brought on by satiety and wealth.[45] A prominent warning in wisdom teachings is the addition or subtraction of words, seen in Prov and Qoh, then later in Sir. This is possibly (but disputedly) found in *Instructions of Ptah-Hotep*: "Neither add a word nor detract, and exchange not one for another". Additional evidence is found in Mesopotamian literature: "It was revealed to him in the night, and when he spoke in the morning he did not leave out a single line, nor did he add one to it".[46] It should be noted that these admonishments are *not* to be grouped under covenantalism.[47]

Wisdom teachings have many possible origins: royal patronage, families, tribal communities. According to Stuart Weeks, royal patronage is unlikely as there is no real

---

[40] K. Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?", in *Theodicy in the Old Testament*, IRT 4 (London: SPCK, 1983).
[41] H. Gese, *Lehre und Wirklichkeit in der alten Weisheit* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1958), 45.
[42] David Daube, "The Culture of Deuteronomy", *Orita* 3(1969): 27-52; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 44.
[43] Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 278; C. Fensham, "Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature", *JNES* 21:2 (1962), 129.
[44] Job 15:34; Prov 17:23; Qoh 7:7; Weinfeld, *School*, 279.
[45] Prov 30:8-9; Job 21:7-15; 22:17-18.
[46] See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 261-262; J. Leipoldt and S. Morenz, *Heilige Schriften: Betrachtungen zur Religionsgeschichte der antiken Mittelmeerwelt* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1953), 56; Z. Žába, *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep, Texte, Traduction et Commentaire* (Éd. de l'Acad. Tchécoslovaque des Sciences: Prague, 1956); S. Morenz, *Ägyptische Religion*, Die Religionen der Menscheit, Bd.8 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1960), 235; W.G. Lambert, "The Fifth Tablet of the Era Epic", *Iraq* 24 (1962), 122, ll.43-44.
[47] Weinfeld, *School*, 262.

evidence to support this claim.[48] Roland Murphy writes that wisdom teachings likely originated in families and tribes, again due to the practicality of wisdom, and were originally transmitted orally.[49] Wisdom teachings describe the real condition of the world, but are not uniquely Israelite, being seen in other ANE cultures.[50] This is best illustrated by the lack of wisdom teachings in those uniquely Israelite origin stories, the patriarchal histories.[51] However, the Israelites did not draw bright lines between wisdom teachings and patriarchal literature. According to Gerhard von Rad (1901-1971), it is correct to imagine Israel shaped by on the one hand "pan-sacralism", a term coined by Martin Buber (1878-1965) that describes the presence of God at all times in everyday life, and on the other the mundane wisdom teachings, designed to assist the Israelite become successful when no divine intervention appeared imminent, or at best "to help those who help themselves", showing that "divine intervention and human independence ... are *always* [sic] operative in the biblical story".[52] This shows that wisdom is fundamentally religious, for the fear of יהוה is the beginning of wisdom.[53] Has wisdom always been religious? According to William McKane, no: Proverbs began as pragmatic advice to assist rulers. But according to von Rad, wisdom teachings cannot emerge from a non-religious background in which humanity tries to position itself in the divinely ordered world. Internal evidence within Proverbs, as well as comparative ANE evidence, tends to support von Rad.[54]

Wisdom is meant to find useful, practical advice for everyday life, and postulates that the world possesses orderliness despite its seeming unpredictability. This underlying order allows

---

[48] Stuart Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 56.
[49] Murphy, *Tree*, 4.
[50] One example is the Assyro-Babylonian *Ahikar*; see R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, vol.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913), 715-784. There are many other Egyptian examples; see Rankin, *Wisdom*, 7.
[51] Gerhard von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Norwich: SCM Press, 1972), 6.
[52] von Rad, *Wisdom*, 59; Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9432.
[53] Prov 9:10; John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 3-4.
[54] Weeks, *Wisdom*, 19; Collins, *Wisdom*, 3.

these practical strategies to be reliably implemented, as these strategies are grounded in a belief that not only is there such a thing as "the way the world is" but that these strategies beneficially cooperate with this order.[55] This orderliness is also seen in lists of worldly phenomena, such as found in Job 38-41, which have ANE analogs in other ancient onomastic lists which provided compilations of disparate areas of knowledge.[56] Wisdom writings often feature commands, as well as pairs of opposites in parallel, and is "a postexilic phenomenon, even if its origins are in the preexilic period".[57] These parallelistic lines typically describe a useful truth about the world. They can occur as negative admonishments or as poems, but in Job often take the form of speeches.[58]

Wisdom's practicality is explained by Oliver S. Rankin (1885-1954) as an effect of the wisdom writings taking principal interest in the life of humanity. Because humans must make decisions and exert moral agency, a literature exists to assess the multiplicity of scenarios in which this agency must be taken.[59] Although the presence of "Lady Wisdom" stands in contrast to this principle, it might be said that the protagonist of the wisdom teachings is the individual human being.[60] This also differentiates wisdom teachings from apocalyptic and prophecy, which emphasize the irruption of divine actions into the sphere of humanity.[61]

It may seem far-fetched to claim that this sense of cosmic order can be ascertained in what might seem, at first inspection, as a laundry list of well-meaning advice. However, two arguments can be levied against this. First, it is possible to over-mystify the sense of "cosmic

---

[55] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9430. Although Sir will extol the life of the scribe, the Jewish wisdom writings are unique in their ennobling of *all* humans, not just literate professions. See Rankin, *Wisdom*, 8-9.
[56] Weinfeld, *School*, 258.
[57] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9430.
[58] J. Crenshaw, "Wisdom" in *Old Testament Form Criticism*, ed. J.H. Hayes (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1974), 253-255; Murphy, *Tree*, 4.
[59] See Rankin, *Wisdom*, 5.
[60] See below for more on "Lady Wisdom"; Rankin, *Wisdom*, 3.
[61] Rankin, *Wisdom*, 3-4.

order" that definitions of wisdom often invoke. The orderliness of the world need be no more and no less that the predictable regularity that ensures the efficacy of any advice. When the authors wish to assert more, they do so in plain language (e.g. Prov 8-9, Job 38-41). Second, the use of comparable wisdom texts in Egyptian and Mesopotamian school settings when the students' vernacular was an entirely different language suggests that the texts were believed to have more than a mundane salutary effect, and that they were "intended to show their readers how to reach a greater attunement with the social and world order, and thus improve themselves".[62] This in turn shows early affinities between the wisdom teachings and the phenomenon of *mûsar/paideia* (below).

Wisdom may also be compared to the covenant with respect to the tablets which Moses received on Horeb/Sinai. These Decalogal tablets present apodeictic laws, easily understood and morally monochromatic.[63] Whereas the rules of the Decalogue are relatively few in number, the principles of wisdom, such as those given in Proverbs, are extensive and provide situational advice.

1.4. Wisdom—Theological Aspects

According to Walther Zimmerli (1907-1983), wisdom theology is creation theology: "The command to be fruitful and have dominion is the divine authorization for the wisdom enterprise of going out to master the world" is a trend of wisdom teachings but not covenantalism.[64] These discrepancies and seeming incompatibilities between wisdom and

[62] Weeks, *Wisdom*, 19.
[63] Deut 5; Exod 20; Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9437.
[64] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9435; W. Zimmerli, "The Place and the Limit of Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology", *SJT* 17:146-158. Murphy cites Gerhard von Rad as opposing wisdom and covenant teachings

covenant are best described by the relationality of God, actively present in the lives of humans like Job.[65] It should also be noted that the Noahic covenant is a fundamentally "creationist" covenant, recreating the world arguably more solidly than the original creation as it features a promise not to again flood the earth. It also has rules to be obeyed, as does the creation narrative in Gen 1-3. Wisdom teachings require a more complex understanding of morality than what is given in the Decalogue, a sentiment congruent with the conviction that the tablets of the law are covenantal, a position typically opposed to wisdom.[66] Also, God is required to obtain knowledge and wisdom; this sentiment underlies the emerging idea that God-given Torah is wisdom.[67] Wisdom is mysteriously and uniquely personified as "Lady Wisdom"; this figure is interpreted with great diversity, from a personification of the divine wisdom of God to a personification of the world-order. For Ben Sira, this personification will also subsume Torah.[68]

Another important theological concern of wisdom is immortality. The reason to implement wisdom is always to have a long and good life.[69] Death is still a problem, however, and leads to considerations of theodicy: how can the wise and unwise die alike? These ideas are more closely addressed in Dan and 2 Macc with the doctrine of the resurrection, and Qumran materials attest that the just are with the angels.[70]

---

in "The Theological Problem of the Old Testament Doctrine of Creation" in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd, 1966), 143, but he seems to align the creation *with* covenant, not against it. See Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9435; also Murphy, *Tree*, 1.

[65] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9436.

[66] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9437.

[67] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9435-9436.

[68] von Rad, *Wisdom*, 244.

[69] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9440.

[70] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9440; 1QS 11:8-9; 1QHod 3:20-22; 11:10-14.

1.5. *Mûsar/Paideia*

Mûsar, the participial form of *yāsār*, is almost always translated "discipline" in English. Its Greek equivalent, *paideia*, is used to translate *mûsar* throughout the LXX. *Mûsar/paideia* is found in Deut 4:36; 8:5; 11:2; Prov 19:18; 29:17; 13:1; 3:11-12; and Job 5:17. *Mûsar* is related to *sur*, which means "to turn from the right path".[71] The Hebrew word *mûsar*, or "discipline/instruction", appears often in the wisdom corpus. It appears in Deuteronomy 11:2: "Remember today that it was not your children (who have not known or seen the discipline (*mûsar*) of יהוה your God), but it is you who must acknowledge his greatness, his mighty hand and his outstretched arm". This idea is pursued more generally in Deut 11:18-21, which promotes the constant self-reflection and inculcation that will ingrain the Torah within the people of Israel:

> You shall put these words of mine in your heart and soul, and you shall bind them as a sign on your hand, and fix them as an emblem on your forehead. Teach them to your children, talking about them when you are at home and when you are away, when you lie down and when you rise.Write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates, so that your days and the days of your children may be multiplied in the land that יהוה swore to your ancestors to give them, as long as the heavens are above the earth.

There are many areas of overlap between *mûsar/paideia* and wisdom, enough to wonder whether any separation is warranted. According to Roger N. Whybray (1923-1998), however, one cannot

[71] Weinfeld, *School*, 304.

merely equate *mûsar* to *ḥākmâ*, and thus it demands separate consideration.[72] Moshe Weinfeld (1925-2009) writes that *mûsar/paideia* is embedded within wisdom, yet it also arises from covenantal ideas, and it is often difficult to determine which is the origin point: "It seems that in order to strengthen the Israelite loyalty to the covenant the author of Deuteronomy not only relied on covenant typology but also employed modes of expression and imagery taken from the sapiential sphere".[73] Further, *mûsar/paideia* warrants consideration apart from wisdom teachings in Second Temple authors because the Hellenistic conquest of Judaea introduced new methods of education which impacted these authors, many of whom received a hybridized training that incorporated Jewish and Greek ideas.

The fear of יהוה is a crucial concept for understanding not only wisdom but also *mûsar/paideia*. Proverbs states that "the way of the fool is right in his own eyes, but a wise man listens to advice".[74] Further, *mûsar* is found as a gloss for "fear of יהוה " in Prov 15:33.[75] This shows that wisdom often involves an element of learning and that the learning process may not be pleasant as is shown by the somewhat negative connotations of *mûsar*. To "fear יהוה " shows an awareness of God's power, but also the possibility of wrong human action and a corresponding punishment on God's part. This "fear of יהוה " is uniquely fundamental to the Israelite way of knowledge.[76] Another area of overlap between wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* is long life, as shown by Deut 6:24 and Prov 10:27.[77]

---

[72] R.N. Whybray, *The Intellectual Tradition of the Old Testament*, BZAW 135 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974), 128.
[73] Weinfeld, *School*, 298.
[74] RSV; Weinfeld, *School*, 274.
[75] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9436; also from the foregoing, "adversity is also *musar*, a father's discipline" (Prov 3:11-12).
[76] M. Barré, "'Fear of God' and the World View of Wisdom", *BTB* 11:2 (1981): 41-43; von Rad, *Wisdom*, 67.
[77] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 299: Weinfeld provides Ps 34:12-13 as reference, but Deut 6:24 is, to my mind, a more convincing piece of evidence.

The theme of education naturally proceeds from these understandings of *mûsar/paideia*, which show that "discipline" will produce good results. In the literature, this is shown as familial, with parents teaching their children.[78] The parental role is critical, as in Prov 4:5: *mûsar* as discipline and *torah* as "teaching" not to be confused with the Torah later attributed to wisdom by Ben Sira.[79] It is interesting that while Deut 1-11 specifies that the father must instruct, the mother appears also in later portions of Deuteronomy (21:18) and motherly instruction is well-attested in Proverbs (1:8; 6:20; 10:1; 15:20; 19:26; 23:22-25; 30:17). The presence of motherly instruction discourages associating these father-son texts as also demonstrating a school setting.[80]

This is a view of education as permanent and transformative: "constant awareness of the educational ideal is demanded from the son-student ... the student should always be conscious of his lore, regardless of the situation in which he finds himself".[81] Weinfeld continues, showing this permanence symbolized in the Deuteronomic inscription on doorposts and binding on the body (Deut 6:8-9; 11:18).[82] Yet covenants can also include these motifs of constant awareness.[83] Much of wisdom can be considered "moral catechesis", a type of training, as opposed to the tablets of law.[84] This again reinforces the idea that *mûsar*/*paideia* is concerned not with the formal content of education, but the education process itself; the methods by which information is absorbed and produces a change in the learner. This can apply to verbal content, such as speeches, stories, laws, etc., but also to habits and physical practices. In the cases above,

---

[78] Deut 6:6-9; 11:18-20; Prov 6:20-22; 7:3; 8:34.
[79] Murphy, *Tree*, 3.
[80] Weeks, *Wisdom*, 15.
[81] Weinfeld, *School*, 299.
[82] Weinfeld, *School*, 299-301; this Deuteronomic reference is not dependent on Exodus as specific rites are not mentioned, figurative meanings are explicitly noted in Deuteronomy, and the physical markers of Exodus are replaced with figurative bindings.
[83] *KUB* 26.25:6'ff; trans. H. Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963), 4; *VTE* ll.198-199; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 302.
[84] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9437; Murphy, *Tree*, 2-3.

mûsar/paideia references the means by which the terms of these covenants are continually remembered by the parties to whom the covenants apply.

The idea of the teacher, administrator of discipline, and exhorter is well attested in Deuteronomy. According to von Rad, Deuteronomy is not the law, precisely, but an exhortation concerning the law with strong parenetic intent.[85] The statement that Deut is not the law opens the question, however, whether we should view "the law" as only the giving of the covenant at Sinai or including its restatement by Moses at Moab. At any rate, the element of exhortation and the presentation of Moses as an active and involved teacher are key elements of Deut 1-11.

1.6. Deut 1-11 and Wisdom, *Mûsar/Paideia*

How is Deut 1-11 related to wisdom teachings? Deuteronomy is not wisdom literature, but is influenced by it.[86] The mere presence of words or a special vocabulary does not constitute a wisdom influence.[87] There are many words translated as "wisdom": *təbūnā, bīnā, daʿat, məzimmā*. .[88] According to Weinfeld, Deuteronomy did not influence the wisdom writings, as was once believed, but rather the wisdom writings which exert influence on Deuteronomy. This is due to the demonstrably ancient origins of the wisdom traditions. Weinfeld also mentions that, should Deuteronomy have influenced the wisdom writings, it is likely that it would have

[85] von Rad, 1953, 15; but see Lohfink above, 1963b, 1976, 229; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 22.
[86] Murphy, "Wisdom", 6:9440; J. Crenshaw, "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon "Historical' Literature", *JBL* 88:2 (1969): 129-142; D. Morgan, *Wisdom in the Old Testament Traditions* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 1981).
[87] R.B.Y. Scott, *The Way of Wisdom* (New York: Macmillan, 1971), 121; criticized in Whybray, *Intellectual Tradition*, 121-149.
[88] von Rad, *Wisdom*, 53; his transliteration given here

influenced wisdom writings in other parts of the world, as well as the absence of henotheistic, religio-national sentiments found within Deuteronomy.[89]

That being said, certain wisdom themes are identifiable within Deut 1-11. One theme may be found at Deut 1:9-18, which features the presence of wise men. According to Weinfeld: "magistrates and leaders must possess intellectual qualities: wisdom understanding and knowledge, traits which characterize the leader and magistrate in wisdom literature also. Thus 'by me kings reign and rulers declare what is just; by me princes rule, and nobles govern the earth' (Prov. 8:15-16)."[90]

In Deut 1:17 there is an emphasis on fair judgment.[91] Deut 4:5-6 gives:

> Behold, I have taught you statutes and ordinances, as יהוה my God commanded me, that you should do them in the land which you are entering to take possession of it. Keep them and do them; for that will be your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the peoples who, when they hear all these statutes, will say, 'Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people'.

According to Weinfeld this shows the same motivation seen elsewhere, as in Sir, to identify Torah with wisdom, as well as the result of (in his view) a scribal apparatus in the seventh-century that enabled the production of wisdom literature and fostered a wisdom

[89] Weinfeld, *School*, 260-261, 297.
[90] Weinfeld, *School*, 244-245.
[91] Also Prov 24:23; Weinfeld, *School*, 273.

culture.[92] Weinfeld also notes the phrase "abomination of יהוה ", found only in Proverbs and Deuteronomy and used in other ANE contexts to describe those who fall within the category of "foolish" or "unwise" and their actions.[93] There is also, as seen above, the provision of long life.[94] According to Norbert Lohfink (1928-2024), Deuteronomy is a text with many affinities to wisdom literature, acting as an archive for traditional maxims.[95]

We therefore find the following wisdom themes within Deut 1-11: comparison of Israel to the nations, a type of parallel, also found within two kinds of people (the perverse and the upright); the abomination of foolishness, and the connection of this to idolatry found in Deut 7:25-26; the importance of choice or human independence, expressed in the need for taking right action; the requirement of the whole heart's involvement; the practicality of the teaching; the need to fear and obey God; mastery of the world including material blessings, but also the temptations these blessings, and wealth generally, can bring; cunning and streetwise knowledge; the danger of adding and subtracting words; provision for the vulnerable of society, namely widows and orphans; and the long life that will result from implementing Moses's teaching in Deuteronomy.

Mûsar/paideia within Deut 1-11 is represented by the presentation of Moses as a teacher, exhorting and instructing; the possibility of punishment for disobedience, and the presence of shame; the involvement of parents in their children's instruction; and the emphasis on regular, systematic inculcation as an educative method.

---

[92] Weinfeld, *School*, 256; *Deuteronomy*, 64; for more on this see Weeks, who opposes scribalism, and Jamieson-Drake, who supports through archaeological evidence but assumes Jerusalem is a scribal center (above).
[93] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 62-63.
[94] Prov 3:16; Weinfeld, *School*, 257.
[95] Lohfink, 1963b, 1976, 209; Lohfink, however, holds to a court-centered view which will be countered by Weeks, *Wisdom*; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 23.

There is some overlap between the themes, just as there is overlap between wisdom themes and *mûsar/paideia*, a subset of wisdom. One example is obedience, an important theme for wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* alike. However, it may be said that the emphasis on parental instruction , regular inculcation, and chastisement may be seen as principally themes of *mûsar/paideia*, whereas the orderliness of the world and the need to master it, practicality of advice, punishment that is not delivered with a view toward future improvement, provision of life, division of reality into pairs, and the importance of choice, as well as the ability to choose, are principally themes of wisdom.

1.7. Covenant—General

The Hebrew *bəriyṭ* is universally given as "covenant" in English translations. *Bəriyṭ* is difficult to precisely define due to its proliferation in a large variety of contexts. Prominent uses of *bəriyṭ* include, Gen 6:18 (the Noahic covenant, also 9:9-17); Gen 15:18 (the land covenant with Abram/Abraham); Gen 17:2-21 (the covenant of fecundity and circumcision); Gen 21:27-32 (resolution of a well dispute between Abraham and Abimelech); Gen 26:28 (a truce between Isaac and Abimelech, secured with a well); Gen 31:44 (farewell benedictions and assurance of peace between Jacob and Laban); Exod 19:5, 34:27-28 (the Sinaitic covenant, inscribed on tablets); Exod 34:12 (covenants between Israel and surrounding nations, here forbidden).

There are several references to covenant in Exod which allude to the previous covenant made with Abraham ensuring the future prosperity of Israel (2:24; 6:4; 6:5). Many references in Lev likewise allude to this covenant (Lev 26:9, 42-45), but the Sinaitic covenant also appears to be in view (Lev 26:15, 25). Num 10:33 is the first appearance of the "ark of the covenant". In

this case, *bəriyṭ* again references the tablets of the Sinaitic covenant which are stored within the ark. There are also priestly uses of *bəriyṭ*; a "covenant of salt" is mentioned in Lev 2:13, Num 18:19, and 2 Chr 13:5 as a liturgical operation, and Num 25:12-13 describes the zeal of Eleazar and the covenant of eternal priesthood which is made with him because of this zeal.

Within Deut there are 27 mentions of *bəriyṭ*, a total only rivaled, within the Pentateuch, by Gen which has 23 mentions. These mentions within Deut almost uniformly reference the Sinaitic covenant, excepting Deut 4:31, 7:12, and 8:18 (the patriarchal/Abrahamic covenants); and 7:2 (covenants with surrounding nations, again forbidden). All of these exceptions, it should be noted, occur within Deut 1-11, making the differentiation between covenants a key issue of this pericope. There are also priestly uses of *bəriyṭ*: a "covenant of salt" is mentioned in Lev 2:13, Num 18:19, and 2 Chr 13:5 as a liturgical operation; Lev 24:8 describes a covenant of priestly ceremony; and Num 25:12-13 describes the zeal of Eleazar and the covenant of eternal priesthood which is made with him because of this zeal.

Bəriyṭ continues to be used with great frequency in the historical and prophetic literature. In Josh, the word occurs typically with reference to the "ark of the covenant" (3:3,6,8,11, *et al.*). The alliance with the Hivites (9:6-16) excepted, all other references in Josh make mention of this Sinaitic covenant; Josh 24:25 retells Joshua's having recorded the continued involvement of the Israelites with the Sinaitic covenant. These senses of the covenant as Sinaitic, including the "ark of the covenant", persist throughout Judg and 1 Sam 4:5; the use of *bəriyṭ* to characterize international alliances will also continue through these chapters. It is not until 1 Sam 18:3 that interpersonal covenants like those witnessed between Abraham, Isaac, and the two Abimelechs reappear, this time between David and Jonathan as a covenant of radical friendship (1 Sam 18:3). This emphasis on interpersonal covenants continues throughout the David narrative until 2 Sam

23:5, in which David mentions an "everlasting covenant", traditionally understood to reference the establishment of the Davidic dynasty in perpetuity found in 2 Sam 7.

These uses of *bəriyṭ* will continue largely unchanged from the Succession Narrative to Ezra-Nehemiah. The Sinaitic covenant is frequently referenced, as are interpersonal alliances. Solomon conflates the Davidic and Sinaitic covenants in 1 Kgs 8:21-23, and the patriarchal/Abrahamic covenants are once more mentioned in 2 Kgs 13:23. The nature of the Davidic dynasty as a covenant is reaffirmed in 2 Chr 21:7. In Ezra 10:3, the resolution to divorce foreign wives is characterized as a covenant. Excepting these, however, the remainder of references point to earlier uses of *bəriyṭ*, most notably with respect to the Sinaitic covenant and interpersonal alliances.

To sum up, it can be said that according to the Jewish scriptures, *bəriyṭ* may be defined as an agreement between two parties.[96] These parties may be divine or human; these agreements may or may not have performative stipulations. Most biblical covenants are between divine and human parties. Further, explicit conditions only occur in the Noahic, patriarchal, and Sinaitic covenants, although many other covenants carry implicit conditions (*e.g.*, Ezra 10:3, the Davidic covenant in 2 Sam 7:11-16).

[96] See Moshe Weinfeld, "*b^{e}rith*", *TDOT* 2:253-279; for a contrary opinion and more expansive view of *berith* see James Barr, "Some Semantic Notes on Covenant", in *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. Herbert Donner, Robert Hanhart, and Rudolf Smend (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977): 23-38.

1.8. Covenant—Deut 1-11

The background literature on covenant is vast and cannot be exhaustively delineated here. Therefore, I will focus on essential studies and those particularly relevant to Deuteronomy 1-11 and the Second Temple period.[97]

Much of Deuteronomic scholarship regarding the covenant addresses the issue of dating, and vacillates between the late second millennium and the seventh century BCE. Modern scholarship on the covenant begins with Wellhausen, who described covenant as a later addition to a more primitive religious sensibility.[98] This was sharply opposed by Walther Eichrodt (1890-1978), who viewed covenant far more benevolently and an integral, indigenous element within the religion of Israel.[99] This view would find support in the work of George E. Mendenhall (1916-2016), who combined ANE archaeological findings concerning Hittite covenant treaties with the ongoing discussion of biblical covenant, and by doing so would set a trend that by now is well-ensconced.[100] By using Hittite treaties, however, Mendenhall effectively dated the composition of Deuteronomy much earlier than the current scholarly consensus of the time; it would fall to Dennis McCarthy (1924-1983) to establish affinities with Deuteronomic covenants and Assyrian treaty documents of the seventh century.[101] Simultaneously, Meredith Kline (1922-2007) would concur with Mendenhall and present the Deuteronomic covenants once more in the context of the second millenium.[102] Rintje Frankena (1925-1974) would next present a study

---

[97] For more on this topic, see John Bergsma, "Covenant", https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780195393361, to which I am much indebted.
[98] Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Edinburgh: A & C Black, 1885).
[99] Walther Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: J.C. Heinrichs, 1933-1939).
[100] G.E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh, PA: Biblical Colloquium, 1955).
[101] Dennis J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963).
[102] Meredith Kline, *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963).

providing strong evidence in favor of a late dating of Deuteronomy in the seventh century, again relying upon Assyrian treaty documents.[103] Weinfeld used Frankena's findings to support his own claim for a seventh-century dating of Deuteronomy, likewise based in Assyrian treaty documents.[104] According to Weinfeld, the Assyrian treaty form is especially relevant to Deuteronomy as it occurs between a lord and vassal, not between sovereign states as is characteristic of Hittite treaties.[105]

This was followed by Ernest W. Nicholson, who tried to reorient the scholarly discussion to Wellhausen's perspective by diminishing the current controversy over ANE covenant texts which presupposed the similarities between Deuteronomy and the covenant treaties, a position Nicholson opposed.[106] Taking something of a different stance is Carly Crouch, who argues that, irrespective of the Assyrian influence on Deuteronomic covenant, the similarities cannot be intentional attempts to engage with and criticize the Assyrian rulers.[107]

Taking a more theological stance in this debate, William Moran (1921-2000) would present the Deuteronomic phrase "love of God" as specifically covenantal in its implications, signifying not a modern sense of affective love but a vassal's fidelity to a lord.[108] Also avoiding the issue of dating and taking a more theological approach, David Noel Freedman (1922-2008) divided covenants into two camps: those in which more powerful entities bind less powerful

---

[103] Rintje Frankena, "The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy", *OTS* 14 (1965): 122-154.
[104] Moshe Weinfeld, *School*, 60-61; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 6-7.
[105] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 9.
[106] Ernest W. Nicholson, *God and his People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986). This opposition is due to his failure to acknowledge the Assyrian influence on the covenant, according to Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy*, 9).
[107] Carly Crouch, *Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon, and the Nature of Subversion*, SBLANEM 8 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).
[108] William M. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy", *CBQ* 25 (1963): 77-87. Dennis J. McCarthy would later expand this to include fathers and sons, relevant for discussions of *musar/paideia*: see "Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy and the Father-Son Relationship between Yahweh and Israel", *CBQ* 27 (1965): 144-148; see also F.C. Fensham, "Father and Son as Terminology for Treaty and Covenant", in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. H. Goedicke (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1971): 121-135.

ones, and those in which more powerful entities bind themselves to lesser ones in something like a suspension of power. This presupposes, of course, that all covenants are between parties unequal in status, a problematic conclusion; but from the standpoint of divine-human covenants, as well as the ANE covenants so prominent in the debate, Freedman's observations are useful.[109] There are tensions in Deuteronomy between the apparent inalienability of the patriarchal/Abrahamic covenants and the Sinaitic covenant's stipulations; these are addressed and simultaneously confirmed by William J. Dumbrell (1926-2016).[110]

Many scholarly works which examine covenantalism also consider the covenant within Second Temple contexts. Very early, Klaus Baltzer (1928-2017) produced a literary form-critical study that accounted for the development of covenant, as a literary form, in the Second Temple period.[111] Later, Lothar Perlitt (1930-2012) would argue that mentions of covenant within Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history were the chronologically earliest, relying upon source-critical views of the other Pentateuchal works. This would shift the emphasis of covenantal thought from the ANE covenantal analogs that had, in the minds of many, preceded the covenant language in the Jewish scriptures, and reorient the discussion within a Second Temple milieu.[112] Not long after, E. P. Sanders (1937-2022) argued for "covenantal nomism", in which Second Temple Jews believed themselves to be covenantally included by gracious default and remained within that covenant through obedience.[113] S. David Sperling would then continue

---

[109] David Noel Freedman, "Divine Commitment and Human Obligation", *Interpretation* 18 (1964): 419-431. Following in this is Delbert R. Hillers who concurs with Freedman but finds covenant in Essene communities. See Hillers, "Covenant", *The Encyclopedia of Religion* 4:133-137.

[110] William J. Dumbrell, "The Prospect of Unconditionality in the Sinaitic Covenant", in *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*, ed. Avraham Gileadi (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988), 141-155.

[111] Klaus Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*, WMANT 4 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960).

[112] Lothar Perlitt, *Bundestheologie in Alten Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969).

[113] E.P. Sanders, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism", in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies*, vol. 1, eds. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 11-44.

this idea and present the covenant as gracious not only by way of inclusion but maintenance, arguing for unconditional and perpetual covenantal inclusion in the exilic and Second Temple period.[114] Given the turbulent political climate of the period, the land-possession component of the covenant became diminished in the Second Temple period according to Betsy Halpern-Amaru.[115] James VanderKam observes the importance of covenant at Qumran, as does Bilhah Nitzan who especially focuses on the dichotomy between determinism and free will in the Qumran materials.[116] William Horbury examines additional Second Temple literature, centering on the role of Moses as a covenant mediator.[117] More specifically, Otto Kaiser (1924-2017) looks at covenant in Sir.[118] Richard Bautch performs a motivic study on covenant in the Second Temple period, arguing that creational, penitential, and kinship motifs allow for cultural survival among Second Temple Jews and proselytes.[119]

Of special note is Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo's edited volume *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. This is an ideal anthology for our purposes, and has many important contributions. Many of these articles address covenant at Qumran: Craig A. Evans addresses covenant at Qumran in a general sense; Martin G. Abegg notes the unifying quality of the covenant in the Jewish scriptures extant at Qumran, as well as the presence of the priestly covenant and covenant renewal; and Michael O. Wise considers the

---

[114] S. David Sperling, "Rethinking Covenant in Late Biblical Books", *Biblica* 70 (1989): 50-73.
[115] B. Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994).
[116] James C. VanderKam, "Covenant", in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol.1, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 151-154; Bilhah Nitzan, "The Concept of the Covenant in Qumran Literature", in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-32 January 1999*, eds. David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz (Leiden: Brill, 2001): 163-176.
[117] William Horbury, "Moses and the Covenant in *The Assumption of Moses* and the Pentateuch", in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E.W. Nicholson*, eds. A.D.H. Mayes and R.B. Salters (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 191-208.
[118] Otto Kaiser, "Covenant and Law in Ben Sira", in *Covenant as Context*, 235-260.
[119] Richard Bautch, *Glory and Power, Ritual and Relationship: The Sinai Covenant in the Postexilic Period*, LHBOTS 471 (London: T & T Clark, 2009).

new covenant as found in 1QHymns, especially the compositional and literary implications of *bəriyṭ* therein.[120]

According to Weinfeld, Deuteronomy narrates the creation of a "second covenant", much as Deuteronomy itself means "second law" or "Second Torah", a covenant which while identical in its terms to the Sinaitic covenant was only ratified by Israel at Moab.[121] Weinfeld attributes Deut 7:13-15 to ancient tribal configurations, drawing upon von Rad's work with amphictyony. Covenant is also critically important to understanding the literary relationship which the authors of the Deuteronomistic history had with the land of Judaea. This land, according to the earliest pentateuchal texts, was given to Abraham and his descendants unconditionally, as was the Davidic covenant to be held in perpetuity. Once Judah was taken into exile, however, an explanation was needed, and as a theological solution the Sinai and land covenants were combined, to produce conditionality in the land covenant and to create a reason why the exile occurred; the disobedience of Israel.[122]

1.9. Method

1.9.1. Introduction: Deut 1-11 and Textuality

I will primarily rely upon what may be considered biblical exegesis, with the caveat that the term "biblical" in the Second Temple is imprecise, as our knowledge of canonicity at that time is scanty at best. Perhaps the phrase "Deuteronomic exegesis" is better, as I will be tracing

[120] Craig A. Evans, "Covenant in the Qumran Literature", in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSupp 71, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 55-80; Martin G. Abegg, "The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians", in *Concept of the Covenant*, 81-98; Michael O. Wise, "The Concept of a New Covenant in the Teacher Hymns from Qumran (1QH^a x-xvii)", in *Concept of the Covenant*, 99-128.
[121] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 1.
[122] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 58.

the presence of Deuteronomy within the texts of the chosen Second Temple authors. This exegesis will on occasion make use of philological and linguistic techniques as circumstances warrant. But I will chiefly use literary means, as my comparisons of Deuteronomy and the Second Temple authors will be localized in the vicinity of the three motifs of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant.

In certain circumstances, a given work may engage with a theme so significantly that it requires special treatment, such as in the cases of Ben Sira and wisdom or Josephus's unusual treatment of covenant. In other cases, a work may engage with Deuteronomy so significantly that to restrict my examination to the three principal themes would do that work a great disservice, and in these cases I permit myself the luxury of examining the text more fully. This thesis may also be considered to employ historical exegesis, in that I will be asking the question of *why* it was that these authors interpreted Deuteronomy the ways that they did and seeking to find the answers to these questions rooted in the circumstances surrounding these authors. It is to these circumstances that I will appeal when proposing explanations for their Deuteronomic interpretations. Perhaps, as in the case of 1 Maccabees, these explanations will have historical explanations; whereas in the case of the Qumran materials, differing interpretations will be motivated by theological considerations. In the case of Philo, no observations can be made without taking into account his employment of the Hellenistic practice of allegorical interpretation to explain certain seemingly difficult passages of the Jewish scriptures, as well as the Hellenistic education which provided Philo with not only this interpretive technique, but also a philosophical framework.

In this thesis I am comparing the quite stable, "canonical" form of Deuteronomy 1-11 to Second Temple documents which include Deuteronomic material in their own content.[123] Timothy Lim suggests caution, or outright rejection, of the concept of a "final form" of Deuteronomy. This is largely motivated by an acknowledgement of the rich textual history that is evident in Deuteronomy. For example, the full text of Deuteronomy does not present a single narrative perspective, but instead presents the majority of the text from the perspective of Moses, at the eastern shore of the river, while the subsequently added postscript is written from the standpoint of a narrator situated at the western shore.[124] The history of the book itself, as attested in Hebrew Scriptures, provides more evidence for editorial alteration, beginning with its origins as a law code that emerges in the reign of Josiah, extending to its adaptation as the prelude of the "Deuteronomistic History" written during the exile and its final priestly recasting as the culmination of the Pentateuch.[125]

However, in other respects Lim's observations are not supported with substantial evidence. As he admits, Qumran texts reproduce the proto-Masoretic text type almost exclusively; while he claims that "there are individual readings of verses in the fragments that corroborate the Septuagintal variants or have affinities to the expansionistic tendencies of the Samaritan Pentateuch", these Septuagintal variants are not visible in the Göttingen critical edition, which present a Greek translation virtually identical to the Masoretic. Lim does acknowledge the present of a Greek variant in cave 4, but this is a single specimen in comparison to the thirty-four Deuteronomy scrolls discovered at Qumran. Further, while much variance is in evidence among Septuagintal copies, the uniformity of the Göttingen edition suggests that these

[123] By "canonical" I mean that Second Temple authors used a uniform text of Deuteronomy. Whether or not an intentionally determined "canon" existed at all remains a matter of debate and the use of this term, without qualification, incurs a high risk of anachronism.
[124] Timothy Lim, "Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period", in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*, LNTS 358 (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 9.
[125] Lim, "Deuteronomy", 8.

variants should be construed as scribal idiosyncrasies, not representative of established, alternative textual traditions. It should also be noted that when Lim later examines two notable examples—Deut 32:8 and 33:12—both of these excerpts fall outside the bounds of this study which is concerned with Deut 1-11.[126] Yet reworkings and syntheses with other biblical manuscripts may be observed in texts which quote Deuteronomic excerpts, combining them with other biblical passages. One such example is the "All Souls" Deuteronomy text which shows a juxtaposition of the forms of the Decalogue as recorded in Exodus and Deuteronomy.[127]

1.9.2. Deuteronomy: Quotations, Allusions, and Intertextuality

We can, then, view Deuteronomy 1-11 as a shared text, interpreted by the Jewish diaspora, and need not consider variant forms of Deuteronomy 1-11 when analyzing secondary documents generated as responses to, or influenced by, Deuteronomy 1-11. As might be expected, the authors of these secondary documents are not scholars or critics in the modern sense. Sometimes they write as historians, seeking to depict events not merely to inform the reader but in many cases—most notably Josephus—to achieve more subtle ends, typically to justify changes in power regimes or defend authoritative institutions already in place. Other times they write as philosophers, expounding detailed guidelines on the events which predictably and reliably occur in the world, as well as the divine foundations of these events. Justified by the teachings of the Jewish scriptures, they offer sage advice, or wisdom, to those who strive to conform their lives to the God-bestowed order that supports the world. These are, of course, two

[126] Lim, "Deuteronomy", 11-12.
[127] Lim, "Deuteronomy", 14-15; Sidnie White Crawford, "4QDt[a]: Biblical Manuscript or Excerpted Text?" in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible and Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell*, H.W. Attridge *et al*, eds. (Lanham: College Theology Resources in Religion, 1990), 13-20.

very different motivations behind the interpretation of Deuteronomy. The Second Temple wisdom writings might be characterized as largely religious in nature, albeit with an emphasis on observable life improvement beyond the bounds of the cultic institution. The historical writings, conversely, might be thought of as generally concerned with simply the vicissitudes of history and how those events explain how present circumstances came to be. Yet just as the predominantly religious emphasis of the wisdom writings cannot be divorced from the occasional commentary on social institutions, such as the praise of the priest found in Ben Sira, the historical writings should not be thought of as purely concerned with an account of events unaffected by divine involvement. Such a perspective, indeed, would be largely anachronistic.[128] Atheism, as we know it today, was almost nonexistent in antiquity.

In other words, we are looking at documents that were generated not by isolated communities but by authors inextricably entwined with concerns apart from the Deuteronomic text they interpreted, as will be shown. This complex social dynamic requires all the more caution to be taken when examining these Second Temple writings. My work will not be strictly philological, but will seek to locate the use of three thematic complexes—wisdom, *musar/paideia*, and covenant—as they are presented in Deuteronomy 1-11 and as they may be found in Second Temple writings. However, the devil always resides in the details, and working with literary themes unfortunately does not provide the level of methodological articulation and precision which resides more natively with specifically—and exclusively—philological approaches. A greater level of explicit intentionality is therefore required.

[128] With some exceptions, e.g. Epicurus (Lucretius, *De rerum natura*).

Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold provide a helpful frame by classifying the use of biblical material in the Second Temple period as *quotations* and *allusions*.[129] They describe a detailed procedure by which, with the help of Oaktree's Accordance software, they performed Hebrew and Greek word searches to locate exact textual duplications within Second Temple literature. The searches used parameters defined by the researchers:

> for the Hebrew/Aramaic texts the number ranged from three to five shared words for prose texts ... two to four words for poetic texts. As for the Greek texts, the number ranged from four to six shared words for prose texts ... three to five shared words for poetic texts ... We generally allowed for one word to be ignored from the source text and for one word to be added in the target text. We also allowed the word order to be ignored.

This transparency on the researchers' part allows the inevitable limitations of their work to be considered alongside their findings. Further, these limitations are acknowledged: "the mechanical parameters of modern electronic search engines alone allow neither for a certain

[129] This frame is preceded by other efforts, not as comprehensive as Lange and Weigold but nonetheless helpful: J. Allenbach et al. (eds.), *Philon d'Alexandrie* (BiPa suppl.; Paris: Editions du CNRS, 1982); J. Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans 'La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres'," *RB* 63 (1956); "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament, et spécialement des Poèmes du Serviteur, dans les Hymnes de Qumran," *RevQ* 2 (1959-1960); S. Delamarter, *A Scripture Index to Charlesworth's The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1960-1961); *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*, SBLRBS 20, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990); R. Fuller, unpublished list of "Citations from the Minor Prophets in Non-Biblical Qumran Compositions"; J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, vol. 3: *Einführung, Zeitreichnung, Register und Bibliographie* (UTB.W 1916; München: Reinhardt, 1996), 161-182; F.J. Morrow, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran" (PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 1973); J. VanderKam amd P. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002). The above list is found in Armin Lange and Matthias Weingold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, JAJSupp 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 16-17.

identification of quotations and allusions nor help with the categorization of identified intertextual references".[130]

Lange and Weingold also stress the importance of comparative evidence found within other ancient literary cultures. It is essential, they claim, to consider these texts when conducting a study of ancient Jewish intertextuality. They provide an example from the *Derveni Papyrus*, in which the author both directly quotes and alludes to an astronomical text by Heraclitus. According to Lange and Weingold, this comparative evidence proves that intertextuality in antiquity is not a purely Jewish phenomenon but is a common feature of ancient textual practices, and therefore may be examined with the same assumptions of universality that govern more modern approaches to intertextuality.[131] This in turn provides the methodological underpinning that permits the impartation of arguably more modern categories, such as the *quotations* and *allusions* mentioned above, to ancient texts. Lange and Weingold also mention that they have restricted their potential source of allusions and quotations to the texts which would be later recognized as the Hebrew Scriptures; as they also state, however, this is not to imply that other texts which were never canonized are not also sources of allusion and quotation, nor that to investigate these other texts should be deemed an unworthy scholarly task.[132] On the contrary, they state that they would have gladly expanded their inquiry had time and funds permitted, and it is their hope not only to continue this research themselves, but that others might follow suit.

On occasion, authors employ phrases in their texts which are representative of biblical *idioms* but which do not necessarily indicate intertextuality. This is noted by Lange and

---

[130] Lange and Weingold, *Biblical Quotations*, 19.
[131] Lange and Weingold, *Biblical Quotations*, 21. This practice may also be seen in the Apostle Paul's use of *gezerah shawah* and *qal vaḥomer* not as specifically rabbinical devices but belonging to a wider rhetorical tradition. See Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (London: Yale University Press, 1989), 13.
[132] Lange and Weingold, *Biblical Quotations*, 36.

Weingold regarding the Hebrew phrase *kol esher tzivah*, "all which had been commanded".[133] While Carmignac considers this phrase, in $1QH^a$ VII_{31-32}, as an allusion to Jer 32(39):23, Lange and Weingold note that this phrase appears in several places within the Deuteronomistic writings; Deut 1:3, 41; 2:37; 18:18; 26:14; Josh 1:16; 8:35; et al. According to Lange and Weingold, then, this phrase in the Qumran text is better viewed as using an idiom developed in the Deuteronomistic texts rather than a specific allusion to any particular text. Julie Hughes concurs, writing that "*all you have commanded* ... should probably be explained as the use of common biblical phraseology rather than as an allusion".[134]

As Lange and Weigold also note, intertextuality has been construed as, in their own words, "the relation of posterior to anterior texts".[135] This definition is likely inspired by Julia Kristeva who provides a similarly broad definition of intertextuality: "Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another".[136] The "text" as material artifact, then, should be considered only a thin veneer that serves as a kind of window on a vast universe of shared meaning. This definition is at its strongest when it is viewed chiefly as a comment on the dependent status that any textual artifact must possess. No man or woman is an island, as the old saying goes; neither is any text. There is always an earlier narrative or record that inspires or informs the text which one holds and reads. Therefore it is essential to view any document as linked to at least one other source, and possibly a considerable number of other sources. The document in question relies upon these others; the author of this document creates in dialogue, consciously or unconsciously, with the other documents. Jonathan Culler

[133] Lange and Weingold, *Biblical Quotations*, 32.
[134] Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, STDJ 59 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 77 n. 62.
[135] Lange and Weingold, *Biblical Quotations*, 22.
[136] Lange and Weingold, *Biblical Quotations*, 21.

perhaps puts this most concisely: "Intertextuality ... becomes less a name for a work's relation to prior texts than a designation of its participation in the discursive space of a culture".[137]

However, this nearly all-encompassing view of intertextuality places a considerable methodological burden upon the scholar who accepts Kristeva's view of intertextuality as provided above by Lange and Weingold. While it is worthwhile to consider the potential web of interconnectivity that relates texts to each other, the practicalities of scholarship demand that these interconnections be examined within controlled boundaries. Therefore any study that aspires to present an authoritatively complete view must define and adhere to self-imposed limitations. A work that attempts to exhaustively catalogue the interconnections in a single document will go unfinished—and unpublished—indefinitely, if Kristeva's view is correct.

The bounds introduced by Lange and Weingold are *quotations* and *allusions*, which they define and which are supported by other theorists who have provided helpful foundational studies. Both quotations and allusions reside within the category of "citationality" as defined by Marko Juvan; quotations and allusions are part of an intentional and explicit intertextuality strictly oriented towards the use of one text upon another, defined as "metatextuality" by G. Genette and expanded by R. S. Miola to include translations. Using the boundaries established by Juvan, Genette, and Miola, Lange and Weingold are able to situate their study within controlled conditions.

My own work approaches the topic from the opposite end of the spectrum. Rather than view each document as a source of textual data defined by its lexical components, I have used *themes* as my boundaries. These themes are wisdom, covenant, and *musar/paideia*. Therefore, I view Deuteronomy 1-11 through the lenses of, or parametrically adjusted through, these three

---

[137] Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London: Routledge, 2005), 114; Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

themes. Each portion of Deuteronomy 1-11 may be viewed as directly related to one or more of these themes. I then locate these themes in Second Temple literature and ask the question, how does the thematic material in the relevant Second Temple document relate to the same themes in Deuteronomy 1-11? I assume throughout that the Second Temple authors, when engaging with this thematic material, knew the relevance of Deuteronomy 1-11 when composing their own materials.

This is a subtle inquiry that especially requires its own grounding and background. Richard Hays directly engages this problem in "'Who Has Believed Our Message?'; Paul's Reading of Isaiah". Here, Hays addresses the methodological difficulties that arise when analyzing the apostle Paul's use of Isaiah to support his newly formed Christian theology.[138] One such issue concerns Paul's authorial intentionality. If the critic seeks to locate "allusions and echoes" in an author's work which relies upon that author's subtle interaction with other works that circulated within the author's milieu, how is the critic able to assert that the author *intentionally* invoked these echoes? To use the Scriptures to corroborate a theological argument is one thing; to instinctively arrange references to those Scriptures, intuitively creating an impression, is quite another. It is a comparison of dialectics v. aesthetics. This distinction is also important when considering these "allusions and echoes" in light of historical arguments. To seek "allusions and echoes" is essentially a literary endeavor, relying upon the tools and techniques of the astute and intentional reader. While there are methodological similarities between the two goals, it is also important to distinguish between them.[139] While my work produces results that are situated within historical circumstances, and relies upon those circumstances as additional evidence that as I will show corroborates the results, I will also rely

[138] Richard B. Hays, "'Who Has Believed Our Message?'; Paul's Reading of Isaiah", in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament*, ed. John M. Court (London: SPCK, 2002), 48-49.
[139] Hays, "Who Has Believed", 48.

chiefly upon literary tools and techniques in my own efforts to show allusions, echoes, and even more subtle resonances between Deuteronomy 1-11 and select Second Temple writings.

It is arguable, in fact, that such a broad view of intertextuality is not only helpful but necessary to place who is possibly the most renowned Second Temple Jewish exegete within an academic framework. The apostle Paul made revolutionary interpretations of the Jewish scriptures, in the service of his radical religious experience. Although a lifelong student of these texts, and an exemplary one by his own attestation, it was not an advanced perusal of texts that transformed him from Paul the Pharisee into Paul the Christian but this experience which, according to Acts, took him completely by surprise and resulted in his complete change of outlook. As Lincicum notes, Hays's study *Echoes/Paul* perhaps disingenuously minimizes the original extent of Kristevan intertextuality, possibly so as to avoid an intellectual confrontation with the implications of Kristeva's work as well as the methodological necessity of borders being placed on that work for purposes of practical scholarship. The biographical account of Paul in Acts reveals evidence for the dangers Lincicum observes. To view Paul's writings as *merely* re-interpretations of Jewish scripture would miss the point entirely and, by ignoring the events of Paul's life, create an unnecessarily restricted view of a phenomenon originally conceived by Kristeva as much more all-encompassing in scope.

This pluriformity of influence, exerting hermeneutical influence upon all who find themselves enmeshed within Paul's writings, applies no less to Deuteronomy. According to Lincicum, the academy at one time considered Paul's writings as highly creative speculations based in the Jewish scriptures.[140] At first glance, this appears to celebrate the possibility of *aporia* as purported by Kristeva's successor Derrida as well as the creative opportunities which

[140] For this and following see David Lincicum, *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013), 2-5.

follow the elimination of authorial power and the elevation of the reader's subjective interpretation. But rather than pay homage to Kristeva's original conception, this move really ignores the entire milieu which surrounded Paul and which Kristeva conceptually recognizes. Paul is not thinking and writing arbitrarily; what scholars failed to understand that Paul's conclusions are not based entirely upon any written text, but include a web of cultural institutions and developed interpretations of those writings. True, he does not explicitly present his methodology, but that is not his goal, and to expect it from him would be anachronistic. While many may not agree with Paul's conclusions, the criticism of his results is not the same as the criticism of his process, which while often misunderstood is nonetheless reasonable and historically justified. This caution also protects against readings which prioritize the theological over the ethical, as Lincicum notes regarding Watson's interpretation of Paul as a revisionist thinker who transmutes law and curse into historical inevitability.[141]

The relevant point here to be noted is that the text of Deuteronomy prefigures this complex interpretive activity and arguably creates the opportunity for later exegetes to respond creatively. Lincicum writes that Deuteronomy functions in this way by 1) self-attesting its status as a collection of divine mandates, to be honored as an authoritative word of God, and 2) also self-attesting that the circumstances in which it is given (the east side of the Jordan) will not be the circumstances in which it is interpreted in perpetuity (the establishment of the temple, west side of the Jordan).[142] Therefore we need not merely view the Kristevan concept of intertextuality as a late critical-theoretical development, a phenomenon in which ancient authors and receptive audiences participated without intentionality or self-awareness. Rather, as the text of Deuteronomy itself suggests, the reality of the Kristevan intertextual milieu was fully

[141] Lincicum, *Paul*, 7-8.
[142] Lincicum, *Paul*, 3: see also Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 3, 15.

understood by antiquity. One need not be an "enlightened" modern to understand that even if a text does not change, but is successively and exactly recopied over time (a possibility which Deut 17:18 suggests), changes in surrounding circumstances—geographical, social, political, liturgical—will prompt changes in interpretation of that text in those circumstances.

1.9.3. Intertextuality and Boundary: Other Voices and Approaches

Laura Quick provides another example of a broad intertextual approach applied to biblical studies, in this case the use of Exodus and Deuteronomy in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian. For Quick, while this work is undeniably a representation of the Exodus narrative, its thematic emphases reveal that the play often prioritizes Deuteronomy's vision of events and figures—especially Moses—and offers a view of Exodus that is not only subtly harmonized with Deuteronomy but conditioned for the expectations of its Hellenistic Jewish and Alexandrian audience.[143] While I do not find all of Quick's conclusions convincing, the methodological foundations of the article, as well as its placement within historical and cultural context, provides an excellent model for my own work.

It is first instructive to note that with the *Exagoge* we find a further example of useful boundaries placed upon the broad concept of intertextuality. The *Exagoge* is a dramatic retelling of the Exodus story, designed for the stage and likely performed in antiquity, including the burning bush.[144] This fortunately created work should not be viewed as derivative but evidence of meaningful reception of Exodus and, if Quick is correct, Deuteronomy amongst the

[143] Laura Quick, "Decontextualizing and Recontextualizing the Torah: Writing and Performing Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period", *HBAI* 11/1 (2020): 60-77.
[144] Quick, "Decontextualizing", 65; Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 98-99; P. Lanfranchi, *L'Exagoge d'Ezéchiel le Tragique: Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 35-38.

Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria. Presenting biblical narratives on stage allows new audiences to access their content. Further, the existence of these stage versions provides a boundary of genre variation that may be successfully applied to a broad concept of intertextuality. Again, while one may speculate about echoes that texts create within their readers, as well as the texts they in turn inspire, it is necessary to locate these echoes in concrete forms for the results of this speculation to become tangible. Genre studies are especially strong in this regard. Not only are they themselves texts, able to provide immediately accessible verbal evidence, but they show the presence of metatextual thinking in the creators of works within variant genres. To read the texts of Exodus and Deuteronomy, then conceive of those events retold as theatrical drama, reveals that the audiences of Exodus and Deuteronomy *could* in fact think of the narrative not merely as a written text, but as vivid events, a narrative present within the mind of the receptive audience. This narrative, sufficiently abstracted to permit representation in other forms, becomes for Ezekiel the Tragedian the subject matter of a play.

It is, however, crucial to realize that the network of shared meaning to which the broad conception of intertextuality refers, while arguably principally nurtured through textual data, may also receive information from non-written sources. New religious movements and emerging convictions, while initially unwritten, may begin to interact with established networks of intertextuality which have been long supported through recognized texts. While these established networks already possess the depth that the Kristevan definition provides, their new involvement with these movements and convictions creates even more extensive interconnected systems of meaning. It is true that, in time, these movements and convictions may take written form, providing still another component to the network.

But it would be a hasty judgment indeed to assume that these written versions of the movements and convictions are so similar to the original oral presentation of the movements and convictions that, from the standpoint of the totality of the intertextual network, the new written versions should be viewed as superfluous. Rather, these texts provide still another layer of information to this network of intertextuality—a network still, and likely to remain, in flux.

This phenomenon is well documented by John M. Court. In *New Testament Writers in the Old Testament: An Introduction*, he comments on the interpretive radicality of the early Christian church.[145] Early Christians, following the trailblazing theology of the apostle Paul, brought a novel hermeneutic apparatus to the Jewish Scriptures. To the consternation of the existing rabbinic authorities, they substantiated their new doctrines of salvation by faith, the need for spiritual attainment above and beyond the requirements of the law, and especially the resurrected Christ as the savior of Israel with interpretive strategies that were shocking in their innovation. These interpretations began not only in the initially unwritten teaching of Paul as documented in Acts, but the similarly unwritten teachings of Jesus himself and John the Baptist, and to add an additional layer of complexity were *themselves* derived from written documents long respected by the Jewish tradition.

However, it would be incorrect to assume the interdependence of author and text began with the new Christian community, and that Paul's theology took no account of the Jewish Scriptures but was merely a creative revisioning of the theological history of the Jews, a sort of "reboot". On the contrary, Paul's commitment to the fidelity of those texts, and his belief in their continuing relevance and necessity, was not refuted but confirmed by his new Christian convictions.[146] In Hays' case, analyzing the writings of Paul through literary means, namely the

[145] John M. Court, *New Testament Writers in the Old Testament: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2002), 2-3.
[146] Hays, "Who Has Believed", 48.

poetic device of dissimile, allows for alternative readings that interpret the Pauline texts not as composites of varying source material, but as documents that have plausibly emerged from the pen of a single authorial hand.[147] By using *literary devices* as framing tools, Hays demonstrates another method by which boundaries may be imposed upon Kristeva's broad possibilities. Hays does not, however, exclude a more concrete understanding of intertextuality, stating that intertextuality is "the embedding of fragments of an earlier text within a later one".[148] But he makes specific allowances for the broader view as espoused by Kristeva, writing that "the phenomenon of intertextuality is by no means limited to texts that are understood as the Scripture of a religious community ... theologians work with a canon, a body of traditions engaged in intertextual reflection ... (including) Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Stevens".[149]

Hays also discusses the existence of another boundary, that of *historicity*. While it is possible to imagine a sort of pre-textual shared network of stories and ideas, much like the oral traditions of early Homeric narrative, from which documents freely draw inspiration and which, *if it is not itself subject to change*, would provide an ahistorical and static source of material for an ongoing series of documents, it is more likely that the intertextual universe itself undergoes change due to its inevitable connection to the documents produced by authors working in concert with this universe.[150] This provides a dimension of historicity that, by necessity, provides boundaries upon the original concept of intertextuality. In fact, according to Hays, historicity and intertextuality are inseparable: "Attention to intertextuality ... compels respect for diachronic concerns".[151]

---

[147] Hays, *Echoes*, xii.
[148] Hays, *Echoes*, 14.
[149] Hays, *Echoes*, 15.
[150] This is essentially the Gadamerian hermeneutic circle; see Gadamer, *Truth and Method*. Gadamer localizes this intertextual universe within the minds of the interpreters.
[151] Hays, *Echoes*, xii.

Another way of justifying the discovery of echoes and allusions through proper bounds is by means of *thematic coherence*. By this, Hays argues for a consistency of reading and use of source materials.[152] The most striking example he cites is T.S. Eliot's use of Augustine's *Confessions* within *The Waste Land*. In the poem, Augustine is quoted within a reference to Carthage: "To Carthage then I came". This is followed by a repeated verbal emphasis on "burning", borrowed literally from the Buddhist Fire Sermon, in agreement with Augustine's own self-revelation: "To Carthage then I came, where a cauldron of unholy loves sang all about mine ears". The implied association with "burning" and sensory temptation is reinforced thematically by the governing message of the Fire Sermon, namely the danger of sensory lures. But an examination of the Augustine passage, just before the "Carthage" line explicitly quoted, gives: "I sank away from Thee, and I wandered, O my God, too much astray from Thee my stay, in these days of my youth, and I became unto myself a barren land". This final compound noun suggests the title of the poem itself (*The Waste Land*). By means of these complex interconnections, Hays asserts, a network of meaning is created justifying further investigations of *The Waste Land* in conjunction with The Fire Sermon and *Confessions*. But the essence of the interconnections is thematic: sensory temptation and barrenness.

[152] Hays, "Who Has Believed", 57.

1.9.4. Method as Applied to the Texts of the Thesis

Ben Sira will indicate by means of quotation his views of wisdom as informed by Deuteronomy 1-11. The fear of God will be associated with wisdom by means of allusive statements and echoes, but also covenant and *mûsar/paideia*. Wisdom will also be equated with Torah obedience by allusions to the figure of Lady Wisdom in Proverbs, as well as subtle textual clues within Ben Sira's text itself. *Mûsar/paideia* will be shown as a historical influence within Ben Sira's work, typified by the Deuteronomic command to bind the texts upon the person. The importance of *mûsar/paideia* will also be seen in explicit quotation, but also literary techniques such as *inclusio*. The themes of testing, as well as the metaphor of a journey, will emerge via subtle allusion. The unpleasant concomitant of *mûsar/paideia*, physical discipline, will be explicitly mentioned. Perhaps the most interesting area of Ben Sira's work, methodologically speaking, is his treatment of right speech. He explicitly identifies this territory as important and as wisdom. But through subtle allusion Ben Sira references Moses's own commendation of right speech, which is accomplished by way of Moses's *actions* as recorded in the text of Deut 1-11. Here, these techniques are combined to produce a complex presentation of right speech as wisdom.

Ben Sira historically interacts with covenant in authentic ways that mirror Israel's understanding of and reception of covenantal systems. He uses thematic linkage to invoke ideas of covenant by way of the death motif, but also to immortality by way of allusion to Deuteronomy. Ben Sira will compound statements about covenant, creating composite citations, to achieve a synthesis of quotation and allusion to further comment on the covenant. In fact, Deuteronomy will continue to exert influence on Ben Sira's text as demonstrated by historical interaction with successive scribes. These historical influences also affect Ben Sira's views of

the priesthood, which he communicates with covenant matters serving as a vehicle for expression.

Within 1 Macc, it is the historical dimension in relation to Deut 1-11 that will take the pride of place, as might be assumed given the subject matter of the work. Because of this, the themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant, while still present, will be diminished in importance and placed alongside other thematic concerns. Often the interaction with Deut 1-11 occurs as phrasal and linguistic links which provide allusions to the Deuteronomic material. Other times, the themes themselves are allusive. They always, however, serve the author's goals which may themselves be situated within a social-historical framework. Covenantal themes are a convenient tool for the author to further justify the Hasmonean priesthood; while Dongbin Choi attests that Deuteronomy 28-30 has been used to this effect by way of thematic allusion, the same practice will be shown regarding Deut 1-11. Explicit linguistic terms will also cement this connection.

The author of 1 Macc will primarily rely upon explicit linguistic quotations to emphasize wisdom, strictly speaking, using the words *pagis* and *skōlon*. More often, however, wisdom themes are combined with covenant and *mûsar/paideia* to create an allusive framework, toward the end of supporting the Hasmonean priesthood. *Mûsar/paideia* will receive a more robust treatment as the phenomenon of Greek education, specifically the *paedagōgos*, is investigated as a dangerous element which the Hasmoneans have removed.

In 2 Macc, the author will rely upon complex combinations of allusions and specific words to create echoes that demonstrate God's continuing favor over Israel while still setting apart a holy people. Often the connection to Deut 1-11 is purely thematic, relying upon the most distant of echoes to establish a conclusion. When discussing covenant, the terminology will

become more explicit, but allusions will remain the principal technique employed to achieve the desired results. These echoes are even more artfully employed as the author makes bold claims concerning the covenant and immortality. The historical uses of echoes and allusions are perhaps most notably seen in the author's treatment of *mûsar/paideia*.

Philo's involvement with ideas of allusion and echo are well known as *allegorical interpretation*. This technique requires substantial involvement with extra-textual material to create and, as a reader, to understand extensive comparisons made between a source text and a body of writing which the author contends may be also perceived in the source text. In Philo's case, that body of writing is Hellenistic philosophy, not merely in a specific textual example but a developed teaching that enjoyed popularity in the Hellenistic world. Philo's priorities will shift from Alexandrian exegesis that emphasizes Platonic thought to a more Stoic mode in his later works, but the allegorical technique will remain his chief tool.

Josephus will carefully use allusions and echoes to make his points, generally praising and defending the Jewish people while simultaneously avoiding any accusation of the Romans. This will emerge in a variety of contexts, most vividly in the speeches Josephus presents in *B.J.* The themes of Deuteronomy are presented without necessarily adhering to the general trends observed; instead, Josephus will often use specifically military emphases in Deut 1-11 to support his points, albeit indirectly. These historical goals will continue in his use of covenantal themes in *A.J.*; by employing a complex array of sub-themes, Josephus will continue to praise both Jews and Romans.

In much the same way as Josephus and Philo, but more dependent upon textual quotations, the Qumran materials will use quotation, allusion, and echo to blend a deep respect for the Deuteronomic text with complex, evolving theologies that both conform to and depart

from what can be seen in other texts. The famous emphasis within Qumran on predestination will interact with wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia* in the context of Deut 1-11with varying nuances, dependent upon the theological ramifications of predestination within the intellectual spheres of the three themes. Also, the monastic, communal nature of Qumran, as an assembled group of religious devotees, will find support in the exposition of *mûsar/paideia*.

1.10. Deut 1-11 and Wisdom, Covenant, *Mûsar/Paideia*—An Overview

As noted, Deut 1-11 is a speech delivered by Moses at Moab. The entirety of Deuteronomy, of course, is also ostensibly the continuation of Moses's speech, although it may be questioned whether or not 12-26 was delivered in one sitting.[155] However, Deut 1-11 is unusual in that it is entirely concerned with the past and future, not the present. The discourse is not a narrative, but an abstracted summary of a previous narrative—the circuitous and lamentably extended journey from Egypt to the plains of Moab—as well as an exposition of God's expectations for Israel, the rewards for their obedience, and the penalties for their disobedience.

This abstraction begins in Deut 1:6, where Moses reminds Israel of the previous dialogue at Horeb, the location of the institution of the Sinaitic covenant. Moses continues to remind Israel, in Deut 1:9-18, how he appointed civic authorities to assist him in governing Israel. The initial failure to occupy the promised land is then recounted, as are the wanderings and interactions with neighboring peoples upon the return to the land's borders. Then, as chapter 4 begins, Israel is told to "heed the statues and commandments", as well as to refrain from adding to or subtracting from them. Yet we are not reminded, at this time, what those "statutes and commandments" are, only that they will be "*wisdom* and ... understanding ... in the sight of the peoples, who, when they hear all these statutes, will say, 'Surely this nation is a wise and understanding people'". Moses continues to extol the importance of obeying the law, as well as its excellence, before reminding Israel of the delivery of the Decalogue as given in Exod 20. This quality of abstraction continues as Moses reminds Israel that they saw "no form", that is, no

[155] And whether or not it could be digested in one reading, or one document discovered by Josiah; see Lundbom *et al.* above.

tangible presence of God, and as he selects only one of the decalogal commands to review: that against the making of graven images. Deuteronomy's refusal to award any religious significance to visual representations of reality therefore continues. The tablets of the law themselves are of course important, but these are not visual images, rather expressions of the divine will in language. This abstracted perspective as consequences of obedience and disobedience are then given in more detail. Deut 5 is a recapitulation of the decalogue, an exception to the rule, but it should be noted that this is not the instantiation of the law given at Sinai, but rather a reminder of its bestowal.

Deut 6 and 7 continue this abstract approach, discussing not the content of parental teaching and covenant, but teaching *qua* teaching and covenant *qua* covenant. The teaching must be the "testimonies ... statutes ... and ordinances" and the means by which it will be inculcated are described, but not the testimonies, statutes, and ordinances themselves. Deut 7 forbids the making of covenant with the surrounding nations, but does not detail what the content of those covenants might be. and warns them of the dangers of future complacency. The reasons for this danger are explained more fully in chapter 9—that Israel is not brought into the land due to any native righteousness—then shifting to the past, Moses reminds them of their apostasy at Sinai. Deut 1-11 closes with a return to the future perspective, as Moses reviews his exhortations. The emphasis on past and future continues in Deut 8, as Moses reminds Israel of their hardships in the wilderness.

Therefore, it is clear that, in Deut 1-11, we are not engaging with an ordinary narrative, but a speech and an abstracted summary. An analysis according to the categories of Propp or Thompson would not be effective. Therefore we must rely upon the key words *ḥākmâ* , *mûsar*, and *bəriyṭ*. As explained above, these words are representative of well-established biblical

themes. Further, they are not elements that neatly fit within a narrative, although they might occur as ancillary components of a narrative that occurs within, for example, a school (*ḥākmâ , mûsar*) or that features a loose grouping of tribes in shifting alliances (*bəriyṯ*). These words, and the theme-complexes they represent, do however encompass the entirety of Deut 1-11. As such, Deut 1-11 may be completely described in terms of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant.

Let us again review the contents of Deut 1-11, shown above to be an abstracted summary and speech. After situating Moses in time and place, Deut 1-11 shows Moses reminding the Israelites of the command God gave them at Horeb/Sinai, after giving the covenant on tablets. It is this command which God will restate once the Israelites arrive at the southern borders of the promised land, in the vicinity of Kadesh-Barnea then yet again, at the eastern borders of the promised land at the plains of Moab: the command to exert dominion over the land, a feature of wisdom teachings. Further, at Horeb/Sinai Moses also institutes "wise, understanding, and experienced men" for leadership.[156] Deut 1-11 then retells the account of the spies at the border, in what should be noted is a text unique to the pentateuchal and historical materials in its concern with the acquisition of knowledge (wisdom). Spies are sent to gain knowledge, in defiance of God's command not to seek knowledge. In fact, God has commanded to them to immediately occupy the territory, in an act of immediate obedience (*mûsar/paideia*). The knowledge with which they return confirms Israel in their disobedience, to which God is wrathful and sends Israel on a peregrination almost forty years in length. This is a generational punishment; the generation responsible for disobedience will not enter the land, but the following generation will. Again, the themes of *mûsar/paideia* may be applied to this emphasis on parents and children, as well as discipline, only now inverted from its usual application. Instead of parents disciplining children, with their children disciplining their own children in turn, God is selectively

[156] As contrasted with Exod 18:21; see Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 145; see also Sir below.

disciplining entire generations among his Israelite "children". A series of battles follow, each one predicated on their relationship with land allotment, again a corollary motif of the dominion mandate of wisdom.

These military sequences may also be viewed as relating to all three motifs of wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia*. These sequences may be viewed as cautionary tales, describing the results of disobeying God. God has given a command, which is both wisdom in its practical content and evocative of *mûsar/paideia* in its presentation of God as exhorter. This wisdom content may be seen more clearly when one notices that God's command in this instance is not liturgical or ceremonial, but an instruction to exert dominion and mastery over a territory. And of course, although these commands are not expressed in written form on tablets, any requirement which God imposes that has associated consequences for obedience and disobedience is linked to the covenantal tradition. This emphasis on commands and consequences evokes the Horeb/Sinai tradition, but as these commands require Israel to interact in a specific way with the *land*, the patriarchal covenants are also in view and, within Deuteronomy itself, these traditions are engaged from a postexilic perspective.

Finally Moab is reached, and Moses's speech catches up with the Israelites' present. A teaching is given, one from which the Israelites may not subtract, nor may they add. "Statutes and ordinances" have been given and to "keep and do them" will be "wisdom and discernment before all the nations" who will proclaim Israel to be "a wise and understanding people".[157] Here, wisdom is shown as the content of Moses's teaching, the wise and holy laws. The Israelites are next exhorted to regular and generational obedience (*mûsar/paideia*), then reminded of the covenantal framework that governs this teaching.[158] The themes of wisdom,

[157] Deut 4:6.
[158] Deut 4:6-14. See also the formal overtones of covenant, above.

mûsar/paideia, and covenant are then explored in a different way as the same crime of creating graven images is considered from a generational context (*mûsar/paideia*) as well as exile from the land, or wisdom reversed. However, because of previous covenanting with the fathers, God will be merciful in relenting should Israel repent of this sin.

Next, the covenant at Horeb/Sinai is repeated, along with the decalogal contents of that covenant, as well as a command to continually and watchfully follow them, "not to turn to right or left".[159] *Mûsar/paideia* and wisdom continues in Deut 6 as Moses tells Israel that, if they wish to live in the land and exert successful dominion, they must not only practice these laws continually but also train their children in them. In Deut 7, however, the dialogue is between wisdom and covenant, as once more the Israelites are told that an inverted *covenant*, or improper alliances made with foreign nations, will result in a disruption of *mûsar/paideia*, or their children being drawn away from worship of God to worship of the gods of the nations. Yet for obedience, Israel is also reminded that they will be given dominion and mastery of the land, once again invoking ideas of wisdom. This technique of inversion continues in Deut 8 as Moses contrasts the anti-dominion experienced by the Israelites in the wilderness, during which they survived by means of God's direct intervention, a motif in opposition to the practical nature of wisdom teachings that minimize divine action.

The wisdom theme of dominion is continued in Deut 9, as Israel is reminded to dispossess the peoples who inhabit the land, specifically the "great and tall" Anakim which terrified the former generation of Israelites. Here, the text is sure to note that "righteousness" plays no part in Israel's having been brought to the land, neither in their self-direct entry nor in God's active leadership up to that point.[160] Moses then shifts the perspective to the past once

[159] Deut 5:32.
[160] Deut 9:5-6.

more, retelling the incident of the golden calf. The expansion of the covenant theme, specifically applied to graven images, which we viewed in Deut 4 is now revisited by Moses, who links the incident with the disobedience at Kadesh-Barnea. This covenantal theme is elaborated further as Moses reminds Israel of the broken tablets which were replaced, then put within an ark. It is this ark which is placed into the safekeeping of the Levites.

Finally, at Deut 10:12, the last great exhortation commences. As with Deut 6:4, the importance of completely loving God—covenantal love—is stressed.[161] This covenantal theme is continued as this love is extended to the forefathers of Israel, the covenant having been demonstrated to have preceded the generation assembled at Moab, and the present generation is told to "circumcise the heart", again referencing covenantal ideas although for the first time in Deut 1-11 referencing the covenant of circumcision found in Gen 17. Wisdom themes are reintroduced, as charity for the widowed, the fatherless, and the sojourners is commanded; but covenantalism remains in the forefront as the same love which Israel extends to God must be also extended to the sojourner. The fear of God and plenitude of the people, wisdom themes, quickly re-enter the speech, followed immediately once more by covenantal love. Almost immediately on cue, the temporarily absent *mûsar/paideia* theme returns, as Israel must consider the *mûsar* which they, the innocent generation, have not seen or experienced. This *mûsar* should be remembered, along with the sequence of historical events beginning in Egypt at the deliverance and exodus, including the destruction of the Kohathite rebellion. The commandments must be kept, previously shown to be wisdom, as well as the material rewards that will ensue from such obedience, again the reiteration of the wisdom theme. The *mûsar/paideia* of instruction is again stressed, as Moses reminds the Israelites to carefully train their children. Finally, the inevitable possession of the land, as a reward for obedience, returns;

[161] See Moran, "ANE", above.

and the entire section ends with the blessings and curses which follow obedience and disobedience, covenantally placed upon Ebal and Gerizim.

1.11. Summary of Contents

First, I examine Ben Sira's treatment of wisdom. As we will see, Ben Sira will create equivalencies between wisdom and three other concepts: remoteness, fear of God, and obedience. As this last concept suggests, Ben Sira will also create an interdependence between wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia*, and these concepts will be critically employed to accomplish this. The individual person must seek and fear God, despite the remoteness of these ideas; therefore, God's help is required. Ben Sira will explore the intersection of covenant and *mûsar/paideia* when discussing the necessity of obedience. *Mûsar/paideia* will also be shown to be related to Ben Sira's work in the priesthood, as well as Ben Sira's special emphasis on the act of speaking rightly. Ben Sira will also declare the Edenic transgression to be a covenantal transgression, which will covenantalize death and provide for the possibility of immortality by means of covenantal obedience. This obedience, however, Ben Sira understands in terms of *mûsar/paideia*, an intergenerational obedience that will reappear in 2 Macc. Covenantal ideas will also support the Aaronic priesthood, as later tradents interact with Ben Sira's work.

In 1 Macc, several allusions to Deut 1-11 are made with the express purpose of defending Judas Maccabeus as a legitimate ruler of Israel; to do this, comparisons are made to the Moses narrative, implying Judas is a great leader as was Moses. Allusion is made to the plains of Moab; phrases such as "the right and left" and "thousands ... hundreds ... fifties" are used; Judas's enemies are compared not only to the Anakim of Deut 1-11 but the Babel builders of Gen 11; the spy narrative of Deut 1-11 is also mentioned, and Deuteronomy is specifically engaged in preference to Numbers to again show support for Judas. Oath-breaking, and making, also show the political goals of the author of 1 Macc, as well as the exiled death of Antiochus IV. Much of

this is militarism, which may be broadly placed under all three headings of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant.

Treatments of the themes more in keeping with our precise definitions given above may be seen in the covenantal language of 1 Macc. Here, covenantal language is used to simultaneously protect the Oniads and the Hasmoneans. *Mûsar/paideia* is used to ennoble the deathbed speech of Mattathias, and the practical nature of wisdom, as opposed to the priesthood, will be seen in the preference for *pagis* rather than *skōlon*. *Mûsar/paideia* usage will continue in an examination of the *gymnasium*, as well as the transmission of power from Mattathias to his sons as compared to the transmission of power among the Greeks.

In 2 Macc, the themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant will prove especially useful for the author, who uses these themes to support the integrity of the Jerusalem temple, the accommodating yet perspicacious defense for the Jerusalem priesthood, and the importance of the Jewish people in the outworking of God's purposes for Israel. However, Deut 1-11, while unavoidable, will present theological challenges in achieving these goals, and so the author of 1 Macc carefully mediates Deut 1-11 so as not to attenuate these objectives. This use of Deut 1-11 will be seen with themes of prayer, mercy, rescue, election, and consecration, yet the author of 2 Macc does not hesitate to minimize the impact of Deut 1-11 on 2 Macc when the text does not fully serve his purposes. Yet when considering the possibility of Gentiles knowing the God of Israel, a statement in keeping with the author's general goal of vindicating the spiritual efficacy of the Jewish people, wisdom themes and Deut 1-11 work in full accord with the author's text. The wisdom theme of wealth and its corollary, warnings against greed, also neatly dovetail with the author's purposes in his depiction of the greedy Menelaus. However, this does not mean that wisdom themes are inviolate, as the author's treatment of charity to widows and orphans

demonstrates. Here, the wisdom of this generous benevolence is dismissed in favor of a defense for the priest Onias, showing again the author's prioritization of a politico-religious agenda. Covenantal themes are explored to defend the Jerusalem temple, promote immortality, and support the deliverance of the Jews from impending slavery.

The same careful defense of the priesthood we have seen in 1 Macc we will see again; in this case, *mûsar/paideia* themes are used alongside a consideration of the *enkuklia paideia* to show that it is as Jews, not as priests, that the Jerusalem priesthood has principally erred. The sufferings of *paideia* are next considered in the context of martyrdom, which we have previously seen as material for a consideration of immortality. While it seems that martyrdom cannot be construed as "discipline", inasmuch that it does not result in the further education of the sufferer but rather death, a cessation of learning and growth, the author of 2 Macc conceives of *paideia* in intergenerational terms, using Deut 1-11 to this effect. Therefore, while the martyrs do not effect their own *paideia*, their deaths serve to train and educate the Jews as a whole. This has the corollary effect of promoting the author's interest in the Jewish people as a whole and their holiness.

Philo engages with Deut 1-11 and its chief themes as they assist him in exegeting other passages from the Jewish scriptures. He discusses the importance of remaining humble when accruing material wealth, as well as the virtue of the priesthood which, according to Philo, disdains worldly possessions. The greatest possession, for Philo, is God himself, which Philo subjects to a detailed consideration of ontological faculties. Philo also presents another wisdom theme, the ordered cosmos, but rather than focus on the practical nature of human interaction with the world, Philo instead embarks on theological exploration of the nature of God. One of the few wisdom themes which Philo treats traditionally is the care for the vulnerable; Philo likely

is explicit about this as a response to the uncharitable trends which surrounded him. Philo's examination of law, especially in the situation of fair judging, also becomes an opportunity to meditate on God's character and virtues. Using the metaphor of the *kubernētēs*, a pilot or controller, Philo's writings begin to intersect with *mûsar/paideia*. This interaction will continue as Philo explores the idea of chastisement, an important sub-theme of *mûsar/paideia*. This theme especially will be treated in close context with theological themes such as the stability of God and material provision. This interconnectivity of themes will be often seen in Philo's writing. Philo also views gaining knowledge of God as *mûsar/paideia*, available to native Jews and proselytes alike. Perhaps the most significant interaction with *mûsar/paideia*, for Philo, is the idea of growth and training, which for Philo is linked not only to virtuous self-transformation but to furthering one's knowledge of God, once again through God's gracious self-revelation and self-bestowal. Philo's use of covenant is extremely flexible and often interwoven with many other Deut 1-11 themes, including the wisdom theme of wise judges; however, this flexible treatment always serves the end of viewing covenant in spiritual terms of stability, and even considers the covenant as an allegory for grace. Finally, covenant becomes a vehicle by which Philo explores one of his major themes, mind and senses, as well as Israel's interaction with other nations and the qualities of the Logos.

I will then look at Josephus's treatment of Deut 1-11 in *Antiquitates judaicae* (*A.J.*) to determine how he engages with wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant, if at all. He dwells at large on wisdom themes, namely the possession of goods and God as the source of these material goods. Memory and obedience are representative of *mûsar/paideia* concerns. Instead of covenant, however, Josephus writes on the law given by Moses. There is also the concept of *pronoia*, or providence, a major theme in Josephus's writings that, in this representation of Deut

1-11, substitutes for God's covenantal care. Providence will become a generic replacement for covenant in Josephus's other writings, as will be seen below. Josephus will also explore wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* in twelve key speeches within *Belli judaicum* (*B.J.*). In these speeches, given in wartime, we will see primarily an engagement with long life, a familiar wisdom theme, but also death and immortality. We will also see Josephus repeatedly engaging with the wisdom themes of land dominion. But interestingly we will also see Josephus presenting the Romans as a mirror inversion of Israel, now enjoying the benefits of God's providence but in accordance with a reversal of the major principles espoused in Deut 1-11. Finally, as expected, Josephus greatly minimizes his exposition of covenant, specifically *diathēkē*, in *A.J.* Here, Josephus consistently substitutes words like *horkos, pistis,* and *sunthēkē*, which allow for a much more inclusive view of Israel's history and provide non-Jewish peoples with a sympathetic perspective, from which they can view themselves also as part of God's purposes, and also allows for his *idee fixe* of the Romans, new benefactors of God's providence, to be repeated. Covenantal concerns are treated carefully in Josephus's entire *ouvre*, always to the end of downplaying Jewish power and supporting the ascendancy of the Romans.

Within the Qumran materials, we will find evidence of a critical engagement not only with Deut 1-11, but with the figure of Moses. Psalm readings will, in some cases, take preference over Deuteronomy, and Moses will be shown to hold power more by virtue of his prophetic office than his individual excellence. These sentiments will be combined with militarism and hints of a messianic deliverer who is not Moses. However, opposition to the Hasmonean priesthood will be shown not to be unanimous, and some texts show support for this priesthood. The wisdom materials at Qumran show evidence of Deut 1-11 influence, but are modified by the strong Qumran sentiment of predestination, the deliverance of wisdom by God

alone, and the doctrinal complications of dual wisdom and mysteries which proceed from the synthesis of these ideas. *Mûsar/paideia* will be shown to characterize the life of those whom the Qumran materials depict, a sort of wandering-Israel-in-microcosm. Covenantal language will continue to emphasize predeterminism and militarism, but surprising anti-deterministic ideas will be seen as well, likely due to the importance of *mûsar/paideia* in the daily lives of the communities described in the Qumran materials, and the effectiveness of this training in producing good behavior.

1.12. A Note on Abbreviations and Languages

All abbreviations will adhere to *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

In this thesis I have attempted to primarily use simplified English transliterations for Greek and Hebrew words. Within textual quotations or certain detailed discussions, however, I have used the original characters. I have tried for consistency in this; any perceived deviations must be faulted to me and not indicative of reader error.

Chapter 2. Ben Sira and Deuteronomy 1-11—Wisdom, Covenant, *Mûsar/Paideia*

2.1. Introduction

Sirach was written by Yeshua ben Eleazar ben Sira, and it was originally written in Hebrew as is indicated by evidence from Qumran and Cairo Geniza.[162] The Hebrew title in Jewish tradition is "The Wisdom of Yeshua son of Eleazar son of Sira"; however, there is no extant first page of Sirach/Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew.[163] In Cairo Geniza MS B, 50:27, the author self-identifies as "Yeshua ben Eleazar ben Sira", or ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירא; in most Greek manuscripts, the title is Σοφία Ἰησοῦ Υἱοῦ Σιραχ, and this title is further attested in Latin and Syriac versions.[164] Sirach was written in Jerusalem as is given in Sir 50:27.[165] Ben Sira's grandson arrived in Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of King Ptolemy VII Physkon Euergetes II

[162] For the following see Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, AB 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 3-4, 8-13, 17-20, 50-62; John Kampen, *Wisdom Literature*, Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 341-345; Benjamin G. Wright, "Sirach", in Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 715-719; M. Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature" in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael E. Stone, vol. 2 of *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 290-301; John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1987), 42-44.

[163] Kampen, *Wisdom Literature*, 341.

[164] Sir 50:27 as corrected by Skehan-Di Lella, and present in Greek and Syriac texts but not Cairo Geniza MS B, which adds שמעון. Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 3; Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 90. The Greek translator is therefore the grandson of the author; according to the prologue, the author, "my (the translator's) grandfather Jesus (Ἰησοῦ)" had immersed himself in the Law, the Prophets, and "the other books of our ancestors", and after some time spent in this way wrote his own text "pertaining to instruction and wisdom (παιδείαν καὶ σοφίαν, Sir Prol 12)". The prologue further attests that this author's grandson, while residing in Egypt, was inspired by the scholarly climate of that place to translate his grandfather's work into Greek (Sir Prol 27-36). An alternative prologue states that this translator's name is also Yeshua (Jesus), the son of another Sirach, who is himself the son of the author, Yeshua (King James Version with Apocrypha, American Edition: https://www.bible.com/bible/546/SIR.1_1.KJVAAE). The complete genealogy therefore is: Sira I—Eleazar—Yeshua I—Sira II—Yeshua II. However, this prologue is of uncertain origin, having been once attributed to Athanasius (Wright, *Sirach*, 716).

[165] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 12.

Euergetes, or 132 BCE, and finished the prologue after Euergetes's death in 117 BCE.[166] An approximation taken from the average length of generations, as well as memorialistic language when referring to high priest Simeon II (219-196 BCE), implies that Ben Sira wrote the text after 196.[167] Further, there is no mention of Antiochus IV Epiphanus's interactions with Jason, son of Simeon II, or his desecration of the Temple.[168] This would suggest a date of approximately 180 BCE for the text's Hebrew composition, but after disputing the memorialistic language and considering issues of reciprocity within the text, Lindsey A. Askin argues for a slightly earlier date of 198 BCE for Sir 50:1-24, and possibly for the entire composition.[169] Patrick W. Skehan (1909-1980) and Alexander Di Lella (1929-2019) argue that the work was considered a sacred writing by Jews of Palestine and Alexandria, as it was included within the LXX.[170] However, they note that rabbinic evidence is inconsistent, and while R. Akiba and the Tosefta declare the book as one which does not defile the hands (i.e., "profane"), the work is often referenced in other rabbinic texts with the formula "it is written".[171] The broad Jewish tradition regards the work as ספרים חיצונים, or "outside books", and it was not considered for canonicity at the synod of Jamnia (Yavneh).[172]

Ben Sira was very likely a priest or part of a social group comprised of literate professionals that assisted the priesthood in their work. These professionals, called "scribes" or "sages", are attested in numerous passages within the Hebrew Bible. As one of these specialized

---

[166] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 8-9; Kampen, *Wisdom Literature*, 343.
[167] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 9; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 23.
[168] 2 Macc 4:7-16, 23-26; Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 9-10.
[169] Kampen, *Wisdom Literature*, 343; Lindsey A. Askin, "Beyond Encomium or Eulogy: The Role of Simon the High Priest in the *Book of Ben Sira*", *JAJ* 9 (2019): 344-365.
[170] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 19-20.
[171] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 20; *J.Sanhedrin* 28a; *Tosefta Yadayim* 2.13; *m.Hag.* 12a; *m.Nid.* 16b; *j.Ber.* 11c.
[172] Kampen, *Wisdom Literature*, 341; Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature", 300; David S. Levene, "Theology and Non-Theology in the Rabbinic Ben Sira", in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference Durham - Ushaw College*, ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 306.

practitioners, Ben Sira possessed detailed knowledge of the Hebrew text, and obtained this knowledge not as an autodidact but via interactions with teachers. In the following chapter, I wish to examine Ben Sira's use of Deut 1-11 in his own writing, specifically his treatment of the themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant. Due to the nature of the subject matter that Ben Sira presents, I will subdivide wisdom into wisdom, generally speaking; wisdom as the fear of יהוה; and wisdom as Torah obedience. *Mûsar/paideia* will be discussed generally, but Ben Sira extensively meditates on a specific manifestation of *mûsar/paideia*, the art of speaking rightly, an application which finds earlier traditional support in Proverbs and is continued in the work of the apostle James. Ben Sira discusses this topic in ways traceable to Deut 1-11 and therefore I will also attend to this category. Some of these categories have received delineation and discussion elsewhere, but the final category is of my own observation.[173]

I use these lenses to show the influence of Deuteronomy 1-11 on Ben Sira, and his interpretation of that work by emphasizing these issues within his own work. Just as for the author of Deuteronomy 1-11, obedience to יהוה produces wisdom and a good life, is inculcated through a process of *paideia* that is essentially familial in structure, and rests upon a foundation of intense respect, or fear, of יהוה. But the act of speaking is specifically important for Deuteronomy 1-11, and it is especially emphasized in Ben Sira as well. By discussing the work in these divisions, I do not wish to imply that Ben Sira himself arranged his material this way; the underlying organizational principles in Sir remain contested, ranging from the holistic views of Skehan and Di Lella to which I subscribe, the chaos theory of William Oesterley (1866-1950), and Wolfgang Roth (1930-2013)/Jeremy Corley's argument that a series of successively released

[173] E.g. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*; Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature".

"installments" comprises the text, with which Schmidt agrees.[174] I agree with Skehan and Di Lella's conclusion as it most simply fits the available historical data: strong and singular attestation of authorship as well as translation, a very late origin date, and extant historical evidence that only attests for a few small additions.[175] But perhaps most convincing, in my view, is that while we do see later interaction with Ben Sira's original materials, those who desire to make major changes, or to translate the work, leave clear statements of their intent that have been preserved along with the original documents. Therefore I find it odd to think that large-scale changes might have been made by tradents who desired to leave no trace of their work, when as recently as two generations following the work's origin we find clear precedent for providing evidence of interaction with that work.

There are four text-types for Sirach, as given by Ziegler and Kearns: HTI, the Hebrew original; HTII, an expanded Hebrew version; GI, the grandson's translation; GII, an expansion of that translation.[176] HTII was expanded between 50 AD and 150 AD, and GII was expanded between 150 and 200 AD.[177] For the following discussion, I will use the Pancratius C. Beentjes edition for the Hebrew, the Ziegler edition for the Greek text, and the New Revised Standard Edition for most English translations; in the section pertaining to covenant, however, I will use the New English Translation of the Septuagint, as it renders covenant more consistently.[178] I will

[174] A. Jordan Schmidt, *Wisdom, Cosmos, and Cultus in the Book of Sirach*, DCLS 42 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2019), 19; W. Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1912); R. Mackenzie, *Sirach*, OTMes 19 (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983); J. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus, or, The Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach*, CBC (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974); J. Harvey, "Toward a Degree of Order in Ben Sira's Book", *ZAW* 105 (1993):52-62; W. Roth, "On the Gnomic-Discursive Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach", *Semeia* 17 (1980): 59-79; J. Corley, "Searching for Structure and Redaction in Ben Sira", in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, DCLS 1, eds. A. Passaro and G. Bellia (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 21-47.
[175] Sir 29:12; 50:29; 51:12ix (see below).
[176] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 55.
[177] Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature", 291.
[178] Beentjes, *Ben Sira*; Joseph Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

use יהוה and κύριος to render the Tetragrammaton as it respectively appears in Hebrew and Greek texts.

2.2. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—Wisdom, Generally

Wisdom is undoubtedly a key concern of Ben Sira. The text presents numerous descriptions of wisdom, its benefits, and continually praises wisdom as something to be loved for its own sake, as well to be earnestly pursued at almost any cost, as to know wisdom is to know God.[179] At the outset of his writing, Ben Sira makes it clear in verse 1:1 that wisdom cannot be obtained without God's assistance, in agreement with Prov 8, Job 28, and as Bar 3:9-4:4 will later attest.[180] In Sir 1:3, Ben Sira writes: "The height of heaven, the breadth of the earth, the abyss, and wisdom—who can search them out?", language that reflects the inaccessible expanses of space which are expressed in Deut 30:11-14 and localized in Deut 11:18-21.[181] Wisdom, then, is as remote as the most distant parts of creation. This theme of remoteness is continued in Sir 24:28, which gives: "The first man did not know wisdom fully, nor will the last one fathom her"; according to Skehan and DiLella, this is a reference to the ultimate transcendence and mystical impenetrability of Torah, and by placing wisdom in the place Torah traditionally holds, Ben Sira is again equating wisdom with Torah.[182]

---

[179] Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 46; A.A. Di Lella, "The Meaning of Wisdom in Ben Sira", in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, eds. L. Perdue, B.B. Scott, and W.J. Wiseman (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 133-148.

[180] Sir 1:1: "All wisdom is from יהוה , and with him it remains forever."; Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature", 293.

[181] Also in Bar 3:29-30; see Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, "The Theological and Philosophical Concepts of Ben Sira", in *Discovering, Deciphering and Dissenting: Ben Sira Manuscripts after 120 Years*, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2018, eds. Núria Calduch-Benages, Jeremy Corley, Michael Duggan and Renate Egger-Wenzel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 290.

[182] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 337. There is no extant Hebrew for Sir 24.

This view of wisdom, as obtainable only with God's help, is held not only by Ben Sira, but shared by other hands participating in the textual tradition. Not only in the original manuscripts, but also in later glosses, is wisdom praised, as Sir 1:10cd indicates: "Love of יהוה יהוה is ennobling wisdom; to those to whom he appears he apportions it, that they may see him".[183] In fact, where wisdom is, so is God, and wisdom that repudiates God is not wisdom at all.[184] True wisdom is created by God, who himself is most wise, and wisdom was first brought into being amongst the entire created order, keeping in mind that wisdom is non-material.[185] This wisdom is not only informative but transformative, as Sir 11:1 shows: "The wisdom of the humble lifts their heads high, and seats them among the great"; "lifts high", or ἀνυψώσει, is indicative of exaltation as Montanari observes.[186] Further, wisdom brings happiness, assists in God's omniscience, and protects humans from sinful behavior.[187]

Wisdom and its benefits are not only a concern for Ben Sira himself, but for later Greek authors participating in the Sirach textual tradition. Sir 1:1-5, a late addition attested in the Old Latin but not found in the Syriac, is representative of a Greek translation of a secondary Hebrew text and is as follows: "The wellspring of wisdom is the word of God in the heights, and its runlets are the ageless commandments. The root of wisdom—to whom has it been revealed? Her subtleties—who knows them? An understanding of wisdom—to whom has this been disclosed; her resourcefulness, who has known?"[188] This late addition and its teachings show the

[183] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 136-137.
[184] Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 46.
[185] Reiterer, "Ben Sira", 288. Monotheism is, as goes without saying, a part of Ben Sira's theology, as is taught in Deut 6:4 and Sir 33:3-5; see Alexander A. Di Lella, "God and Wisdom in the Theology of Ben Sira: An Overview", in *Ben Sira's God*, 5.
[186] Franco Montanari, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 214.
[187] Sir 14:20; 15:18; 18:27-28. No Hebrew text exists for Sir 18:27-28.
[188] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 136-137; see also Sir 3:25.

persistence of the traditions observed above not only in Ben Sira's work, but possibly that of his grandson, and more likely later Greek scribes and tradents.[189]

Wisdom must be sought, as is made clear in Sir 6:26-28: "Come to her with all your soul, and keep her ways with all your might. Search out and seek, and she will become known to you; and when you get hold of her, do not let her go. For at last you will find the rest she gives, and she will be changed into joy for you." This is strongly akin to Deut 6:5: which exhorts, "You shall love יהוה your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might." It is this wholeness of soul in one's effort that is required not only to love יהוה in Deut 1-11, but also in Sir. Ben Sira has therefore drawn upon this concept of wholeness and entirety, to draw upon the sum total of one's resources in one's effort, which Deuteronomy assigns to the love of יהוה and which Ben Sira now declares must be invoked in the pursuit of wisdom.[190] This love also evokes the theme of covenant, specifically covenantal love.[191]

We have seen above Ben Sira's view of wisdom, and that it is strongly informed by themes of Deut 1-11. Wisdom originates with God, and one cannot be truly wise without God's help. But it is nevertheless the responsibility of the individual to seek God, and not to do so with a sense of imminent failure but with confidence and the expectation of divine cooperation. By writing as an exhorter, Ben Sira emulates Moses, the great exhorter of Deut 1-11 who reminds the Israelite that they too cannot and have not succeeded without God's help, and that if they only comply with God's commands they will find, as Jesus of Nazareth claimed roughly 210 years

[189] See Pancratius C. Beentjes, "'Full Wisdom is from the Lord': Sir 1:1-10 and its Place in Israel's Wisdom Literature", in *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 145, although this evidence is questionable and somewhat subjective.
[190] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 194.
[191] See Introduction above.

after Ben Sira, that the "yoke is easy" and that the "burden is light".[192] That being said, let us now examine several topics within the text itself. It is perhaps Sir 1:27 that best depicts not only the aims of this discussion, but the aim of Ben Sira himself: "For the fear of κύριος is wisdom and discipline (παιδεία), fidelity and humility are his delight". Here we find an emphasis on the fear of κύριος as synonymous with wisdom, as well as discipline or *paideia*. But obedient fidelity is also important, and as we will see, Torah obedience is invariably concomitant with wisdom for Ben Sira.

2.3. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—Wisdom as the Fear of God

While significant scholarly effort has been spent arguing that Ben Sira's primary theme is wisdom, other authors have presented the fear of God as the main theme of the work.[193] For Ben Sira, wisdom and the fear of God cannot be easily separated; "there is no wisdom, then, without fear of the Lord, which means that for Ben Sira wisdom is in the religious and not in the merely secular order".[194] The phrase "fear of κύριος ", or an equivalent, occurs fifty-five to sixty times in the book of Ben Sira.[195] Fearing and loving God, however, are equated, and therefore the concept of fearing God has strong Deuteronomic precedent, as the Shema gives: "Hear, O Israel:

---

[192] Matt 11:30.

[193] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 75; Gerhard von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, trans. J. D. Martin (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1972), 242; J. Marböck, *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheittheologie bei Ben Sira* (BBB 37, 1971); J. Haspecker, *Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach: Ihre religiöse Struktur und ihre literarische und doktrinäre Bedeutung*, AnBib 30 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), 87-105; Renate Egger-Wenzel, "'Faith in God' Rather Than 'Fear of God' in Ben Sira and Job: A Necessary Adjustment in Terminology and Understanding", in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.*, CBQ Monograph Series 48, eds. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005), 219.

[194] Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature", 294; Jeremy Corley, *Ben Sira's Teaching on Friendship*, Brown Judaic Studies 316 (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2002), 217.

[195] Deut 6:13, 10:12; Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 76; see also Haspecker, *Gottesfurcht*, 48-50; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 46. Although "walking in the ways" could be understood as obedience, it is not explicit.

יהוה is our God, יהוה alone. You shall love יהוה your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might".[196] Wisdom—and fear of God— is therefore "not only a matter of understanding but also a moral disposition ... (entailing) patience, discipline, trust, humility, and sincerity ... an attitude of reverence for God and respect for received tradition".[197] However, it should be understood that fearing God, obeying Torah, and wisdom are interrelated, so that while I deal with these topics separately, they should not be construed as having independent existence.[198] Covenantalism, too, is assimilated within this ongoing amalgamation of themes, as again the "love" of Deut 6:4 references covenantal fidelity.[199]

Fearing God is emphasized at the initial point of Ben Sira's work. This emphasis upon the fear of God is itself a major theme of Deuteronomy 1-11.[200] Sir 1:11-13 gives: "The fear of κύριος produces much goodness: glory and exultation, and gladness and a crown of rejoicing; the fear of κύριος delights the heart, and gives gladness and joy and long life; those who fear κύριος will have a happy end; on the day of their death they will be blessed".[201] Here we find wisdom themes that seem to address worldly life—glory, gladness, joy, long life—but by the end of the passage, Ben Sira has shifted the focus from life to death, and from temporal benefits to the spiritual rewards that await the virtuous at the time of their death. By subtly reminding his

---

[196] Deut 6:4-5 (NRSV).
[197] Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 47.
[198] Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature", 294; also Reiterer, "Ben Sira", 287; Egger-Wenzel, "Faith in God", 221; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 255-256; but also Greg Schmidt Goering, *Wisdom's Root Revealed: Ben Sira and the Election of Israel*, JSJSupp 139 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), for a general problematization of this topic.
[199] See Introduction, above.
[200] Deut 6:13, 10:12.
[201] No extant Hebrew for Sir 1:11-13; 2:7-10. See also Sir 1:14; 1:16-18; 1:26-27; 2:15-17; 15:1; 19:18; 25:11; 34:14-17; 40:26-27. Also 2:1; according to Skehan and DiLella, this "when you come to serve יהוה " is "when you come to the fear of God" in the Syriac, and is Smend and Duesberg-Fransen's preferred reading. See Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 150; R. Smend, *Das hebräische Fragment der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, N. F., 2, 2 (Berlin: Weidmannsche, 1897), 18; H. Deusberg and I. Fransen, *Ecclesiastico*, La Sacra Bibbia ... di S. Garofalo. Antico Testamento, G. Rinaldi, ed. (Turin: Marietti, 1966), 98.

readers of the spiritual conditions that support earthly existence, Ben Sira echoes the recurring theme in Deut 1-11 that there is no good to be had without God's involvement. Sir 4:14, " Those who serve her minister to the Holy One; the Lord loves those who love her" shows, according to Skehan and DiLella, "Ben Sira (implicitly equating) Wisdom with the fear of יהוה : in the theology of Ben Sira, Wisdom equals fear of יהוה , and יהוה loves those who fear him by keeping the Law".[202] Sir 10:20 and 22: " Among family members their leader is worthy of honor, but those who fear the Lord are worthy of honor in his eyes ... The rich, and the eminent, and the poor-- their glory is the fear of the Lord".[203]

For Ben Sira, then, fearing God is of chief importance, as Moses teaches in Deut 1-11. We have seen Ben Sira previously show the inaccessibility of wisdom by comparing it to the remote extremes of creation, as is done in Deut 1-11. However, he also develops this by including the fear of God, asserting that this fear also should be compared to the same extremes. Later writers, working with the text, will amplify this idea in the years to come. Sir 50:29 gives: "For if they put them (instruction and understanding and knowledge, Sir 50:27) into practice, they will be equal to anything, for the fear of κύριος is their path". Skehan and DiLella render this verse as: "If he carries them out, he will be equal to any challenge, for the fear of יהוה will provide him with depth". In the Hebrew MS B, there is only given: "For the fear of יהוה is life"; the additional portion comes from the Syriac, which has "The height of the fear of יהוה is exalted above everything; hold on to it, my son, and do not let it go", which according to Skehan and DiLella is derived from the Greek manuscript which adds a twelfth verse to chapter 25, "Fear of

[202] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 172.
[203] Verse 21 is a gloss, "The beginning of acceptance is the fear of the Lord; the beginning of rejection, effrontery, and pride": Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 278.

κύριος is the beginning of loving him, and fidelity is the beginning of clinging to him".[204] Height and depth have already been visited in Sir 1:3: "The height of heaven, the breadth of the earth, the abyss, and wisdom— who can search them out?"

These concepts also strongly resonate with the Deuteronomic injunction found in Deut 30:11-14, a passage which contrasts the fear of God with the word, or *dābār dābār*. Ben Sira states that the fear of God has qualities *like* unattainable heights and depths, yet as we have seen this fear is not beyond the reach of human possibility—otherwise, how could Ben Sira reasonably commend that his readers attain it? Deut 30:11-14 elaborates this, and clarifies that the commandment (*miṣwâ*) is *not* like the heights and depths in that it is attainable:

> Surely, this commandment that I am commanding you today is not too hard for you, nor is it too far away. It is not in heaven, that you should say, "Who will go up to heaven for us, and get it for us so that we may hear it and observe it?" Neither is it beyond the sea, that you should say, "Who will cross to the other side of the sea for us, and get it for us so that we may hear it and observe it?" No, the word is very near to you; it is in your mouth and in your heart for you to observe.

Deut 1-11 also considers the idea of the word residing close to Israel, but does not emphasize the possibility that the word may be distant. Rather, it focuses on Israel's need to repeatedly reinforce this word through education, or *mûsar/paideia*, as in Deut 11:18-21:

> You shall put these words of mine in your heart and soul, and you shall bind them as a sign on your hand, and fix them as an emblem on your forehead. Teach them to your

[204] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 557, 340; Beentjes, *Ben Sira*, 91, Ziegler, *Sapientia*, 244.

> children, talking about them when you are at home and when you are away, when you lie down and when you rise. Write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates, so that your days and the days of your children may be multiplied in the land that יהוה swore to your ancestors to give them, as long as the heavens are above the earth.

In the later writings of the apostle Paul, we find an assent to the nearness of the word and its absence from heights and depths; however, these ideas are somewhat problematized in the Ben Sira textual tradition.[205] While the ideas of heights and depths remain, these extremes of existence are accessible to the faithful if one is able to successfully cling, not to the word, but to the fear of God.[206]

Therefore, we see in Ben Sira the importance of fearing God as a wise practice. This is directly related to specific Deuteronomic teachings, notably in Deut 6:13 and 10:12, that the Israelites are directly commanded to fear God and that to do so will result in their prosperity within the land of their occupation. As the text develops over time, in the hands of its tradents, we find this idea connected to the concept of cosmic distance, or great heights and depths, and that the fear of God allows attainment of these pinnacles. The tradents accomplish this by means of another Deuteronomic idea, the *dābār*, and asserting that the *dābār* is not far away, but close enough that it may be obeyed. So for Ben Sira, the heights and depths are equivalent to the good and desirable fear of God, which is wisdom; in Deuteronomy 30, the heights and depths are far away but the *dābār* is not; and in Deut 1-11, the *dābār* is good, and must be earnestly pursued through *mûsar/paideia*. For the tradents, this may have led to a contradiction—how can we pursue both that which is distant (the fear of God) and yet also pursue the word *despite* its

[205] Rom 10:6-9.
[206] Word as *logos* will be more closely examined in a following section.

distance? In other words, how can distance be an obstacle in the case of one, yet not the other? Perhaps the answer, for them, was that attainability did not equal ease of accessibility, and the mere fact that the fear of God was like the heights and depths, and therefore difficult to achieve, should not discourage the pursuit of it. These problems are not completely solved by Ben Sira, but what we do witness is the necessary interweaving of the three principal themes of Deut 1-11—wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia*—driven by the consideration of wisdom as obtainable with God's help, but also consisting primarily of the fear of God.

2.4. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—Wisdom as Torah Obedience

We have seen thus far that Ben Sira praises God through wisdom, and that the desirable property of wisdom can only be attained through God's help. We have also seen that God is to be feared, and that this fear enables one to achieve spiritual benefits that may be likened to great heights and depths, with the assistance of the *dābār* which is close to the Israelites. These concepts are all expressed, by Ben Sira and his tradents, by means of ideas found within Deut 1-11. But Ben Sira also clarifies that it is obedience to Torah, specifically, which enables these spiritual benefits. This, too, is clearly expressed in Deut 1-11, which devotes a great deal of time to enumerating not only the benefits of obedience, but the consequences of disobedience. This focus on obedience positions Ben Sira's teaching away from broad conceptions of Torah. For Ben Sira, Torah is not a vague idea of a "path" or a "way", but a specific set of instructions from God which, as Ben Sira is clear to communicate, can be as easily—if not more easily for most—disobeyed as obeyed. This view is undoubtedly influenced by Ben Sira's proximity to the priesthood, which daily faced the reality of specific instructions that should be scrupulously

followed. But it is also influenced by Ben Sira's advocacy of the Jerusalem priesthood against claims of rival lineages, as we will explore in greater detail below, since the possibility of disobedience correspondingly enables the possibility of misapplying the Torah not only in the case of daily life but in determining who should and should not serve as a priest.

Certainly by the time of Ben Sira's grandson, the emphasis found within the work of Ben Sira himself upon Torah obedience has survived, as it is promoted by that grandson himself. Torah obedience is a concern of Deut 4:6, in which the Israelites are exhorted to show their wisdom through their observance of the statutes. In Sir Prol 13-14 we find: "... so that by becoming familiar also with his book those who love learning might make even greater progress in living according to the law".[207] The Law is also used to frame the Prologue itself, forming an *inclusio*: "Many great teachings have been given to us through the Law and the Prophets and the others that followed them ... I have applied my skill day and night to complete and publish the book for those living abroad who wished to gain learning and are disposed to live according to the law."[208]

Torah obedience is critically important, then, for Ben Sira; further, he will equate Torah obedience with wisdom. This is first seen in Sir 6:37: "Reflect on the statutes of κύριος , and meditate at all times on his commandments. It is he who will give insight to your mind, and your desire for wisdom will be granted".[209] In Sir 24:1-22, Wisdom is personified and gives an extensive speech, describing her cosmic origins, her arboreal development, and her rewards to

[207] See also Stuart Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 86; although his citation of Deut 4:6 as equating Torah with wisdom more precisely applies to the *chuqqim* and *mishpatim*, not *torah*.
[208] Sir Prol 1, 34-36; Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 135.
[209] Also Sir 19:19. The Greek in 6:37 gives "heart", καρδία.

those who claim her fruits.[210] She here addresses an audience as part of a heavenly council, as does Moses the assembly of Israel.[211] This speech is followed by 24:23: "All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law that Moses commanded us as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob".[212] Covenantalism is again evoked here; and again, we see the equivalence Ben Sira assigns to Torah obedience and wisdom. The Deuteronomic influence may also be detected in the similar thought of Philo of Alexandria, who while residing within a greatly differing social milieu than Ben Sira and preferring a highly spiritual and allegorical approach to the law, nonetheless holds that its tenets are not merely symbolic but are to be scrupulously followed.[213]

We have seen thus far that the family is often regarded in antiquity as the primary instiller of *mûsar/paideia*. But for Jewish communities, this means study and obedience of Torah. Often the two overlap, and in these cases Ben Sira notes that Torah obedience, when it is part of *mûsar/paideia*, is wisdom. For example, the honor which is properly due to the family is no strange teaching to either the Greek or the Roman world, but it is also one of the commandments of the Decalogue, as Deut 5:16 gives: "Honor your father and your mother, as יהוה your God commanded you, so that your days may be long and that it may go well with you in the land that יהוה your God is giving you".[214] So in Sir 3:6-7 we find: "Those who respect their father will have long life, and those who honor their mother obey κύριος ; they will serve their parents as their masters", a strong parallel between obeying Torah and honoring parents, indicated by the

[210] According to John J. Collins, this personification is "indebted to the Egyptian Isis hymns". See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 49-50; Marbock, *Weisheit*, 47-54; C. Kayatz, *Studien zu Proverbien 1-9* (Neukirchen-Yluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966), 76-119.
[211] Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 50; Deut 1:1, 5:1.
[212] Again, see Goering, *Wisdom's Root*, 3-7.
[213] *Abr*.89-93; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 47.
[214] Exod 21:17; Lev 20:9; Tob 4:3-4, 14:12-13; Prov 1:8, 6:20; Matt 15:3-6; Mark 7:9-13; Eph 6:2-3; Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 155.

inclusion of longevity, as a reward, within the Sir text.[215] Yet Ben Sira does not explicitly mention Torah here, which lends support to the idea that the Torah is *itself* wisdom, and perhaps also synonymous with *mûsar/paideia*: an idea which is strengthened by Ben Sira's particular method of expounding his teachings, as he does not delineate or further elaborate upon the precepts themselves.[216]

Torah obedience, according to Ben Sira, is also synonymous with the fear of God, as Sir 2:15-16 gives: "Those who fear κύριος do not disobey his words, and those who love him keep his ways. Those who fear κύριος seek to please him, and those who love him are filled with his law", and as the fear of God is itself synonymous with wisdom (shown elsewhere), it is a simple conclusion that Torah obedience is, for Ben Sira, wisdom itself.[217] As Sir 1:26 gives, "If you desire wisdom, keep the commandments, and κύριος will lavish her upon you". Torah also stipulates that one should love their neighbor, and this too is part of Ben Sira's wisdom teaching, for Sir 6:17 gives: "Those who fear κύριος direct their friendship aright, for as they are, so are their neighbors also".[218]

So we have seen Ben Sira commend to his readers that they obey Torah, and to do so is an inalienable aspect of wisdom and the fear of God. In fact, this obedience may be construed not as merely a means to wisdom, but wisdom itself. This obedience involves daily involvement with Torah, certainly an occupation of the priesthood but also, to a lesser extent, the laity. But it also requires a right stance toward other humans, which we will also see emphasized in a later document that exhorts the listener to love God and neighbor.[219]

---

[215] See Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 155. The Hebrew gives a portion of verse 6 only.
[216] Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature", 295.
[217] No extant Hebrew for Sir 2.
[218] Lev 19:18; Matt 19:19; Luke 10:27. Also Sir 15:1; 19:20; 19:24; 21:11. No extant Hebrew for Sir 1:26.
[219] Mark 12:30-31; Matt 22:36-40.

2.5. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*

Sir was given several additional titles by Jewish readers. Talmudic references call it "The Book of Ben Sira", or *sepher ben sira*.[220] Rabbi Joseph calls it "The Proverbs of Ben Sira", *mishle ben sira*; in the 10th century, Saadia calls it "The Book of Instruction", or *sepher mûsar*, while other rabbis name it "The Instruction of Ben Sira", or *mûsar ben sira*.[221] In the prologue to Sir, Ben Sira's grandson writes that Israel should be praised for its *paideia*. Throughout Sir, *mûsar* as present in the Hebrew text is translated *paideia* with one notable exception examined below.[222] As noted above, Ben Sira was either a priest or involved with the priesthood as a scribe or sage. This means that, for him, a text that discussed *paideia* carried additional connotations not immediately evident. For the laity of Ben Sira's time, *paideia* meant resolution and discipline in Torah and in one's personal conduct. We cannot say with any authority that it resembled what would be known as the Hellenistic *paideia*, as our earliest evidence for this originates in the priesthoods of Menelaus and Jason, Oniad priests of a later generation than Simeon II whom Ben Sira praises.[223] Yet for Ben Sira himself, daily life entailed dedication to studying the sacred Hebrew texts. The texts, were, then, *themselves* a type of *paideia* for Ben Sira, and certain elements in the text reveal this. But Ben Sira was not the first to experience this type of textual *paideia*, as it is clearly proscribed in Deut 1-11. There, the Israelites are instructed to bind the "words", or *dêbārîm*, "as a sign upon (the) hand ... as frontlets between

---

[220] See Skehan-DiLella, who attribute these rabbinic references to *m.Ḥag.* 13a, *m.Nid.* 16b, *m.Ber.* 1lb.
[221] As above, *Ben Sira*, 3-4; G.H. Box and W.O.E. Oesterley, "Sirach", in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. R.H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 1:217. Skehan and Di Lella offer Talmudic references but do not specify whether they are of the Jerusalem or Babylonian type.
[222] Beentjes, *Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*; Ziegler, *Sapientia*.
[223] 2 Macc 4:7, 23.

your eyes ... write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates".[224] These Deuteronomic echoes continue to emerge throughout Ben Sira's work, showing the constant influence of Deut 1-11 on Ben Sira's *paideia* writings.

According to Skehan and DiLella:

> The 'instruction' (*paideia*/*mûsar*) or 'discipline,' is what enables one to possess 'wisdom' (*sophia*/ *ḥākmâ*), which in the thought of Ben Sira means fear of the Lord which equals keeping the Law ... Because such 'instruction' and 'wisdom' have been given to the Jews through 'the Law, the Prophets, and the later authors,' Israel merits praise.[225]

Sir Prol 3 gives: "Many great teachings have been given to us through the Law and the Prophets and the others that followed them, and for these we should praise Israel for instruction and wisdom (παιδείας καὶ σοφίας)". Here, Ben Sira's grandson writes that traditions have been transmitted through the Law and the Prophets, as well as presumably the Writings, and that by ensuring that these traditions remain within Jewish society, the stewards of this society/scribes (as described later in Sir) should be praised for "instruction (παιδείας) and wisdom (σοφίας)". This work itself, claims Ben Sira's grandson, is also a work of *paideia* and *sophia*. Ben Sira's work begins with questions designed to provoke and challenge the reader, beginning their journey into *mûsar/paideia*: according to Reiterer, this is itself a formative technique.[226] Sir 1:27 gives: "For the fear of κύριος is wisdom (σοφία) and discipline (παιδεία), fidelity and humility

[224] Deut 6:8-9.
[225] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 133.
[226] Sir 1:2-3: Reiterer, "Ben Sira", 289.

are his delight". The universe itself provides teaching and instruction for Ben Sira, as Sir 18:9-10 illustrate.[227]

Here we find discipline (παιδευθήσεις/תסר) forming an *inclusio* with wisdom, but also the immediate juxtaposition of Torah, as given in "statutes" and "commandments", ἐντολαῖς/במצותו and προστάγμασιν/ בתרת.[228] Discipline and intelligence is within the reach of all, attentive learning produces wisdom, and the usual context of *paideia*, a mentoring relationship, is strongly encouraged. As observed above, for Ben Sira *paideia* is not merely an academic exercise; any interaction with the world produces a kind of *paideia*. But as expected, the main focus of *paideia*, according to Ben Sira, is in the study of texts, and this is accordingly emphasized throughout his work. The Torah, not coincidentally, is transmitted through text, and as we have seen Ben Sira assign the value of wisdom to Torah, it stands to reason that he would similarly praise the means by which this Torah is inculcated, namely, *paideia*. *Paideia* then, for Ben Sira, may be considered as playing an analogous role to obedience in daily life; just as one makes Torah a reality in one's life through obedience, one impresses the Torah in one's mind through the *paideia* of training and study.

This practical esteem given to study is undoubtedly a key element in Sir 6:32-37, which commends the educational value to be found in associating with elders, an extension of the common motif of parents and children found with *mûsar/paideia*. Here, Ben Sira provides a concrete approval of *paideia*:

---

[227] Reiterer, "Ben Sira", 294; Jean-Louis Ska, "Torah, Paideia, and Sophia in Ben Sira", in *Ben Sira in Conversation with Traditions: A Festschrift for Prof. Núria Calduch-Benages*, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 47, eds. Francis M. Matacangay and Francisco-Javier Ruiz-Ortiz in collaboration with Renate Egger-Wenzel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2022), 45; for the equivalence in the Greek text of מסר and σοφία in Sir 6:22 see Ska, "Torah", 39.

[228] The Hebrew *betorah* is the reading of Skehan and Di Lella; see Beentjes for an alternative. Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 192; Beentjes, *Ben Sira*, 29.

> If you are willing, my child, you can be disciplined ... If you love to listen you will gain knowledge, and if you pay attention you will become wise. Stand in the company of the elders. Who is wise? Attach yourself to such a one. Be ready to listen to every godly discourse, and let no wise proverbs escape you. If you see an intelligent person, rise early to visit him; let your foot wear out his doorstep.

However, according to John J. Collins neither Torah or the wisdom of elders "is simply equated with wisdom here ... (they are) propadeutic ... Wisdom is a gift of God, over and beyond what one can acquire by study. It is a disposition of the mind and character".[229] This strongly resembles Philo of Alexandria's convictions regarding wisdom (see below) and shows again a common thread of Deuteronomic interpretive influence; just as the Israelites "sat at the feet" of Moses, to receive a connected complex of wisdom-Torah-*paideia*, so too must the Israelites in Ben Sira's day attend to the teaching of the ancestors.[230] Further, respect for one's elders even in one's maturity, rather than a pure disregard for their physical weakness, shows awareness of one's own position with respect to God and is a marked departure from Greek ideals.[231]

But Sir does not only reference *mûsar/paideia* overtly. Ideas of self-control and discipline, as instrumental in the acquisition of wisdom, also occur in more subtle ways. Sir 2:1-6 gives:

---

[229] Collins, *Hebrew Wisdom*, 48; also Reiterer, "Ben Sira", 307, specifically commenting on Ben Sira's exhortation to seek wisdom with the understanding that it is possible, albeit with God's help.
[230] This is also seen in Jesus's preference of Mary to Martha in Luke 10:38-42. For more on Moses as teacher see Ska, "Torah", 40-42.
[231] Homer, *Il.* 6.208, 11.784; Reiterer, "Ben Sira", 292-293. For a different view of relations between parents and children that examines self-interest, atonement, and sexual control see Ibolya Balla, *Ben Sira on Family, Gender, and Sexuality*, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 8, eds. Friedrich V. Reiterer, Beate Ego, and Tobias Nicklas (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 22-50.

> My child, when you come to serve κύριος , prepare yourself for testing. Set your heart right and be steadfast, and do not be impetuous in time of calamity. Cling to him and do not depart, so that your last days may be prosperous. Accept whatever befalls you, and in times of humiliation be patient. For gold is tested in the fire, and those found acceptable, in the furnace of humiliation. Trust in him, and he will help you; make your ways straight, and hope in him.

Skehan and DiLella write that this testing is part of the "Deuteronomic theory of retribution that legitimated probationary suffering for the virtuous".[232] This testing also conveys a type of transformation for those subject to its trial.[233] The Greek for Sir 4:11 is Ἡ σοφία υἱοὺς αὐτῆς ἀνύψωσεν καὶ ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν; ἀνύψωσεν is translated "teaches" by Skehan and DiLella, but Franco Montanari gives "raise, exalt".[234] Again, we find the need for discipline exhorted for all, not merely the priest or scholar but for the layman as well. Further, we see that this discipline will have a greater effect than measurable information that is assimilated. Not only will it result in a discernible effect on the mind, increasing the knowledge which it possesses, but also will spiritually shape the will and resolve, which hearkens back to Collins's and Philo's observation that the relationship between Torah and the wisdom of elders on the one hand, and divine wisdom on the other, may not be so transparently stated that acquisition of the former inevitably provides the latter.

---

[232] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 150; O.S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1954), 77-80; A.A. DiLella, "Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom", *CBQ* 28:2 (1966): 143-146; Jas 1:2-4; 1 Pet 6-7; Luke 11:4; Matt 6:13.

[233] See also 1 Peter 1:6-7, and Nuria Calduch-Benages, "Trial Motif in the Book of Ben Sira with Special Reference to Sir 2,1-6", in *For Wisdom's Sake: Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira*, BZAW 499 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021), 30; ibid., "Amid Trials: Ben Sira 2:1 and James 1:2", in *Intertextual*, 259.

[234] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 169; Montanari, *Dictionary*, 214.

We may therefore view *paideia* as something of a journey, and Ben Sira uses this metaphor also. *Paideia* is also the translation choice for *mûsar* in Sir 4:17: "For at first she will walk with them on tortuous paths; she will bring fear and dread upon them, and will torment them by her discipline (παιδείᾳ) until she trusts them, and she will test them with her ordinances". Wisdom is even depicted as a companion walking alongside the disciples, as is given in Deut 8:2.[235] Sir 6:18: "My child, from your youth choose discipline (παιδείαν), and when you have gray hair you will still find wisdom"; and 6:20: "She seems very harsh to the undisciplined (ἀπαιδεύτοις); fools cannot remain with her".[236] However, hints have begun to emerge that this is no proverbial walk in the park, but an arduous trek that will discourage most of those who begin. This unpleasantness is, for Ben Sira, not only essential for most, but a sign that moral reform is happening within the traveler, since it is especially difficult for the morally bankrupt to take steps toward Wisdom. This, in fact, requires the traveler to abstain, or *repent*, from immoral practices, and even enlighten oneself away from the old mentality that empowered these practices. Sir 6:20 shows that discipline is an unpleasant burden to the morally deficient, as is also attested in Prov 1:7 and 15:5; but there is also a pun here in the Hebrew, on the word *sur*, meaning "to turn aside".[237] This indicates the presence of returning toיהוה , or repentance, a critical idea in Deuteronomy 1-11 that allows the Israelites to atone for any acts of betrayal against God they may commit.[238] The sense of this pun is continued later in the Greek, as Sir 18:13 gives: "The compassion of human beings is for their neighbors, but the compassion of the Lord is for every living thing. He rebukes and trains (παιδεύων) and teaches them, *and turns*

[235] Calduch-Benages, "Trial", 33.
[236] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 172.
[237] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 193; Beentjes, *Ben Sira*, 28.
[238] Deut 4:25-31; but see also David Lambert, *How Repentance Became Biblical*: *Judaism, Christianity, and the Interpretation of Scripture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

them back (ἐπιστρέφων), as a shepherd his flock."[239] In 6:18 and 6:22, discipline occurs in the Hebrew MS A as a framing element, setting apart this section as an *inclusio*.[240] The Greek, however, gives *sophia* in 6:22 (σοφία γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἐστιν καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς ἐστιν φανερά), indicating the translator's view of *sophia* and *mûsar* as equivalent. The relationship between *paideia* and wisdom is further explored in Sir 22:6, which gives: "Like music in time of mourning is ill-timed conversation, but a thrashing and discipline (παιδεία) are at all times wisdom", and 23:2: "Who will set whips over my thoughts, and the discipline (παιδείαν) of wisdom over my mind, so as not to spare me in my errors, and not overlook my sins?".

These last two verses make clear the association with *paideia* and physical discipline. *Paideia* is often attested in the Septuagint and Greek corpus in the context of physical correction. *Mûsar*, likewise, is presented as physical discipline, or rebuke, within the Hebrew Bible. Specifically, *mûsar/paideia* typically is used to depict a parent's correction of a child, and it is also in this sense that Ben Sira will typically use the concept. This is unsurprising, given all we have seen above. While the journey to Wisdom is desirable, and leads to God, it is marked by fidelity to Torah and, for many, involvement with Torah to a greater or lesser degree. It is likely that this involvement matched the individual's level of aptitude; certainly Ben Sira would dissuade none with ability from the profession of the scribe, as he repeatedly praises the occupation. Yet the road is hard, and often painful, requiring much spiritual formation and the acquisition of discipline. But as all parents can attest, there is no more impossible task than to force a human being, no matter how large or small, to do what they resolutely do not wish to do. In Ben Sira's discussion of *paideia*, then, theory meets practice with all the urgency that Hebrew

[239] Unfortunately there is no extant Hebrew for this verse.
[240] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 192; Beentjes, *Ben Sira*, 28. Another *inclusio* can be seen between 32:14 (The one who seeks God will accept his discipline (παιδείαν), and those who rise early to seek him will find favor) and 33:18 (Consider that I have not labored for myself alone, but for all who seek instruction (παιδείαν)); Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 397.

child-raising, as given in the texts, demands. Proverbs famously states that to spare the rod is to spoil the child, as well as that to allow a child to raise him- or herself is tantamount to committing them to a life of self-slavery, unable to control themselves.[241]

Ben Sira writes in accordance with this, emphasizing a necessary physical component to *paideia*. In general, we see Sir 22:6: "Like music in time of mourning is ill-timed conversation, but a thrashing and discipline (παιδεία) are at all times wisdom", and 23:2: "Who will set whips over my thoughts, and the discipline (παιδείαν) of wisdom over my mind, so as not to spare me in my errors, and not overlook my sins?". There is also the long poem in Sir 30, which repeatedly exhorts fathers to use physical contact as a means of discipline for their sons. This passage shows the importance of corporal punishment for Ben Sira, and as might be expected it is "sons", בנים, who primarily receive this discipline. But in the Greek, it should be noted that sons as well as daughters are subject to stringent parental discipline, as Sir 7:23 clarifies: "Do you have children (τέκνα/בנים)? Discipline (παίδευσον) them, and make them obedient from their youth."[242] The Greek gives τέκνα, or "children", suggesting that Greek and Roman ideas of *paideia* have begun to influence the Jews of Ben Sira's grandson's time. These ideas of the *enkuklia paideia* and its emphasis on mental discipline perhaps seemed more congenitally applied to sons and daughters alike. However, in both Greek and Hebrew versions the father remained in control of the household, with his wife as submissive subordinate, as 26:14 gives: "A silent wife is a gift from the Lord, and nothing is so precious as her self-discipline (πεπαιδευμένης)".

---

[241] Prov 13:24; 22:6. Here I do not use the customary (and imprecise) translation, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it", but the more correct "Allow a child to raise himself, and when he is old he will not be able to depart from that 'upbringing'".
[242] John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 77.

One passage that is misleadingly severe in the Greek is Sir 33:25: "Fodder and a stick and burdens for a donkey; bread and discipline (παιδεία) and work for a slave". The underlying Hebrew for this verse (MS E) has מרדת, not מסר, which carries a stronger connotation of physical correction.[243] While the original Hebrew seems to imply that slaves have no share in the wisdom elements of *mûsar*, this distinction is lost in the Greek translation. It is easy to see how the equities for slaves and servants, implied in Deut 5:14-15, have emerged in the Greek translation, and how in the Greek one might even construe the salutary benefits of *paideia* as befitting a servant.[244]

We therefore have received a composite picture, from Ben Sira, of wisdom and *paideia* as two sides of the same coin. For Ben Sira, wisdom leads to God such that the fear of God may be itself construed as wisdom. Those who fear God will by necessity seek out Torah, and Torah obedience is a key component of wisdom. But this is not easy, and the road to wisdom requires hard effort for the scribe and layman alike. This road may, in fact, be so difficult as to require parents to assiduously discipline their children if they wish to ensure that their sons and daughters will be able to follow them on this road. Only in this most immediate aspect of *paideia*, the physical upbringing of children, can Ben Sira said to have departed substantially from Deut 1-11; for all of his theoretical writings concerning *paideia*, Ben Sira draws heavily upon traditions found within Deut 1-11. But this training is likely to be imperfect; as we will see below, Ben Sira comments extensively on an aspect of life in which *paideia* seems to elude all people, namely, speech.

---

[243] Skehan-DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 403; Beentjes, *Ben Sira*, 114.

[244] Deut 5:14-15: " ... you shall not do any work ... or your male or female slave ... so that your male and female slave may rest as well as you ... Remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt".

2.6. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia* as Right Speech

Deuteronomy 1-11 is entirely a speech delivered by Moses. It is through the power and effectiveness of his speech that Moses desires to influence Israel to avoid the mistakes of their fathers and live successfully in the promised land. Similarly, Ben Sira devotes a considerable amount of material to the discussion of speech—specifically, how speech may be rightfully and wrongfully used in daily life.[245] Wisdom, personified, indeed might be considered speech personified, for as Sir 24:3 relates, "I (Wisdom) came forth from the mouth of the Most High, and covered the earth like a mist". If "mist" is rightly understood to be synonymous or at the least evocative of "spirit", we have in Sir "philosophical implications ... present in embryo" that show a remarkable similarity to *logos* ideas, found in Stoicism, developed in Wisdom of Solomon, Philo, and John, as well as the concept of *pneuma* developed both in Stoicism, Wisdom of Solomon, and the New Testament.[246] Yet while valuable, these observations do not detract from or preclude the simple fact that Wisdom is the *speech* of God, as easily *hrema* as *logos*, and that the additional philosophical dimensions which *logos* has accumulated for Stoics, and will accumulate for later Jewish authors, are not necessarily present in Ben Sira.

However, it is as *mûsar/paideia* that Ben Sira's chiefly identifies speech. God's speech is not only the source of Wisdom, but creation itself, as Sir 42:15 gives in MS B: "By יהוה 's speech (exist) his works and the manufacturer of his will (is) his teaching/instruction"; here Ben Sira links the speech of God not only to creation but to creation's ability to teach and educate.[247] This is itself reminiscent of Deut 11:18-21, which we have examined earlier, that reiterates that God's

[245] See Calduch-Benages, "Fear of the Powerful or Respect for Authority in Sirach", in *For Wisdom's Sake*, 43.
[246] Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 50; B. Mack, *Logos and Sophia* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973).
[247] Translation by Reiterer: see Reiterer, "Ben Sira", 298.

commands to the Israelite exist not only as metaphysical potentialities but as physical realities, if not literally to be bound upon the hand and the eyes then to be thoroughly ingrained within each Israelite so that the words may be said to be "bound" to them. Yet the binarism characteristic of wisdom teachings will be present also in Ben Sira's engagement with right speech, as he constantly considers the effects of those who speak rightly contrasted with those who speak poorly.

Right speech brings its own benefits, as is seen in Sir 6:5: "Pleasant speech multiplies friends, and a gracious tongue multiplies courtesies".[248] One extensive passage is Sir 5:10-6:1:

> Stand firm for what you know, and let your speech be consistent. Be quick to hear, but deliberate in answering. If you know what to say, answer your neighbor; but if not, put your hand over your mouth. Honor and dishonor come from speaking, and the tongue of mortals may be their downfall. Do not be called double-tongued and do not lay traps with your tongue; for shame comes to the thief, and severe condemnation to the double-tongued. In great and small matters cause no harm, and do not become an enemy instead of a friend; for a bad name incurs shame and reproach; so it is with the double-tongued sinner.

Here, Ben Sira describes both positive and negative outcomes that result from speech which is, respectively, proper and improper. Standing firm, consistency, attentiveness, careful speech, awareness of one's own knowledge, and avoidance of malice demonstrate a speaker who receives honor, while inconsistency, duplicity, wily strategy, in short being "double-tongued" all show a speaker who will receive dishonor. While Ben Sira's manner of depicting speech in this example

[248] Also Sir 25:8 and 19:6.

is remarkably thorough, and should be considered as such, it also suggests the possibility of human agency through its stark characterization of the speech act. One may speak honorably or dishonorably, for weal or woe, "singly" or "doubly" tongued; and therefore the text implies a choice is presented to the hearer. Which, Ben Sira seems to ask, will the reader choose—good speech or bad?[249]

Later, another Jewish author within the new Christian sect, James, will address the same agency we have seen in Ben Sira's treatment of speech, as well as the possibility of misusing this agency. For James, the tongue has an enormously destructive potential for destruction, and requires careful control, for while the tongue can bless, it can also curse.[250] Writing approximately two hundred years earlier, Ben Sira foreshadows James's sentiments in his own lengthy meditation on the subject, a pericope that mentions blessings and curses and shows the continuance of yet another traditional motif found within, yet which did not originate within, Ben Sira: the stark presentation of choice, a prominent theme found within the exhortations of Deuteronomy 1-11.[251] In that passage, Moses reminds Israel of God's commands to them forty years prior, along with their implied, disobedient opposites. "Resume your journey ... go into the hill country of the Amorites ... take possession of the land that I swore to your ancestors ...".[252] Moses also gave them orders, to "choose ... individuals who are wise, discerning, and reputable to be your leaders".[253] Then he recapitulates the earlier commands to go up and take

[249] For an anthropomorphic view of this see Elisa Estévez López, "Quick to Listen, Slow to Speak, and Slow to Anger (Jas 1:19 and Sir 5:11)", in *Conversation*, 301-320. For the binary nature of speech see Alexander A. Di Lella, "Ben Sira's Doctrine on the Discipline of the Tongue: An Intertextual and Synchronic Analysis", in *Wisdom*, 234.
[250] James's use of Sir cannot be further investigated here but is amply explored in Oda Wischmeyer, "The Book of Ben Sira From a Reception-Historical Perspective: Hubert Frankenmölle's Commentary on the Letter of James", in *Conversation*, 297-312.
[251] Jas 3:2b-12; Sir 15:16; Sir 28:12-26.
[252] Deut 1:7-8.
[253] Deut 1:13.

possession.[254] But Israel desires to use spies, and upon receiving this intelligence fails to promptly take possession of the land, which in the eyes of God constitutes disobedience. The remainder of the chapter, and the next two, retell the commands which God gave to Israel as they wander the wilderness and pass through hostile territories.

Finally the story catches up to the present, and Moses begins his exhortation in earnest, which becomes a meta-discourse on obedience and its results. This address by Moses could be considered an exemplar of "good speech", which emphasizes the wisdom of the statutes and ordinances, a feature we have seen developed thus far in Ben Sira.[255] It also emphasizes discipline as *mûsar/paideia*.[256] But the starkness of choice is presented also in Deut 5:32-33, although by means of an unusually employed metaphor: "You must therefore be careful to do as יהוה your God has commanded you; you shall not turn to the right or to the left. You must follow exactly the path that יהוה your God has commanded you, so that you may live, and that it may go well with you, and that you may live long in the land that you are to possess". While we might expect the left and the right to characterize good and evil, here both left and right are shown as possible diversions from יהוה 's path, and the dichotomy is here construed as off the path, be it to the left or right, and on the path. This type of choice is also presented in the strictly circumscribed options which the Israelites have for dealing with foreign nations: do not intermarry, demolish their cultic artifacts.[257] Indeed, Moses promises that God will respond to the Israelites with a similar starkness of choice: love and hate, blessing and curses.[258] Sir 37:16-18 further attests to this quality of choice: "Discussion is the beginning of every work, and

[254] Deut 1:20-21.
[255] Deut 4:6-8
[256] Deut 4:36; 8:5; 11:2.
[257] Deut 7:3-5.
[258] Deut 7:9-10; 11:26-28.

counsel precedes every undertaking. The mind is the root of all conduct; it sprouts four branches, good and evil, life and death; and it is the tongue that continually rules them." Although here we are given four paths rather than two, the binary nature of the decision that Ben Sira envisions is preserved by the division of the branches into one desirable way—good and life—and one undesirable way—evil and death.[259]

In summary, we have seen that Ben Sira places great value on human speech, as he devotes much of his writing to that topic. His view of human speech is practical and does not venture into later metaphysical ideas about speech and *logos* that are seen in Philo and John, for example. This view suggests the use of Deut 11:18-21 which commands the Israelites to "bind" God's *words* to themselves, or to educate themselves in the words of God. Ben Sira's work also emphasizes the ability of the individual human to speak and act rightly, and Ben Sira's constant exhortations to the reader draw upon the accounts within Deut 1-11, specifically chapters 1-13 and 5:32-33, echoing Moses himself who also exhorted the Israelites to live rightly. Although later traditions vary somewhat, we will also see below that for Ben Sira, rightful speech is also linked to wisdom itself, Torah, and what is perhaps the most obvious manner in which wrongful speech defies the law of God, namely, blasphemy.

An early version of Ben Sira's text explicitly attributes wisdom and understanding alongside the ability to speak well. Sir 11:15 in MS A gives: "wisdom (כמה) and understanding (שכל) and *knowing how to speak* (דבר הביד) are from יהוה ". However, a later Greek manuscript gives: "wisdom and understanding and knowledge of the Law, love and virtuous paths, are from

[259] According to Skehan-Di Lella, the equivalence between good and life on the one hand, evil and death on the other can be found in Deut 30:15-20, but see also Deut 5:16, "Honor your father and your mother, as והיה your God commanded you, so that your days may be long and that it may go well with you in the land that יהוה your God is giving you". See Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 436.

κύριος ".[260] This shows that for Ben Sira one could easily argue for an equivalence between כמה, wisdom, שכל, understanding, and דבר הביך, "knowing how to speak".[261] Speech is further equated with wisdom in Sir 20:4-8: "Some people keep silent and are thought to be wise, while others are detested for being talkative. Some people keep silent because they have nothing to say, while others keep silent because they know when to speak. The wise remain silent until the right moment, but a boasting fool misses the right moment. Whoever talks too much is detested, and whoever pretends to authority is hated."[262]

Ben Sira also equates right speech with the law in Sir 9:15: "Let your conversation be with intelligent people, and let all your discussion be about the law of the Most High", and in three passages he suggests an equivalence between right speech and education. These are Sir 4:23-24: "Do not refrain from speaking at the proper moment, and do not hide your wisdom. For wisdom becomes known through speech, and education through the words of the tongue"; Sir 37:20-21: "Some people may be clever enough to teach many (παιδευτής), and yet be useless to themselves. A skillful speaker may be hated; he will be destitute of all food, for the Lord has withheld the gift of charm, since he is lacking in all wisdom", and through *mûsar* in the Hebrew at Sir 37:31: "Many people have died from over-eating; control yourself (הגמסר), and so prolong your life".[263]

In a long poem, Ben Sira engages with several ideas we have already seen and links them to a central concern of Deut 1-11—that of blasphemy. Deut 5:11 gives: "You shall not make wrongful use of the name of יהוה your God, for יהוה will not acquit anyone who misuses his

[260] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 237.
[261] See Beentjes, *Ben Sira*, 37.
[262] Also Sir 20:13 and 20:20.
[263] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 437.

name". After an introductory statement ("Sinners are overtaken through their lips; by them the reviler and the arrogant are tripped up"), Ben Sira gives a lengthy warning concerning oaths and blasphemy:

> Do not accustom your mouth to oaths, nor habitually utter the name of the Holy One; for as a servant who is constantly under scrutiny will not lack bruises, so also the person who always swears and utters the Name will never be cleansed from sin. The one who swears many oaths is full of iniquity, and the scourge will not leave his house. If he swears in error, his sin remains on him, and if he disregards it, he sins doubly; if he swears a false oath, he will not be justified, for his house will be filled with calamities.[264]

Such language leads to death, one of the poor choices shown earlier: "There is a manner of speaking comparable to death; may it never be found in the inheritance of Jacob! Such conduct will be far from the godly, and they will not wallow in sins. Do not accustom your mouth to coarse, foul language, for it involves sinful speech".[265] Yet Ben Sira returns the discussion to Deuteronomy once more in the same manner as seen above in Sir 37:16-18, namely, through invocation of Deut 5:16: " Remember your father and mother when you sit among the great, or you may forget yourself in their presence, and behave like a fool through bad habit; then you will wish that you had never been born, and you will curse the day of your birth".[266] Ben Sira then concludes with an appeal to *paideia*: "Those who are accustomed to using abusive language will never become disciplined as long as they live".[267]

---

[264] Sir 23:8; 23:9-11.
[265] Sir 23:12-13.
[266] Sir 23:14.
[267] Sir 23:15.

For Ben Sira, then, rightful speech is perhaps the most immediate *topos* through which his complex ideas regarding wisdom, the law, obedience, and education may be accessed. While wisdom literature is known not only for its spiritual view of wisdom, as is seen in the constant emphasis of God's presence for the wise and even so far as the conception of "Lady Wisdom" found in Proverbs 8-9, it famously emphasizes practical action and mundane life to the extent that its lineage is easily traced to Israel's neighbors in the ancient Near East. Ben Sira expresses this dichotomy by his extensive reference to speech, for it is this everyday action that serves as a crucible of sorts in which the lofty ideals of wisdom may be tested for all people. Blasphemy is perhaps the purest expression of this type of trial, as it is always possible for someone, at any time, to commit this gravest of sins merely through the wrongful use of speech. And as we have also consistently seen, Deut 1-11 informs his approach to all of these topics. This approach will endure uncontested, with only one successor providing an emendation to his original thought in a later Greek version.

But Ben Sira, of course, exists in a social setting, and much of his writing concerns these exact circumstances as well. As we have seen, Ben Sira is interested in connecting wisdom, a system of ideas that Israel shares with its ancient Near Eastern neighbors, to Torah, or the law received by Moses that is unique to Israel. By doing this Ben Sira is engaging with issues of inclusion and interconnectivity—who is a Jew? How is Israel set apart from other nations? To what extent can other nations expect to become wise and yet remain separate, in practice, from Israel? We might expect that Ben Sira, grappling with these issues, would devote a considerable amount of material to a discussion of covenant, and that is exactly what we will find. But Ben Sira, again, does not live in a vacuum, and in his time, he is not the only interlocutor with these ideas. Further, issues of covenant have enormous implications for the legitimacy of the

priesthood, and Ben Sira has considerable personal interest, or as is colloquially put, "skin in the game", with respect to these concerns. Therefore, we will see below that while Ben Sira remains in this respect influenced by Deut 1-11, as he has been regarding other *topoi*, his writings on covenant demonstrate the influence of pressing issues relevant to his era, so that it may be said that his handling of this idea is less "pure".

2.7. Ben Sira and Deut 1-11—Covenant

Biblical covenants may be divided into two types: the *suzerain-vassal* covenant, exemplified by Hittite covenants, in which a powerful party imposes requirements upon a vassal, with corresponding positive and negative consequences for adherence to the terms of the agreement and failure to comply; and the *vassal-suzerain* covenant, exemplified by Assyrian treaties, in which the suzerain is self-bound to accomplish certain outcomes with respect to the vassal.[268] These types of covenants are perhaps best typified by God's covenant made with Abraham in Gen 15 (vassal-suzerain) and the Horeb/Sinai covenant in Exod 19:6, 23:22-23, 34:12, and Deuteronomy (suzerain-vassal). In the Second Temple period, Jewish authors expressed their perennial belief in both covenants, and that not only would God remain true to the promises he had made them, but that should they fail to meet their ends of the suzerain-vassal bargains, repentance and renewal were always available. During the pre-exilic period, Israel conducted many renewal ceremonies expressing their acknowledgement of wrongdoing and their desire for repentance.[269] Israel's conviction that God will mercifully respond to their repentance

[268] David Noel Freedman and David Miano, "People of the New Covenant", in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSupp 71, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 7-9. For the development of this see Introduction above.
[269] 2 Chr 15:10-15; 2 Kgs 11:17; 2 Chr 29:10; 2 Kgs 23:3; Freedman/Miano, "People", 10.

continued after the exile, and is based upon the belief that, while God has promised to forever care for them and bless them, their personal disobedience excludes them from this permanent condition of blessedness—that is, so long as they remain unrepentant, for the full measure of God's mercy is available to them so long as they turn from disobedience and remain in submission to God.[270]

Ben Sira is no exception to these conditions. Much of his covenantal writing alludes to the suzerain-vassal and vassal-suzerain covenants, and ambiguities in Ben Sira's references will show that these covenants are often not as discretely separated as one might initially think. When God makes a promise, it is often a promise to respond to Israel in a certain way, dependent on Israel's actions. Conversely, Israel's obedience or disobedience, while indeed catalyzing an arrangement by means of Israel's free volition, actually interacts with a system that is not of Israel's design but is instead "unilaterally" imposed.[271]

The only instance of a purely vassal-suzerain treaty that Ben Sira describes is 44:18. This is prefaced with historical context as Ben Sira writes, "Enoch pleased the Lord, and was taken up; he was an example of repentance to all generations. Noah was found perfect and righteous; in the time of wrath he was taken in exchange; therefore a remnant was left to the earth when the flood came."[272] God then responds with a promise that appears to be only predicated on an action that God took, although it could be argued that the sin of humanity was the actual precipitating event: "Covenants of eternity were added to him lest all flesh be blotted out by a

[270] Freedman/Miano, "People", 10-11. Post-exilic covenantal confidence may be seen in Neh 1:5 and 9:7-8, as well as Dan 9:4-19.
[271] "Unilateral" and "bilateral" are specific theological terms common in the Reformed tradition. These terms emerge from Christian covenantal theologies which are, although arguably embryonically present in patristics, expressed most concretely in the confessions of the Protestant Reformation; they are not as useful when considering Second Temple views of covenant—except perhaps in conjunction with election—and therefore I will not adopt them here.
[272] Sir 44:16-17.

flood".[273] In this case, the vassal-suzerain covenant may be formulated as follows: God makes covenant (a promise) to never again flood the earth. God has delivered this flood as a punishment for sinful humanity, which is, along with Gen 5:5 that records the death of Adam, a concrete manifestation of his declaration in Gen 2:16-17 that all who eat the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil will literally "dying die" or as is usually given in English idiom "surely die". Ben Sira expressly alludes to this phrase in Sir 14:17: "All flesh becomes old like a garment, for the *covenant* of old is, 'By death you shall die!'". Ben Sira often stresses the inevitability of death, and does so in covenantal terms that represent the Second Temple understanding of God's imposition of terms juxtaposed with mankind's responsibility to comply. Sir 16:22 gives, "Acts of justice who will announce, or who will await? For the covenant is far off", implies the arrival of death, as explained by Skehan and Di Lella who equate the Hebrew *ḥōq* for *māvet*, or "death", as in Sir 14:12 which also stresses death's arrival for all: "Remember that death will not tarry, and the covenant of Hades has not been shown to you".[274] Ben Sira is alluding to God's command regarding the tree of the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil, and the consequences for eating that fruit. In this case, God has given a suzerain-vassal covenant that may be formulated as follows: God has promised that, should Adam consume the fruit, Adam will die. Here, Ben Sira has used the common theme of death to link the Noahic covenant and the Edenic transgression, a linkage which allows him to likewise presume the existence of covenant at Eden.

Ben Sira also shows the interplay between suzerain-vassal and vassal-suzerain covenants in his depiction of the fathers, who are shown as having received a covenantal promise from God, but also as having successfully obeyed the terms of other covenants. Sir 44:19-20 gives:

---

[273] Sir 44:18. This is a rainbow reference according to Skehan-Di Lella, "Ben Sira", 505.
[274] Skehan-Di Lella, "Ben Sira", 259-260, 275.

"Abraham was the great father of a multitude of nations, and no one has been found like him in glory; who kept the law of the Most High, and he entered in a covenant with him; in his flesh he established a covenant, and in a trial he was found faithful".

These patriarchal covenants may be thought of as foreshadowing the synthesis of suzerain-vassal and vassal-suzerain covenants found in the Mosaic/Sinaitic covenant revelations. Ben Sira provides a short summary of this in 44:12: "Their descendants stand by the covenants; their children also, for their sake". According to Skehan and Di Lella, this verse indicates that covenant faithfulness ensures the safety of oneself and one's family.[275] Ben Sira has given this statement following an encomiastic recitation of

> famous men ... our fathers ... those who ruled in their kingdoms ... men renowned for their power, giving counsel by their understanding ... proclaiming prophecies ... leaders of the people ... those who composed musical tunes, and set forth verses in writing ... men of mercy, whose righteous deeds have not been forgotten.[276]

This is as much an encomium of wisdom as of the individuals to whom Ben Sira directs his praise, as these leaders of the people are specifically leaders "in understanding of learning for the people, wise in their words of instruction". But here is also a sense of generational unity and interconnectedness that has not been seen earlier, yet which is strongly derived from traditions originating in Deut 1-11. Although Ben Sira does not claim that obedience to the covenants provides literal immortality, as this would mitigate his view of human mortality largely derived from wisdom traditions, he does write that obedience is accomplished "for the sake" of those

[275] Skehan-Di Lella, "Ben Sira", 501.
[276] Sir 44:1-11.

who have gone before, and that as a result "their posterity will continue forever, and their glory will not be blotted out".[277] This same emphasis on obedience, not for literal immortality but for prosperity in the present life, may be seen in the promises of Deut 4:40, which commands the Israelites to "keep (God's) statutes and commandments ... that it may go well with you, and with your children after you, and that you may prolong your days in the land which יהוה your God gives you forever". Not only does this verse specify a reward for obedience that may even be construed as diametrically opposed to *spiritual* immortality—a reward not of survival after death, but the delay of death itself by means of a prolongation of days—it also promotes the concept of generational interconnectedness, as does Ben Sira, in its promise that obedience will benefit not only those who obey, but their descendants.

Ben Sira further addresses covenants in terms which, for lack of a better word, may be termed "Ecclesiastical" in that they propound sentiments closest to those found in Qohelet/Ecclesiastes. This is first seen in Sir 11:20: "Stand by your covenant and attend to it, and grow old in your work". The Greek text gives διαθήκῃ: according to Skehan and Di Lella, this indicates that Israel's primary duty is to honor the divine covenant, as is seen in Exod 5:14 and Neh 10:1-30.[278] In Sir 28:7, for example, Ben Sira writes, "Remember commandments, and do not be irate with your fellow, and remember the covenant of the Most High, and overlook a mistake". Whereas this merciful emphasis may be seen in Exod 34:7, "a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger", this focus on interpersonal graciousness is seen in Eccl 7:9, which recommends the *reader* "be not quick to anger"; while Qohelet does not explicitly say this, the reader is being thereby encouraged to emulate God in this respect. Eccl 10:4 also confirms this: "If the anger of the ruler rises against you, do not leave your place, for deference will make

[277] Sir 44:13.
[278] Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 281-282.

amends for great offenses", as does Prov 14:17: "A man of quick temper acts foolishly, but a man of discretion is patient".

But Ben Sira also assigns a covenantal emphasis to the practical issues found in Qohelet and Proverbs. This is perhaps best seen in Sir 41:19, in which the importance of the covenant is embedded amongst a list of shameful practical matters: parental disrespect, dishonesty before authorities, religious hypocrisy, fraudulent mercantile, churlishness, lust, and greed. Further, this verse shows a possible presence of Deuteronomic traditions not on Ben Sira, but in the grandson's translation or successive iterations within the LXX tradition of Sirach. In the Beentjes critical edition of the Hebrew text (MS B) we find ברית ולה..., with the initial material obscured.[279] MS B in the Frédérique Michèle Rey/Eric D. Reymond edition is clearer, with an initial aleph supplied.[280] According to Skehan and Di Lella, this is the Hebrew *ʾālâ*, or "oath".[281] Yet the Ziegler edition gives ἀληθείας θεοῦ και διαθήκης, "truth of God and his covenant".[282] Here, *ʾālâ* is likely read as *elaha* (Aram. for God) or perhaps a divine name substitute, while the possessive of *bəriyṯ* which appears nowhere in the Hebrew as either suffix or particle is indicated by the genitive case in the Greek, a scribal interpretation of the Hebrew text.

So we see that Ben Sira originally invokes "oath and covenant".[283] Therefore, according to Ben Sira, the covenant extends to not only idolatry and intermarriage, but specific and seemingly minor infractions of propriety. According to Skehan and Di Lella, this merely refers to man-made covenants, and if this is the case, is only reminiscent of Deut 7 in its dealing with

---

[279] Beentjes, *Ben Sira*, 72.
[280] Frédérique Michèle Rey and Eric D. Reymond, *A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Manuscripts of Ben Sira With Translations and Philological Notes*, JSJSupp 217 (Leiden: Brill, 2024), 128.
[281] Skehan - DiLella, *Ben Sira*, 481.
[282] This is the reading followed by many English editions, including the RSV and Douay-Rheims American Edition (following the Vulgate which gives *veritate Dei et testamento*).
[283] Sir 41:19.

human covenants which the Israelites are forbidden to make with the surrounding nations.[284] These man-made covenants may also be seen in the covenant between David and Jonathan (1 Sam 18:1-3; 20:3, 8, 17) as well as the extension of this covenant to Mephibosheth (2 Sam 9:1). Jeremy Corley considers Ben Sira's respect for friendship as illustrative of his generally conservative approach, but while he cites Skehan and Di Lella as evidence, he does not cite their notes on this verse.[285] In this light, covenant becomes a formal means of concretizing a friendship, ostensibly toward the goal of assisting in its preservation and maintenance. But in the Greek, this meaning has shifted away from human covenants and towards the covenant that God has given. In its current context of everyday human interaction, detached from liturgical concerns, this reveals a strong influence of Deuteronomy upon the Greek version of Sir.

Ben Sira also goes to great lengths to describe the scribal profession and its relation to covenantalism, although this is occasionally done by way of contrast as is seen in Sir 38:33: "And they will not leap up in the assembly. On the judge's seat they will not sit, and disposition of a legal decision (*diathēkē*) they will not understand, and they will never shed light on instruction and judgment, and in illustrations they will not be found", words which, according to Skehan and Di Lella, describe those who are *not* scribes. Ben Sira continues this in 39:8 which gives: "He will illuminate the instruction of his teaching, and in the law God's covenant he will boast", again which praises the work of the scribe.[286]

Ben Sira first mentions the Sinaitic covenant at Sir 17:12: "A perpetual covenant he established with them, and his judgments he showed to them". Skehan and Di Lella explicitly

---

[284] Skehan-Di Lella, "Ben Sira", 481; also Ezek 17:13-18, which Skehan and Di Lella reference.
[285] Jeremy Corley, *Ben Sira's Teaching on Friendship*, BJS 316 (Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 2002) , 5. Di Lella's work on Sira's conservative theology, which Corley introduces to the discussion, does not address this specific example; for di Lella, Ben Sira's conservatism means a respect for the traditions and texts he has received, and a proto-Sadducean reluctance to teach anything which is not set forth in those texts and traditions. See Di Lella, "Conservative", 140.
[286] Skehan-Di Lella, "Ben Sira",

connect his phrase, "everlasting covenant" with Bar 4:1, "She is the book of the commandments of God, and the law that endures forever. All who hold her fast will live, and those who forsake her will die", and further claim that this is the covenant made on Sinai as detailed in Deut 5:1-22, as does the following verse 17:14: "And he said to them, 'Beware of all unrighteousness'. And he gave commandment to each of them concerning his neighbor".[287]

Ben Sira also mentions the Sinaitic covenant at Sir 24:23: "All these things are the book of the covenant of the Most High God, a law that Moyses commanded us, an inheritance for the gatherings of Jacob".[288] In this verse, Ben Sira mentions the "book of the covenant", βίβλος διαθήκης, a descriptive term found in Exod 24:7. The second half of the verse is a quotation of Deut 33:4: νόμον, ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς, κληρονομίαν συναγωγαῖς Ιακωβ (when Moses commanded us a law, as a possession for the assembly of Jacob). The idea of the βίβλος διαθήκης, or "book of the covenant", is most closely paralleled within Deuteronomy at Deut 30:10, which gives τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου "the book of the law". This is a discussion of the importance of the covenant which God has given and which is extensively detailed in the preceding chapter. That chapter details the current state of the Israelites at Moab, the trials they have escaped, but also the consequences that await them should they fail to obey the commands God has given them. However, in Deut 29 it is "covenant", *bəriyṯ/diathēkē,* which is the noun used to encapsulate these commands. Deut 30 suddenly shifts to "the book of the law" which implies that the covenant has been recorded within this book. It is Deut 4 where we find that the covenant has been recorded in another physical medium, namely "two tables of stone". This will be further explored in Deut 9-10, in which Moses recounts the story of the giving of the tablets

[287] RSV. NETS: "She is the book of the decrees of God and the law that remains forever. All who seize her are for life, but those who forsake her will die". Skehan-Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 282-283.
[288] No extant Hebrew.

and the episode of the golden calf. Deut 4:7 also presents the concept of God's nearness, as does Deut 30:11-14.[289] Deut 4's presentation of the physically recorded covenant appears in Sir 24:23, and has here been conflated with the concept of τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου found in Deut 30:10 to create the composite idea of βίβλος διαθήκης, a conflation which is assisted by the idea of God's nearness present in both Deut 4 and Deut 30. This presentation of composite citations is a common practice in antiquity, and reveals an author's ingrained familiarity with different texts, either in working practice, through notebooks and rough drafts, or the synthesis, consciously or not, of assimilated textual traditions.[290]

We have seen some Deuteronomic influence, from 1-11 specifically, in Ben Sira's writings concerning covenant, but not to the extent that Deut 1-11 influences Ben Sira's treatment of wisdom and *mûsar/paideia*. However, there is one area within these writings that we have not yet examined, and that is the covenantal portion of Ben Sira's corpus that addresses the priesthood. This discussion, however, requires a preliminary *caveat*. As significant scholarly consensus holds that Ben Sira writes to defend the Aaronic priesthood and employs the idea of covenant to do so, I first wish to examine the scriptural evidence for such a claim.[291] I do this to locate the simplest way to substantiate or refute Ben Sira's argument, since if the texts themselves do not justify Ben Sira's claim, Ben Sira must rely upon other means to prove his point.

---

[289] Gerald T. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 66.

[290] For more see Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn, "What is a Composite Citation? An Introduction", 1-16; Sean A. Adams, "Greek Education and Composite Citations of Homer", 17-34; and Seth E. Ehorn, "Composite Citations in Plutarch", 35-56; from *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*, LNTS 525, eds. Sean A. Adams and Seth E. Ehorn (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2016).

[291] See for example Saul M. Olyan, "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood", HTS 80:3 (1987): 261-286; Benjamin G. Wright III, "'Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest': Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood" in *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction*: *Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*, JSJSupp 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 97-126; Dongshin Don Chang, *Phinehas, the Sons of Zadok, and Melchizedek: Priestly Covenant in Late Second Temple Texts*, Library of Second Temple Studies 90 (Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 65-79.

Priestly actions are first recorded in Genesis 14, in which Melchizedek is presented as a priest, of God Most High. Melchizedek brings out bread and wine and receives a tenth of everything. While Potiphera and Jethro are later presented as, respectively, Egyptian and Midianite priests, the Hebrew priesthood is next presented in Exod 19:6, in which God tells Moses that Israel will be a kingdom of priests. Yet the priests and people are shown as separate categories in Exod 19:21-24: "... Go down, charge the people ... and let the priests also ... sanctify themselves ... let not the priests and the people break through". This priesthood is presumably some form of the Midianite and Egyptian priesthoods with which the Hebrews had interacted; although Exod 6:16-25 lists the Levitical line from Levi through Aaron to Phinehas, no mention is made at this point of the Levitical priesthood. As Aaron's line is further described but not Moses, one might presume that Moses had no sons, but this is not stated decisively in the text; Psalm 99:6 and Exod 24:4-8 show Moses performing rituals, Exod 33:7-11 shows Moses and Joshua acting as priests, and Judg 18:30 gives evidence for a Mosaic priesthood.[292] Further, 1 Chr 23: 14-17 states that Moses did indeed have sons, and this line is given as far as the sons of Rehabiah which were "very many".[293] Yet the Hebrew and Greek versions differ on the eventual fate of these sons and whether or not they remain in good standing, and Num 17:5 (16:40) gives that "no one who is not a priest, *who is not of the descendants of Aaron*, should draw near to burn incense before יהוה ", Exod 29:4-15 provides for the priestly ordination of Aaron and his sons, and Num 18:8 promises the heave offering, forever, as a consecrated portion for Aaron and his sons.[294]

[292] Olyan, "Relationship", 267.
[293] 1 Chr 23:17. The Hebrew gives "great in iniquity" (למעלה), while LXX gives "having been made to grow in height" (ηὐξήθησαν εἰς ὕψος).
[294] Olyan, "Relationship", 271-272.

So far we have seen no decisive answer to the question: who is a priest, Moses/his sons, Aaron/his sons, or both? Yet there are additional complications. Other texts broadly present the Levitical line as priestly, which would include Moses and any sons he might have had. Deut 18:1-4 separates the line of Levi from the other Israelites, denying them the "portion and inheritance" that belongs to Israel as a whole and restricting them to priestly offerings.[295] Deut 18:6-7 continues, stating that any Levite may minister in the name of יהוה , if they come to "the place which יהוה shall choose", and Jer 33:18 and 33:21 promise an "eternal covenant" with the Levitical ministers.[296] This covenant is also presented in Malachi, who declares that the priests of his time have "corrupted the covenant of Levi".[297] In Chronicles we find the sons of Aaron and the Levites juxtaposed and their relationship examined more closely. Whereas the Levites are "appointed for all the service of the tabernacle of the house of God", Aaron and his sons "made offerings upon the altar of burnt offering and upon the altar of incense for all the work of the most holy place, and to make atonement for Israel, according to all that Moses the servant of God had commanded".[298] Deut 33:9 states that Levi "kept the covenant", having disregarded family for the sake of God, and now inherit teaching and priestly responsibilities.[299] Num 3:9 gives that Levites belong to Aaron and his sons, and Ezekiel writes that the Levites committed idolatry for which they are punished with a servant status.[300]

It appears, then, that according to the Pentateuch the sons of Aaron are priests without dispute. Many texts suggest that sons of Moses may be priests, but Num 17:5 claims only Aaron and his descendants may be priests. This is clarified in prophetic texts; while the Levites may

[295] Deut 18:1; Olyan, "Relationship", 273.
[296] Deut 18:6.
[297] Mal 2:8.
[298] 1 Chr 6:33-34 (48-49).
[299] Deut 33:9-10; see also Matt 12:48-50.
[300] Ezek 44:10-16; 48:10-12.

have enjoyed the privilege of priesthood, without the honor of serving at the holy of holies, this is removed in Ezekiel and Malachi. Aaronids, then, are priests, and Levites their servants, as is the view at Qumran.[301] But the concept of *covenant* plays little part in this discussion, and when it is invoked, it supports *Levi*, not Aaron, his sons, or Moses. To better answer the question of Ben Sira's use of covenant and its relationship to Deut 1-11 we must go further. We have taken a general look at the Pentateuch's presentation of priestly legitimacy, and also a general overview of Ben Sira's writing on priesthood. Let us now triangulate our lenses and examine Ben Sira's writings on covenant as it pertains specifically to the priesthood.

First, it may be said that Ben Sira possesses an extremely high view of the priesthood, so much so that there is a direct correlation between the respect a person has for God and the respect a person has for the priesthood. In Saul M. Olyan's words, "Ben Sira all but equates the individual's relationship with God to the same individual's relationship to the priesthood". [302] This is unsurprising if Ben Sira was in fact either a priest himself or part of a scribal professional class often referenced in scholarly literature as a "sage"; Ben Sira would have a vested personal interest in defending the priesthood, apart from his spiritual convictions.[303] Secondly, Ben Sira uses Deut 1-11 material to make this point, creating a strong series of parallels between Deut 6:5 and respect for the priesthood; in Benjamin J. Wright's words, "Ben Sira's use of Deuteronomy lends tremendous symbolic and historical weight" to his praise of the priesthood.[304] When desiring to emphasize the need for daily devotion to God, then, Ben Sira uses Deuteronomy,

---

[301] Olyan, "Relationship", 280.
[302] Olyan, "Relationship", 263.
[303] Wright, "Fear", 102; R.A. Horsley and P. Tiller, "Ben Sira and the Sociology of the Second Temple", in *Second Temple Studies III: Studies in Politics, Class, and Material Culture*, JSOTSupp 340, eds. P.R. Davies and J.M. Halligan (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 74-107.
[304] Wright, "Fear", 100; Olyan, "Relationship", 264.

even when that devotion involves the institution of the priesthood which is not particularly promoted or detailed in Deuteronomy.[305]

In Sir 45:6-24, Aaron is described as "a holy person like (Moses), of the tribe of Leui", and that God "established him as an everlasting covenant and gave him a priesthood of the people".[306] Ben Sira then narrates Aaron's priestly garments and anointing—by Moses—then again states that this priesthood is "for him an everlasting covenant and in his seed for all the days of the sky, to minister to him and at the same time to be a priest and to bless his people in the name".[307] This covenant is described as continuing with Aaron's son Phinehas, with whom is "established with him a covenant of peace to be in charge of holy things and of his people so that he and his seed might have the magnificence of the priesthood forever".[308] In this passage, the "Praise of the Fathers", Aaron, Phinehas, and their line are given twenty verses, whereas Moses only in mentioned in five, a significant textual emphasis.[309] As is seen in the Hebrew, but not the Greek, this priesthood is specified as the *kĕhunnāh gĕdôlāh*, which according to Olyan specifically argues that the *high* priesthood belongs to Phinehas and his descendants.[310] However, in a later addition to the text (Sir 51:12ix, MS B), we find that God has "chosen the sons of Zadok to be his priests". There is no mention of covenant, and this addition supports the position that a priest must not only be Aaronic but Zadokite. This criticizes the Hasmonean priesthood, who were themselves Aaronic but not Zadokite, by demanding a greater level of specificity than Ben Sira seems to require, and is a view also seen in Qumran.[311]

---

[305] Also found in 1QH; see Olyan, "Relationship", 256-266.
[306] Sir 45:7.
[307] Sir 45:15. RSV gives "the Lord", but Beentjes and Ziegler only show the presence of God by means of grammatical markers, as in the above "in the name". There are no substitutes for God's name in the Hebrew.
[308] Sir 45:24.
[309] Olyan, "Relationship", 269; Wright, "Fear", 101.
[310] Olyan, "Relationship", 270.
[311] 1 Macc 14:41-49; Olyan, "Relationship", 278.

2.8. Conclusion

Ben Sira echoes many prominent themes of Deuteronomy 1-11 in his own writing. Deut 6:5 commands the Israelites to love God completely and with the greatest possible zeal; Ben Sira transfers this intensity of purpose to the pursuit of wisdom, but also equates wisdom with God, and so extrapolates the teaching of Deuteronomy 1-11 into the pursuit of wisdom, defending his argument by positing an equivalence between God and wisdom. This is seen in Sir 1:1, 1:3, 1:10, 11:1, 14:20, 15:18, 18:27-28, and 6:26-28.

But Ben Sira goes further than to claim that wisdom is God, or better, the pursuit of God; he also claims that it is the fear of God that is the fullest expression of wisdom as it is required to successfully pursue God. This idea is present in Deut 6:13 and 10:12, and is interrelated with the disciplinary associations of *paideia*/*mûsar*. Ben Sira presents the fear of God in 1:11-28, 26-27; 2:1, 7-10, 15-17; 4:14; 10:20-22; 15:1; 34:14-17; 40:26-27; and 50:29.

For Ben Sira, fearing God is not enough. While it is a correct posture of the heart, it is important to realize this conviction in one's life through action, and for Ben Sira the right action for this purpose is obeying Torah. Deut 4:6 makes this clear, as does Deut 5:16, and Ben Sira communicates this in 1:26; 2:15-16, 3:6-7; 6:17, 37; 19:19-24;21:11; 24:1-22; and 24:23, 28.

And as expected, since wisdom is a pursuit that requires attention and dedication on the part of the seeker, the idea of *mûsar/paideia* emerges frequently in Ben Sira's meditation on wisdom. *Mûsar*/*paideia* is also an important theme in Deut 11:2 and 11:18-21, for it is through the constant inculcation of oneself, a focus on training, and constant educational repetition that Israel is instructed to prepare itself for a life of obedience. Fittingly, this idea of intergenerational transmission is reflected in the textual evidence itself, as the prologue to Ben

Sira, written by Ben Sira's grandson, communicates the efficacy of these measures in 1:3 and 1:12. Within Ben Sira's work, the idea emerges in Sir 1:27; 2:1-6; 4:17; 6:18, 20, 22; 6:32-37; 7:23; 22:6, 14; 23:2; 30:1-16; and 33:25. These ideas continue in the writings of another Second Temple Jewish author and important founding figure of Christianity, the apostle Peter.

Finally, Ben Sira creates a metaphor in 24:3 that likens Wisdom, personified, to the speech of God. These ideas will become intertwined with Stoic ideas of *logos* and will be further developed in Wisdom of Solomon, Philo, and John. Ben Sira develops these ideas in Sir 4:23-24; 5:10-6:1; 6:5; 9:15; 11:15; 19:16; 20:4-8; 20:13; 20:20; 24:3; 25:8; 37:16-18; 37:20-21; and 37:31. Ben Sira extends this metaphor into an exhortation that the wise might speak virtuously. This emphasis on right speech can be found in Deut 5:11's prohibition on blasphemy, and 5:32-33's depiction of right speaking as one of two roads which may be taken. This general emphasis on speech may be seen in the setting of Deut 1-11, which is entirely a speech delivered by Moses, and the specifics continue in the work of the apostle James, who discourses at length on the two possible paths a speaker may take; the way of exaltation, or the way of destruction.

Ben Sira has united not only law and wisdom, but covenant and all its implications. There is now a perceptible yet unforeseen benefit to Ben Sira's interpretation of personified wisdom. While of course this personification is not Ben Sira's own development, having originated much earlier in Proverbs, Wisdom is now clearly propounded as a creation and agent of God, and implicated in the covenant at Sinai. Ben Sira has interacted with the intensely personal nature of the Sinai covenant, as depicted in Deut 1-11, and has created an alliance with the personified figure of Wisdom. As a principle or idea, Wisdom is properly available to all

peoples and nations, as is the case in Hellenistic Judaism.[312] But as an *individual*, Wisdom may be viewed as a covenantal partner with both God and Israel. This means that the specificity that we view in Deut 1-11, most notably in Deut 4 and 7, now applies to Wisdom, as it is implicated in the exclusive bond between God and Israel that Moses proclaims in Deut 1-11. As Gabriele Boccaccini has observed:

> Wisdom loses her divine status and much of her cosmopolitan dimension of being accessible to human experience, even outside the boundaries of the covenantal community of Israel, and experience loses much of its non-conformist and autonomous power of revelation and criticism towards and even against the Torah, which we see so powerfully in action in the books of Job, Jonah and Qohelet.[313]

And just as the covenant is closely aligned with obedience in Deut 1-11, so does obedience become the hallmark of priesthood for Ben Sira, as the group excluded from priesthood on the basis of disobedience—the Levites—becomes the group which, Ben Sira argues by implication, *cannot* produce priests. For Ben Sira, the priesthood belongs to the Aaronids, and covenantal ideas are introduced, consistently with Ben Sira's view of covenant as expressed in Deut 1-11, to make this point.

In Deut 1-11, the covenant is presented as an agreement with God which is given to the nation of Israel. Second person pronouns are used both in the singular and the plural in Deuteronomy 1-11, making it difficult to argue for either a purely collective or a purely personal

---

[312] Gabriele Boccaccini, "Where Does Ben Sira Belong?" in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18-20 May, 2006*, JSJSupp 127, eds. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 27-28.
[313] Boccaccini, "Where Does Ben Sira Belong?", 25.

emphasis, but the requirements and consequences of the covenant are inalienably positioned as a governing principle for Israel as a whole, rather than the priesthood. The priesthood is subsumed within this covenant, but its terms are expected of, and may be performed by, all Israelites. But for Ben Sira, the idea of the covenant is used to validate the priesthood. It seems that regarding Deut 1-11, Ben Sira shows a strong engagement with interpretive traditions, when dealing with wisdom and *paideia*, but with covenant, the issue is inseparable from the priesthood, and contemporary politics dictate the approach of the text.

This is, in my view, indicative of shifting priorities between the Hebrew author (Ben Sira) and the Greek translator/grandson as well as the later additions to the text. There are two observable views of wisdom, which may be called "practical" and "theoretical". Deut 1-11 may be said to address "practical" wisdom, or the type of life which an Israelite should lead to remain on good terms with God. Yet it has been demonstrated by many that "theoretical" concerns appear in the wisdom writings, in that the cosmos is believed to proceed in an orderly way in accordance with God's design. This concept provides the rationale for the "practical" wisdom teachings which largely consists of life instructions and exhortations. Further, this subset of wisdom more naturally fell within the daily purview of the priesthood and other literate classes, as Ben Sira is believed to be (see Wright et al).

One of Ben Sira's goals is to defend the Jerusalem priesthood, specifically Simon II. To do this, he relies upon the covenant made with Phinehas in Numbers. While the exact details of his argument, or whether he is arguing at all, remain disputed, it may be said that Ben Sira supports the Oniad priesthood on the grounds of their Aaronic ancestry. This is an effective argument against claims of Levitic priesthood, as is seen in Qumran, Testament of Levi, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jubilees, *et al*., as these sources suggest that Levites may

also be high priests. It is, however, not a sufficient argument for the claim that the high priests must be Zadokite; that argument will be made later, in an addition, when the historical circumstances warrant it.

The relevant issue here is how Ben Sira uses covenant to make his argument. For Ben Sira, covenant is the means by which God has instituted priesthood for the line of Phinehas. This further presents the wisdom-complex of ideas not as generalized advice for the world, but the special property of Israel. Ben Sira does this by repeatedly emphasizing the covenantal nature of this generalized advice, in accordance with his interpretation of Deut 1-11, then re-emphasizing covenant when praising the righteous men of old and the Jerusalem priesthood. This has two effects: first, it more closely aligns wisdom with Torah and the Jewish people; second, it justifies the Jerusalem priesthood versus the accusations of any detractors.

Chapter 3. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Wisdom, Covenant, *Mûsar/Paideia*

Written in Jerusalem no earlier than 130 BCE and likely during the reign of high priest Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE), 1 Maccabees describes the sacrilegious actions of Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the uprising against him first led by Mattathias, a Joarib priest, and then by his sons Judas Maccabeus and Simon.[314] The author of 1 Maccabees promotes the idea that Judas Maccabeus accomplished his goals without supernatural aid. While the author presents a narrative that suggests the Hasmoneans are endowed with priestly privilege, the author does not directly say this. In fact, supernaturalism is generally de-emphasized throughout 1 Maccabees.[315] As will also be shown below, the author of 1 Maccabees substantially interacts with Deut 1-11, as can be traced through lexical and thematic connections. Occasionally, these interactions take the shape of similarities or contrasts which show their connection to Deut 1-11 only through phrasal and lexical links; in these instances, Deuteronomy 1-11's influence may be characterized only as part of the author's immersion within the Jewish textual tradition writ large.

---

[314] For a brief overview see Robert Doran, "The Revolt of the Maccabees", *The National Interest* 85 (2006): 99-103; Michael W. Duggan, "1 Maccabees: Emotions of Life and Death in Narrative and Lament", in *Ancient Jewish Prayers and Emotions: Emotions Associated with Jewish Prayer in and Around the Second Temple Period*, DCLS 26, eds. Stefan C. Reif and Renate Egger-Wenzel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 95-116; Jonathan A. Goldstein, "How the Authors in I and II Maccabees Treated the 'Messianic' Promises", in *Semites, Iranians, Greeks, and Romans: Studies in their Interactions*, BJS 217 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2020), 221-250; For general introductions see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 3 vols, rev. and eds. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, Martin Goodman, Matthew Black, and Pamela Vermes (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 1973); Martin Hengel, *Hellenism and Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1991); Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (New York: Athenaeum, 1974); Elias Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees*, trans. Horst R. Moehring, in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees*, ed. Amram Tropper (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Erich Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, HCS 30 (London: University of California Press, 1998); and most recently (as well as most "subversive") Sylvie Honigman, *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochus IV* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2014). The understanding of diasporic-Palestinian historiography is problematized in Ari Finkelstein, "Fitting a Round Peg into a Square Hole: Categorizing Works of Jewish Historiography or the Second Temple Period", *JSJ* 49 (2018): 304-329.

[315] The author's goals should be differentiated from the goals of the characters, as seen in their prayers and speeches; see Agneta Enermalm, "Prayers in Wartime: Thematic Tensions in 1 Maccabees", *ST* 49 (1995): 272-286. Nevertheless, the prayers do reinforce the observed authorial tendencies; see James A. Kelhoffer, "The Maccabees at Prayer: Pro- and Anti-Hasmonean Tendencies in the Prayers of First and Second Maccabees", *EC* 2 (2011): 201.

Much more commonly, however, the author's use of Deut 1-11 serves his greater goal of depicting Judas Maccabeus and the Hasmoneans as deliverers of Israel and rightful leaders, with a plausible claim to the priesthood, but without overt supernaturalism or explicit attestations of that priesthood. In these cases, the author's use of Deut 1-11 may be categorized under the following subheadings, which I will explore below: the use of power; Deuteronomic/Babelic themes of physical fortifications and name establishment; reaction to military intelligence; the theological monologue of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, which focuses on his destruction, his oppression of the Jews, and his death in a foreign land; the bravery of Judas Maccabeus; and the phenomenon of oath-breaking.[316]

In 1 Maccabees, then, it is well-established that the author has specific historical goals, namely to show the Hasmonean dynasty as the rightful rulers of Judea after their acquisition of the ruling authority. Their fitness as priests is also suggested, although not directly asserted. Instead, it is presented as part of a complex association of covenantal zeal and the everlasting covenant of priesthood formed with Phinehas. How then do the lenses of wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia* emerge in the work of the historian of 1 Maccabees? Here, these lenses are not uniformly present as *topoi* in their own right, but as motifs interwoven with the historical narrative of 1 Maccabees and with each other.

First, I explore the general *topoi* with which the author of 1 Maccabees uses Deut 1-11 traditions. Next, I examine how the author uses Deut 1-11 in the context of covenant, wisdom, and *mûsar/paideia*. I will show that the author of 1 Macc makes ample use of Deut 1-11. This narrative, the story of Moses addressing the second-generation Israelites at the plains of Moab, demonstrates many points of similarity with the account that the author of 1 Maccabees presents.

[316] I have not discussed occupation of the land as in my view 1 Maccabees does not engage with this idea in the tradition of Deut 1-11, but in Hellenistic terms. See Katell Berthelot, "Reclaiming the Land (1 Maccabees 15:28-36): Hasmonean Discourse between Biblical Tradition and Seleucid Rhetoric", *JBL* 133:3 (2014): 539-559.

The author has, in fact, used these similarities to give his account additional *gravitas* and to authenticate his chronicle of Judas Maccabeus by associating the narrative with Moses, Judas Maccabeus's illustrious predecessor. Yet the historical presentation, and the implicit goals which the author of 1 Maccabees seeks to achieve within that presentation, always takes pride of place over a philosophical or dogmatic exposition of ideas, and these historical motivations often overshadow the lenses of covenant, wisdom, and *mûsar/paideia*.

In this chapter, I will use the Kappler critical edition of the Greek text, and the Revised Standard Version for all English examples.[317] As before, I will use κύριος for mentions of "the Lord", replacing the Greek *kurios*, or "Lord", the standard representation of the Tetragrammaton in the LXX.

3.1. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Phrasal and Linguistic Links

In 1 Macc 1:1, the author describes Alexander's rule by retelling his defeat of Darius, his subsequent usurpation of the throne of the Medes and Persians, the many wars which he then conducted, and the nations that fell to his rule, as far as "the ends of the earth". Like the conquests of the Israelites in Deut 2:33 and 3:3, Alexander's activity is depicted through the Greek *patassō* , or "smite", and *krateō* , or "grasp". Alexander, however, enjoys neither the favor of God nor God's direct bestowal of the land, as is amply attested in Deut 1-11, at Deut 3:2 and elsewhere. According to Jonathan Goldstein, the phrases, "marched out from the land of Chettim" and "brought much evil into the world" are allusions to Num 24:24; further, the identification of Alexander as the son of *Philip* is a clue that Alexander Jannaeus will be the star

[317] *Maccabaeorum liber I*, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum IX.1, ed. Werner Kappler (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990).

to arise from Jacob or a "son" of Jacob.[318] Goldstein does not, however, mention that the Balaam sequence in Num 22:36-24:25 occurs as Israel is "encamped tribe by tribe" in a wilderness that is viewed from a high point, by a "stele of Baal", near "a city of Moab, which is on the borders of Arnon".[319] This is, in other words, Balaam looking down upon Israel during the speech of Moses in Deut 1-11.

Immediately after the defeat of Timothy's foreign army, Judas begins the return journey to Judea with his own army and the Israelites from Gilead. As they return, the travelers encounter the city of Ephron, "a large and very strong town on the road", and the Israelites cannot bypass this town "to the right or to the left".[320] This language is evocative of Deut 2:27, as Moses sends messengers to Heshbon to inform Sihon that Moses will "go only by the road [and] will turn aside neither to the right nor to the left". 1 Maccabees also corresponds to Deut 1-11 in a reference to the ordering of the peoples under Judas Maccabeus. Judas arranges leaders in charge of "thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens" (χιλιάρχους καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους καὶ πεντηκοντάρχους καὶ δεκαδάρχους). This is the same language used in Deut 1:15, as Moses appoints leaders over the tribes, or κριταῖς. But in 1 Macc, the author changes this to λαοῦ, as "tribe" in the plural can hardly be appropriate when talking of these refugees from Jerusalem, all originating from the exiled and returned tribe of Judah.

1 Maccabees also references Deut 1-11 in Mattathias's farewell speech to his sons, which features a long passage that prefigures the "hall of faith" found in Hebrews 11. Here, Caleb is described: "because he testified in the assembly, received an inheritance in the land".[321] But this

---

[318] Jonathan A. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, AB 41 (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 191. Goldstein also observes parallels in repetition between "smote" and "fled", building further parallels between 1 Macc 1:2 and Deut 4:42: see ibid., 192.
[319] Num 24:2; 22:41; 22:36.
[320] 1 Macc 5:46.
[321] 1 Macc 2:56.

passage is in turn inspired by Deut 1:36, as this mention of Caleb parallels the declaration of Caleb in Deut 1:36 as a recipient of land, and further should be understood as pointing to Jonathan, son of Mattathias and the inheritor of responsibility following the death of Judas Maccabeus.[322]

Thus far, we have viewed several ways that the author of 1 Maccabees engages with Deut 1-11. Many more examples, however, show both an engagement with Deut 1-11 and the author's emphasis on the non-supernatural victories of Judas Maccabeus, and these examples will be explored below.

3.2. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: The Use of Power

1 Maccabees also engages with the dynamics of power. By invoking Deuteronomic language, the author of 1 Maccabees explores the rightful exercise of power, its proper ownership, and the effects of power as it is transferred from one agent to another. The phrase ὁ φόβος καὶ ὁ τρόμος appears in 1 Maccabees 7:18: "Then *the fear and dread* of them fell upon all the people, for they said, 'There is no truth or justice in them, for they have violated the agreement and the oath which they swore.'" This phrase appears in Genesis 9:2 as a measure of humanity's power over the animal kingdom, as God tells Noah, "The fear of you and the dread of you (τρόμος καὶ φόβος) shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every bird of the air; upon everything that creeps on the ground and all the fish of the sea; into your hand they are delivered". In Deuteronomy, this phrase becomes a power marker not of humanity's dominance over animals, but the Israelites' dominance over the other nations of the earth. Deut 2:25 has

[322] Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 240.

God promising to put the "fear and dread" (τρόμος καὶ φόβος) of Israel "upon the peoples that are under the whole heaven, who shall hear the report of you and shall tremble and be in anguish because of you". Deut 11:25 further states that these peoples will be unable to defeat Israel, although the verse implies that this success will only apply to the land which God has promised to Israel: "No man shall be able to stand against you; κύριος your God will lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land that you shall tread, as he promised you". These mentions of the phrase τρόμος καὶ φόβος are its only occurrences in narrative before the Second Temple period; after the exile and return, the phrase is used considerably more often in narrative (Judith 2:28; 15:2; 4 Esdras 15:33, 37; 4 Maccabees 4:10).[323] Further, these verses all involve the actions of human warriors, with the exception of the 4 Maccabees passages.[324] By using this phrase τρόμος καὶ φόβος, the author of 1 Maccabees draws upon Deuteronomic usage and emphasizes the naturalistic actions of the Greek general Apollonius. Yet the inversion of the Deuteronomic theme should be noted, as the "fear and dread" is experienced not by the enemies of Israel, but Israel itself, showing either the successful usurpation of power by Israel's enemies or, more alarmingly, God's favor of the enemies of Israel, although this reading is hardly credible given the emphasis throughout on Judas Maccabeus's heroism. This is in keeping with the recognized emphasis in 1 Macc away from supernatural concerns and towards the practical action of Mattathias, Judas Maccabeus, and the other sons of Mattathias.

[323] The phrase is also common in New Testament writings,

[324] Non-narrative uses of τρόμος καὶ φόβος do occur in Psa 2:11 and 55:5, involving the interaction of God and humanity.

3.3. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: Deuteronomic/Babelic Themes of Physical Fortifications and Name Establishment

1 Maccabees 5 describes the response to the surrounding nations after Judas Maccabeus and his brothers reclaim the sanctuary. These Gentile countries, perhaps sensing a time of weakness after recent military action—not to mention the probable cessation of Greek interference or protection of their Jewish subjects—take the opportunity to stage a series of assaults against Judea. These assaults are led by Gilead, Tyre, Sidon, and Galilee, and Judas and Jonathan personally attend to the matters in Gilead. As they cross the Jordan, they are intercepted by Nabateans who inform them that the Jews in Gilead "have been shut up in Bozrah and Bosor, in Alema and Chaspho, Maked and Carnaim—all these cities were strong and large".[325] This language for "strong and large", ὀχυραὶ καὶ μεγάλαι, is strongly evocative of Deut 1:28 and 3:5, which mention cities that are μεγάλαι καὶ τετειχισμέναι, "great and fortified up to heaven", and ὀχυραί τείχη ὑψηλά πύλαι καὶ μοχλοι, "fortified with high walls, gates, and bars".[326] The Deuteronomy tradition however alludes in turn to the Babel narrative of Genesis 11, as the men in the land of Shinar desire to build a city and a tower "with its top in the heavens".[327] Deut 9 continues this allusion, where the "wickedness of the nations" is made explicit as the reason why Israel is brought into the promised land in the first place, as the Israelites go to "dispossess nations greater and mightier than [themselves], cities great and fortified up to heaven (λεις μεγάλας καὶ τειχήρεις ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ)".[328] This connection between Deuteronomy 9 and the Babel narrative further emerges in Deut 9:14, where God declares to Moses, "let me alone, that I

[325] 1 Macc 5:26.
[326] See Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 301.
[327] Gen 11:4.
[328] Deut 9:4,1.

may destroy them and blot out their name from under heaven"; compare this to Gen 11:4: "let us make a name for ourselves". Again, the author of 1 Maccabees does not wish to directly allude to the Babel narrative, as once again the supernatural character of the events during the wars of the Maccabees is subdued in favor of a naturalistic narrative. And yet again, the Maccabees are presented as the liberators of Israel apart from miraculous intervention.

The interweaving of Babelic and Deuteronomic ideas may be further seen in 1 Macc 5:57; here, the name language continues as Joseph son of Zechariah and Azariah, two Israelite generals, seek to emulate the success of Judas and his brothers by leading their own forces into battle. "Let us also *make a name* for ourselves", they insist; "let us go and make war on the Gentiles around us".[329] As in the Babel narrative, Joseph and Azariah desire to establish their own "names", or reputations; as in the Deuteronomic tradition, they seek to make war upon surrounding foreign nations. This endeavor fails, as did the building of the tower of Babel and the initial salvo at the borders of the promised land, and the failure itself is presented in a Deuteronomic light as, just as in Deut 1:44, the author of 1 Maccabees gives the extent of the Israelites' flight once they are routed; in Deuteronomy, the Israelites are driven "as far as Hormah" while in 1 Maccabees, the Jews are driven "to the borders of Judea".[330] But in Gen 11 and Deuteronomy, the failure is attributed to human actions that are opposed by divine agency.[331] In 1 Macc 5:61-62, the author informs us that the reason Joseph and Azariah fail is that they did not obey *Judas*, and that they "did not belong to the family of those men through whom deliverance was given to Israel". So once again, the author of 1 Maccabees appropriates earlier Deuteronomic traditions, in this instance alongside the Babel narrative, and subtly shifts their emphases to highlight the goal of presenting Judas Maccabeus and his brothers as the deliverers

[329] 1 Macc 5:57.
[330] Deut 1:44; 1 Macc 5:60.
[331] Gen 11:6; Deut 1:42.

of Israel, apart from supernatural intervention, while simultaneously avoiding statements that would contradict Mattathias's legitimate claim to the priesthood.

3.4. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: Reaction to Military Intelligence

Further interaction with the Deuteronomic text may be seen by examining the dialogue between Judas, Jonathan, and the Nabataeans as a narrative. In 1 Macc 5, we are given the "bad news" from the Nabateans as direct speech, whereas in Deut the "bad news" from the spies is reported as indirect hearsay, from the mouths of the grumbling Israelites.[332] Later, Judas will send his own spies, as do the Israelites in Deut 1:22. But while those spies are sent as an alternative to obedience, and their unheeded advice ironically leads to the Israelites' defeat, Judas will implement his own spies' advice to excellent effect. When he receives the alarming intelligence from the Nabateans, Judas does not hesitate, but begins to kill the opposition, then sends his own spies to assess the strength of Timothy's army. Judas's spies tell him that in Raphon, the enemy general Timothy awaits with a large force of Gentiles, with hired Arabs, "across the stream, ready to come and fight against you".[333] Judas again enters battle without hesitation; the author is so motivated to communicate this that he includes a speech by Timothy, who comments that if Judas camps by the stream—that is, hesitates—rather than immediately crossing, the enemies of Israel will win the battle. Judas does not hesitate, but immediately crosses the stream; the Jews win the battle, and the comparison with Deut is made all the more

[332] 1 Macc 5:26; Deut 1:28.
[333] 1 Macc 5:39.

dramatic. The speech Moses gives in Deut 1-11 is itself the result of an enforced hesitation, for God has forbidden Moses to cross the river Jordan.[334]

3.5. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: The Theological Monologue of Antiochus IV Epiphanes

Deuteronomic traditions are also used to support the theological observations of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Although we may question the validity of Antiochus's conclusions, nonetheless the language adopted by the author of 1 Maccabees alludes to certain episodes within the Deuteronomic text. In 1 Macc 6:1-13, Antiochus is journeying through the eastern Greek empire, seeking to recover his economic losses. Antiochus has heard reports of Elymais, a "city famed for its wealth in silver and gold".[335] Hastening there to claim its wealth, he is unexpectedly defeated by the citizens of Elymais. As he returns to Babylon, he is told of the recent Jewish successes in Jerusalem. Disheartened, he takes to his bed and dies of grief, but not before he utters a final dying speech:

> To what distress I have come! And into what a great flood I now am plunged! For I was kind and beloved in my power. But now I remember the evils I did in Jerusalem. I seized all her vessels of silver and gold; and I sent to destroy the inhabitants of Judah without good reason. I know that it is because of this that these evils have come upon me; and behold, I am perishing of deep grief in a strange land.[336]

---

[334] Deut 3:27, 29.
[335] 1 Macc 6:1. Elymais is currently understood to be a territory within the Greek empire rather than a city; see Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 308; see also Josephus, *A.J.* 12.9.1.354; Pliny, *Nat.* 6.135.
[336] 1 Macc 6:11-13; see also Duggan, "Emotions", 100-101.

With this, Antiochus concludes 1) that he has been destroyed, "perishing of deep grief"; 2) his misfortunes are a direct result of his having oppressed the Jews; and 3) that he is dying "in a strange land". These themes are strongly resonant of Deuteronomy, which in many passages within 1-11 addresses the same concerns, albeit from the perspective of God and the Israelites. In Deut 5:33, 6:10, 6:18, and 8:1, it is reiterated that obedience to God will bring the Israelites a long life in the land where God has brought them. In Deut 7:1, it is further attested that the Israelites must destroy the peoples who presently inhabit the land which God has recently given to the Israelites. These peoples must be destroyed, "for they would turn away your sons from following me, to serve other gods; then the anger of יהוה would be kindled against you, and he would destroy you quickly".[337] Antiochus's misfortunes directly parallel the warnings given to Israel in Deuteronomy, but in reverse. Whereas his destruction arises from his having acted "without good reason" and according to his own desire for wealth, Israel will be destroyed according to Deuteronomy if they disobey the direct commands which God has given them. Antiochus dies because he brought misfortune to the Jews; conversely, the Israelites will die if they fail to obey God, which includes destroying the peoples that surround them. Rather than "Anti-ochus", then, we see the dying king depicted as an "anti-Israel", a figure that illustrates an opposite extrapolation of the Deuteronomic text. Moreover, Antiochus specifically dies of a strange disease-like manifestation of disappointment. In Deut 7:13, however, it is clear that the Israelites will not suffer from sickness and disease, "the evil diseases of Egypt" but that these afflictions will strike the *enemies* of Israel.[338]

[337] Deut 7:4.
[338] Deut 7:13.

However, the mirroring observed above is not as neat as it may initially appear. Deut 1-11 is the story of two generations—one which committed an act of gross disobedience upon reaching the borders of the promised land resulting in their failure to enter, and one which, thirty-eight years later, successfully obeyed and entered. The first generation was ordered to enter, but failed to do so and instead desired to send spies. Because of this, God promises them that they will die in exile, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua who were obedient, and that only their children will see the promised land.[339] It is this first generation who is driven "as far as Hormah". The Israelites then wander the wilderness, and thirty-eight years pass before they reach Moab on their way back to the border of the promised land, this time the eastern boundary. By this time, all of the previous generation has perished, and only the next generation remains.[340] This generation, according to Deut 9, will easily conquer the promised land, as would have the initial generation had they obeyed, not because of any inherent righteousness of their own but because of the wickedness of the nations currently dwelling there.[341] However, death in exile, for *this* generation, is never threatened within Deuteronomy 1-11. It is presented as the result of disobedience, but Israel is never specifically told, by God, that if they disobey they will die in the wilderness. Rather, this fate is delivered either suddenly, before any warning, or it is omitted in passages where Moses, speaking for God, advises the Israelites regarding the consequences of their decisions. The Israelites' death in exile, in Deuteronomy 1-11, is mentioned twice; Deut 1:35-36, where the current generation is forbidden to enter, and Deut 9:28, where Moses predicts that the Egyptians will accuse God of having destroyed Israel in the wilderness.

[339] Deut 1:35-39.
[340] Deut 2:14.
[341] Deut 9:4-5.

3.6. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: Bravery of Judas Maccabeus

The author of 1 Maccabees also describes the fearlessness of Judas Maccabeus, in contrast to the fear that the Israelites experience when they receive the spies' report.[342] In 1 Macc 6:41, Lysias assembles an army comprised of infantry, cavalry, mercenaries, elephants, and siege engines. So fearsome is this army that "all who heard the noise made by their multitude, by the marching of the multitude and the clanking of their arms, trembled".[343] Judas Maccabeus, however, confronts the army without fear, and Eleazar even manages to single-handedly kill an elephant; by doing so, he wins for himself "an everlasting name".[344] The differences between Deut 1 and 1 Macc are further illustrated in 1 Macc 9:9-10, in which, as in the episode of the spies, a general outcry is rebutted by an assertion of confidence from a position of authority. In 1 Macc 9:9-10, we will soon read of Judas Maccabeus's final battle, one in which heavy casualties are sustained and Judas himself is killed in combat. Before the fight, both Judas and his soldiers know what the outcome will be: "when they saw the huge number of the enemy forces, they were greatly frightened, and many slipped away from the camp, until no more than eight hundred of them were left".[345] Judas himself is "crushed in spirit" and "became faint", but says nevertheless: "Let us rise and go up against our enemies. We may be able to fight them".[346] The soldiers protest, "We are not able. Let us rather save our own lives now, and let us come back with our brethren and fight them; we are too few".[347] Judas responds, "Far be it from us to do such a thing as to flee from them. If our time has come, let us dies bravely for our brethren, and

---

[342] For more on Judas's bravery see Duggan, "Emotions", 99-100.
[343] 1 Macc 6:41.
[344] 1 Macc 6:44.
[345] 1 Macc 9:6.
[346] 1 Macc 9:7-9; note also the phrase "go up", common in Deuteronomistic history texts (Judges, Joshua, Samuel).
[347] 1 Macc 9:9.

leave no cause to question our honor".[348] This is much like the spy narrative of Deut 1, in which the Israelites lament, "Whither are we going up? Our brethren have made our hearts melt, saying, 'The people are greater and taller than we; the cities are great and fortified up to heaven; and moreover we have seen the sons of the Anakim there'".[349] Moses answers:

> Do not be in dread or afraid of them. יהוה your God who goes before you will himself fight for you, just as he did for you in Egypt before your eyes, and in the wilderness, where you have seen how יהוה your God bore you, as a man bears his son, in all the way that you went until you came to this place.[350]

As with Judas Maccabeus, Moses gives a confident response to a subordinate force that is concerned about their upcoming success in battle. But there are several key differences to be noted. First, Moses does not secretly—or not so secretly—fear the upcoming battle, but is confident that, should the Israelites promptly obey God and go to war, they will win, unlike Judas who knows that defeat is imminent. Second, there is reason to ask if Deuteronomy is presenting the entire story, as Numbers 13 presents a different version of the narrative; here, it is Caleb who reassures the people in the presence of Moses, after the initial report has been delivered. Caleb "quieted the people before Moses, and said, 'Let us go up at once, and occupy it; for we are well able to overcome it'".[351] Yet in this passage, Caleb is also confident that the Israelites will succeed should they obey. However, the account in 1 Macc is more closely aligned with the Deuteronomy tradition, for in the Deuteronomy pericope the interaction

[348] 1 Macc 9:10.
[349] Deut 1:28.
[350] Deut 1:29-31.
[351] Num 13:30.

between fearful "soldiers" and fearless general is presented as a simple dialogue—as it is in 1 Macc—rather than a crisis which finds a priestly solution, as in Numbers 14:5-37, in which the final verdict of God is delivered in person to the assembled Israelites. The author of 1 Macc, who has thus far suppressed overt references to priestly activity and divine intervention in order to emphasize the deeds of the Hasmoneans, consistently applies his methodology, and the loss of Judas Maccabeus is portrayed without *deus ex machina* but with a laudable show of bravery under duress, even in the face of fear.

These two accounts demand a response from the reader, either to prioritize one over the other or to perform an interpretive act of theological harmonization. Further, we may conclude from the Qumran materials that both Numbers and Deuteronomy were important texts for Second Temple Jews. Therefore, it is also reasonable to conclude that the author of 1 Maccabees had experience with textual examples that provided challenging attestations for the devout reader, and required creative solutions in order to produce a meaningful governing narrative. What this author's solution was in the case of the Numbers/Deuteronomy account of Moses and the spies, we cannot say. But his work in 1 Maccabees shows the recognition of a need to provide historical events with a narrative overlay that explores the motivations of the historical agents, regardless if those events have explicit motivations or not.

3.7. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Thematic Links: Oath-breaking

Oath-breaking is another major point of comparison between 1 Maccabees and Deuteronomy 1-11. The author's interaction begins with the treatment of "heaven and earth",

common elements in Hebrew oath-taking.[353] In 1 Macc 2:37, the peaceful refugees from Jerusalem refuse to resist the Greeks on the sabbath. Rather than fight, they announce: "Let us all die in our innocence; heaven and earth testify for us that you are killing us unjustly". This recalls Deut 4:26, in which Moses tells Israel what will befall them if they provoke יהוה to anger by carving graven images and doing evil: "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that you will soon perish from the land which you are going over the Jordan to possess; you will not live long upon it, but will be utterly destroyed".[354] Again, this is an inversion of the original Deuteronomic context, contrasted with the usage in 1 Maccabees. In Deuteronomy, heaven and earth are called as witnesses to certify a promise of righteous punishment for wicked action. But in 1 Maccabees, heaven and earth do not certify a punishment for the wicked, but instead the virtue of the martyrs. For the author of 1 Maccabees, this removes the prophetic element from the assertion and instead lends validity to an action that has already occurred. Instead of promising that the murderers of the "many who were seeking righteousness and justice" (1 Macc 2:29) will be punished in the future, heaven and earth are invoked to support the martyr's claim that their deaths, in the present, are unjust.

Oath-taking themes continue in 1 Macc 6:48-63. Here, Lysias has besieged the sanctuary of Jerusalem for many days, engaged in a mutual battle of siege engines, "siege towers, engines of war to throw fire and stones, machines to shoot arrows, and catapults". However, during this fight, intelligence reaches Lysias that Philip, whom Antiochus appointed as ward of the biological heir Antiochus V, has returned from the eastern Seleucid territories of Persia and Media to claim power in Judea. Lysias therefore breaks off the siege and makes a peace treaty

[353] The use of heaven and earth, as witnesses, is an important characteristic of the covenants between God and man since God, as a party within the covenant, technically cannot serve as a witness. However, as *diatheke* does not occur in the following passages, I include these sections within a separate classification and will specifically deal with covenant below. For more see Weinfeld, *School*, 62.

[354] See Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 237.

with the Jews—"let us come to terms with these men, and make peace with them and with all their nation, and agree to let them live by their laws as they did before; for it was on account of their laws which we abolished that they became angry and did all these things". However, Lysias breaks this oath due to the strength of the wall surrounding Mount Zion; he tears down this wall, then goes quickly to Antioch to fight Philip.

Oath-breaking continues in 1 Macc 7:18, this time from Alcimus and Bacchides, and in 7:27 from Nicanor. This brief narrative section is set apart by means of *pisteuō* , which provides the initial and final points of the section via the technique of *inclusio. Pisteuō* , "trust", is the ironic hallmark that encourages the reader to examine this section more closely. The word is first used by "all the lawless and ungodly men of Israel", inherently *untrustworthy* men, who are led by Alcimus.[355] Alcimus aspires to the position of the Jerusalem high priest, further lending suspicion of untrustworthiness to his words and actions. This faction approaches new king Demetrius, son of Seleucus, with a lie: "Judas and his brothers have destroyed all your friends, and have driven us out of the land".[356] The conspirators then encourage Demetrius to exercise trust and locate his own agent, to verify the story that Demetrius has just been given. Demetrius responds by making Alcimus high priest, then selects Bacchides, a "Friend" of the king and governor of the province "Beyond the River" as a trustworthy agent. But Demetrius seemingly trusts Alcimus also, even though the initial suggestion made by Alcimus and the lawless men does not encourage Demetrius to do so. In fact, Alcimus suggests that he should *not* be trusted—why else would he recommend that Demetrius send a trusted ally to verify what Alcimus has just reported to him? But Demetrius clearly views Alcimus's word as reliable, for Demetrius immediately commands Alcimus and Bacchides "to take vengeance on the sons of Israel".

[355] 1 Macc 7:5.
[356] 1 Macc 7:6.

Alcimus and Bacchides set off and Alcimus without hesitation delivers "peaceable but treacherous words" to Judas Maccabeus and his brothers. These words do not fool Judas and his brothers, but the Hasideans in Judah welcome Demetrius's emissaries as they regard Alcimus to be "a priest of the line of Aaron". Alcimus then swears an oath to the Hasideans, promising not to harm them, and again *pisteuo* makes an appearance as "they trusted him; but he seized sixty of them and killed them in one day". An editorial comment serves the *inclusio* passage as an epilogue, which in the Greek links Alcimus to Psalm 67.[357]

There are considerable scholarly arguments that Alcimus is not the villainous type presented by the author of 1 Maccabees, but rather an antagonist of circumstance that opposed Judas Maccabeus most likely due to Judas's lack of priestly lineage and support for the Seleucids. Alcimus is not an impious or false priest but instead supports the Seleucids, not the Ptolemies or rapidly ascending Hasmoneans.[358] To avoid the complexities of delineating where exactly Alcimus's loyalties lie, as well as to avoid weakening his own argument that the Hasmoneans are worthy successors because of their priestly piety and covenantal zeal, the author of 1 Macc sidesteps the issue altogether and instead contrives a claim of impiety against Alcimus. The text's claim that Alcimus was "of the line of Aaron" preserves the Zadokite claims that Alcimus could have made against Judas Maccabeus's non-Zadokite, Joaribite lineage. Nor need it be assumed that Alcimus's actions in the restructuring of the temple walls are purely blasphemous or impious, as the claims regarding the walls themselves being of prophetic origin

[357] See Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, on this section. For the rhetorical use of *pistis* see Duncan E. MacRae, "Reading the Roman-Jewish Treaty in 1 Maccabees 8", *Hermathena* 200/201 (2016): 73-94. For arguments against Alcimus as author of Psalm 67 see Harlan Creelman, "Are There Maccabean Psalms? II", in *The Old and New Testament Student*, 15:5/6 (1892): 192-201; Robert Doran, "Emending 1 Macc 7,16", *Biblica* 87:2 (2006): 261-262; and David J. Halperin's review of Goldstein's commentary in *JAOS* 99.1 (1979): 112-113.

[358] Goldstein, "Apocryphal Book of Baruch", in *Semites*, 203; also *1 Maccabees* 332-336; also 1 Macc 7:1-25; 9:1; 23-27; 54-57; 2 Macc 14:3-26.

are subject to critical scrutiny.[359] Having Alcimus remain a pious and valid priest creates two problems for the author; first, if Alcimus *is* a pious priest, and of Aaronic-Zadokite heritage, the Hasmoneans have no business pretending to the priesthood: and second, if the only pious and qualified candidate for the Jerusalem high priesthood supports the Seleucids, including this detail in the 1 Maccabees account inevitably provokes a question of alternatives in the reader's mind. If Antiochus III wrongfully overtook the Ptolemies, and Judea belongs in the hands of the Seleucids, who hold an unblemished track record of Jewish religious tolerance, should not the Hasmoneans surrender their conquered territories to the Seleucids?[360]

It may rather be understood that the author of 1 Maccabees casts actions in a certain light to further his own convictions that the Hasmonean dynasty rightfully holds both political control of Judea and the high priesthood. This narrative harmonization, or "emplotment", serves to provide a consistent ideological background for actions which are in and of themselves inscrutable at best and deliberately obfuscated at worst.[361] The salient point for our discussion is that the same emplotment may be observed when one compares the account of Moses in Deut 1-11 with Num 13-14. In Num 13, the narrative proceeds as follows: God instructs Moses to send spies, one from each tribe, to obtain intelligence of the promised land; Moses does so, and orders the spies to provide knowledge, of geography, population, agriculture, fortifications, and the amenability of the current inhabitants; the spies complete their mission and deliver the news that the inhabitants are too powerful to be overcome, despite Joshua and Caleb's dissent; the people

[359] Daniel Lanziger, "Alcimus' (sic) Last Command: History and Propaganda in 1 Maccabees 9:54", *JSJ* 46:1 (2015): 86-102.
[360] See Benedikt Eckhardt, "The Hasmoneans and their Rivals in Seleucid and Post-Seleucid Judea", *JSJ* 47 (2016): 58: " ... there is an evident lacuna, one that has to do with the general reluctance of 1 Maccabees to give any serious portrait of anti-Hasmonean factors apart from rival Seleucid kings. While much of 1 Maccabees deals with internal opponents directly or implicitly, the text consistently offers a black-and-white picture of these internal struggles, with the Hasmoneans and their supporters facing a largely anonymous circle of 'lawless men', who are at times credited with highly symbolic speeches that certainly do not reflect their actual program."
[361] Steven Weitzman, "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution", *JBL* 123:2 (2004): 219-234.

of Israel lament this news and conclude that they should return to Egypt. God is displeased, but Moses intercedes for Israel, asking that they not be destroyed, for in that case the Egyptians will gloat over God's failure to rescue them. God arrives at a compromise; the present generation will be excluded from the land, excluding Joshua and Caleb, but their children will be allowed to enter. Once the Israelites realize they are forbidden from entering the land, they change their minds and try to enter, but are predictably unsuccessful. However, in Deut 1, it is the *Israelites* who suggest the use of spies. Moses agrees, and the story proceeds with the same results as in Numbers. But God is not implicated in the Deuteronomy version of the story. Instead, when he hears the words of Israel, he "is angered" and swears an oath, forbidding not only the current generation from entering the promised land but also Moses with whom he is also "angry".

In 1 Macc 7:27, Nicanor subordinates the oath formula to his own desires, transforming it from its usual purpose into an instrument of self-willed determination and rebellion. The oath formula conventionally involves God as a witness between two human parties. But in 1 Macc 7:27, Nicanor sends a message, or perhaps an offer, to Judas Maccabeus. At this point in 1 Macc, Jerusalem has been successfully usurped by Alcimus and Bacchides on behalf of Demetrius son of Seleucus, who has taken the opportunity created by the death of Antiochus IV to assert his own kingship. As a result, Judas Maccabeus and his soldiers have moved their base of operations to the surrounding wilderness. Rather than approaching Judas and swearing an oath to the effect of, "May God deal with me harshly if I fail to carry out my word", Nicanor sends what is better characterized as an informal promise: "Let there be no fighting between me and you; I shall come with a few men to see you face to face in peace".[362] While this is partially honored by Nicanor, who does meet with Judas, Nicanor's underlying intent is to forcibly capture

[362] See Ruth 1:17; 1 Macc 7:27.

Judas, as Judas somehow discovers.[363] Refusing to place himself twice in a vulnerable position, Judas does not meet with Nicanor a second time, and Nicanor initiates a battle with Judas at Capharsalama.[364] This battle does not go well for Nicanor, who loses five hundred of his men, with the rest routed by Judas's army.[365] These soldiers flee into Jerusalem. At this point, Nicanor demonstrates himself to be truly a villain, as he then approaches the Mount Zion sanctuary, which is inarguably in alliance with Demetrius, Bacchides, and Nicanor.[366] Although the priests offer a friendly greeting and a demonstration of their intercessory burnt offering for Demetrius, Nicanor "mocked them and derided them and defiled them and spoke arrogantly, and in anger he *swore this oath*, 'Unless Judas and his army are delivered into my hands this time, then if I return safely I will burn up this house'".[367]

This oath does not make reference to God as a witness, as does the oath-formula in Ruth. It is a statement of intent, which the author of 1 Maccabees presents as proceeding from a speaker who is utterly convinced of his ability to enact the promise which he here makes. Yet Nicanor presents his intent with no consideration for the possibility that he may not be able to carry out his promise, which is exactly the function of invoking God in the conventional oath-formula, i.e., to establish the severity of the consequences that await the oath-taker should they fail to carry out the conditions of the oath. Such an oath is also found in Deut 1-11, where oaths are exceptionally rare. In fact, the only oath actually sworn in Deut 1-11 is an oath sworn by God, also without the conventional formula, in which God resolves not to allow the disobedient

[363] 1 Macc 7:29-30.
[364] 1 Macc 7:30-31.
[365] 1 Macc 7:32.
[366] Most likely, this sanctuary is governed by Alcimus; it is possible that this sanctuary at Zion retains loyalties to the long-standing Akra garrison, but as this garrison was initially Seleucid there should have been no conflict of interests.
[367] 1 Macc 7:32-34.

generation, and possibly also Moses, to cross the Jordan and enter the promised land.[368] In this passage, God of course does not name himself as witness. This illustrates the impiety of Nicanor's oath; by framing his own oath in terms nearly identical to God's own oath in Deut 1, Nicanor places himself in a position equal to God, implying that he himself is the witness for his oath, just as God was the witness to his oath in Deut 1. Further, Nicanor demonstrates additional impiety by promising to destroy the sanctuary, which has offered him nothing but gestures in good faith. The author of 1 Macc, then, draws upon the traditions of Deut 1 by using its oath formulations, acceptable when invoked by God, and placing this oath in the mouth of Nicanor, thereby vilifying him and justifying Judas Maccabeus's actions in overthrowing him.

3.8. Interim Summary

Thus far, we have seen Deut 1-11 used in a great variety of literary examples within 1 Maccabees. Often, those examples demonstrate stylistic resonances as phrases or lexemes, merely giving evidence of the importance of Deut 1-11 for the author of 1 Maccabees. But in other examples, and significantly examples that are not merely linguistically but also thematically linked to Deut 1-11, a deeper authorial purpose may be seen; the intent to justify the Hasmonean dynasty. Often, this may be characterized as an attenuation of supernaturalism, emphasizing the physical, military actions of Judas Maccabeus. This particular emphasis may be seen in the author of 1 Maccabees's treatment of power, in which its rightful use, proper ownership, and transference is examined; and the bravery of Judas Maccabeus; and the strong resonances between Deuteronomy 1-11 and the Babel narrative. In other examples—the theological narrative of Antiochus IV Epiphanus , the military intelligence of the Jews, and the

[368] Deut 1:34-37.

breaking of oaths—supernaturalism is not relevant to the discussion, but Deut 1-11 nonetheless informs and supports the author's goal of establishing the Hasmonean dynasty.

Due to the great influence that Deut 1-11 exerts on 1 Maccabees, these examples warranted their own discussion. But how does Deut 1-11 inform the author of 1 Maccabees's examination of covenant, wisdom, and *mûsar/paideia*? This will be examined below.

3.9. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Covenant

Lester Grabbe provides a helpful overview of covenant in 1 Maccabees. He writes that *diathēkē* almost invariably references a covenant made with God, made in the past and that encompasses all aspects of Jewish law.[369] Dongshin Don Chang continues to shed light on covenant in 1 Maccabees, writing that covenant is largely used in the introduction of 1 Maccabees to justify the Hasmonean priesthood through zeal for the law and Mattathias's status as the inheritor of Phinehas's priestly covenant.[370] This is of course a more specific use of covenant, which justifies the Hasmoneans without necessarily detailing the niceties of priestly law; generally speaking, Grabbe is correct. Taking both of these authors into account, one concludes that covenant is specifically used in the early portions of 1 Maccabees to justify the Hasmonean priesthood, whereas in the rest of the text, covenant is a reference point used in dialogue, as Grabbe observes, as a kind of shorthand signifying the whole of the law.

---

[369] Also *sunthēkē* which only describes human agreements and occurs only eight times in LXX (1 Macc 10:26; 2 Macc 14:26; Wis 12:21; Ps 8:10; Isa 28:15; Isa 30:1; Dan 11:6, 17. See Lester L. Grabbe, "Did All Jews Think Alike? 'Covenant' in Philo and Josephus in the Context of Second Temple Judaic Religion", in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSupp 71, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 260.

[370] Dongshin Don Chang, *Phinehas, The Sons of Zadok, and Melchizedek*: *Priestly Covenant in Late Second Temple Texts*, LSTS 90 (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 23-44, 49.

This of course includes Deuteronomy, and Dongbin Choi focuses the discussion, writing that 1 Maccabees shows substantial interaction with Deuteronomy not only in its treatment of Mosaic law, which as he observes is a prevalent observation in scholarship, but also in its treatment of covenant.[371] For Choi, this means conformity to a pattern which he labels DCRB, or the Deuteronomic covenantal framework, comprised of a recurring cycle of defilement-cursing-repentance-blessing.[372] But Choi's work consistently relies upon the entirety of Deuteronomy to make his argument, most notably Deut 28-30.[373] The initial portion of Deuteronomy—chapters 1-11—is as useful when characterizing 1 Maccabees's use of covenant, as I will show below.

After a lengthy historical preamble which details the successful military activities of the second-generation Israelites on their way back to the promised land, culminating in their arrival at Moab, Moses informs the Israelites that they must heed the "statutes and ordinances" which he will teach them, and that they must "do them, that [they] might live".[374] These commandments are presented as a defined entity, so much so that the Israelites may not tamper with or deface them, and that obedience to these commandments will result in survival while disobedience will result in death, just as the Israelites who followed the Baal of Peor died.[375] While Moses is beginning to discuss these "statutes and ordinances", this is not the Israelites' first exposure to the rules, as the use of δεικνύμι in the perfect tense, as well as the piel perfect למד, indicates; Moses has, in fact, taught these rules before.[376] After an excursus on the law's ability to produce "wisdom and understanding", as well as to earn the esteem of other nations, Moses reveals

[371] Dongbin Choi, *The Use and Function of Scripture in 1 Maccabees*, LSTS 98 (London: T & T Clark, 2022), 156-167.
[372] Choi, *Scripture*, 159.
[373] Choi, *Scripture*, 157-158.
[374] Deut 4:1.
[375] Deut 4:2-3.
[376] Deut 4:5.

exactly when this prior teaching has occurred—"the day that you stood before יהוה your God at Horeb".[377] At this point, God "declared to you his *covenant*, which he commanded you to perform, that is, the ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone".[378] Moses then proceeds to elaborate on what was Exod 20:2-6, and what will be Deut 5:7-10, or the prohibition against false worship and idolatry.[379] Defiance of this command will mean that the Israelites will "utterly perish from the land ... and יהוה will scatter you among the peoples ... but from there you will seek יהוה your God, and you will find him, if you search after him with all your heart and all your soul".[380]

From this brief passage it is clear that the Deuteronomic covenantal framework which Choi observes in 1 Maccabees and for which he finds evidence in Deut 28-30 is also present in Deut 1-11. Further, the model receives additional nuance in Deut 1-11, characterized as OBDCRB, or obedience-blessing-defilement-curse-repentance-blessing. Deut 7:12 is clear that if the Israelites observe and obey the commands which they have been given, they will receive a wealth of blessings; offspring, agricultural abundance, plentiful livestock, excellent health, and military prowess. But Deut 7:25-26 qualify this blessing with the same warnings observed earlier; if the Israelites fall prey to the temptation of graven images, curses will follow: "The graven images of their gods you shall burn with fire; you shall not covet the silver or the gold that is on them ... lest you be ensnared by it ... and become accursed like it ... it is an accursed thing".[381]

---

[377] Deut 4:10; see also Deut 5:2.
[378] Deut 4:13.
[379] Deut 4:25.
[380] Deut 4:26-29; see also Deut 4:30-31; 5:33; 6:2, 10-15.
[381] Deut 7:25-26.

In 1 Maccabees, *diathēkē* first occurs in 1:11-15. Here, "lawless men" emerge from Israel and propose to "make a covenant (διαθήκην) with the Gentiles round about us, for since we separated from them many evils have come upon us".[382] According to Jonathan Goldstein, these "lawless men" are Menelaus and the Oniad priests detailed in 2 Maccabees. The moral complexity of the Oniad priesthood, certainly not uniformly without merit, is omitted due to Onias III's "closeness to the wicked Tobian publican, Hyrcanus; for his long stay at sinful Antioch; for taking asylum at a pagan shrine; and perhaps even for having the esteem of the gentiles (II 3:11, 4:5, 33-37)".[383] Deut 1-11 provides the biblical justification for both the criminality of the "lawless men" and the author's refusal to accuse them of idolatry. Deut 7:1-4 demands a strict separation from the surrounding nations, and Ezra-Nehemiah justifies applying this law to the nations of Hellenistic Judea.[384] However, Deut 4:25-28 commands destruction and exile for idolaters; while the author of 1 Maccabees believes the Oniads to have engaged in wrongful activity, a "covenant" with the Gentiles is not necessarily the same as idolatry, and either for a belief that the Oniads did not commit idolatry or for a merciful desire not to see them suffer destruction and exile, the author does not accuse them of this crime.[385] Instead, the author relies upon the designation *diathēkas hagias* to differentiate the covenant which the "lawless men" have abandoned—the covenant with God detailed in Deuteronomy and elsewhere—from the covenant they wish to form with the surrounding nations. By describing that allegiance with the nations as merely *diathēkē*, the author again suggests that the interaction which the "lawless

---

[382] 1 Macc 1:11.
[383] Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 73; see here also for comments on *damnatio memoriae*.
[384] Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 199; Ezra 9:1-2, 10:11; Neh 9:2, 10:31, 13:1-3.
[385] There is also the possibility that, the Oniads having already been exiled (in a sense) to the Egyptian temple at Leontopolis, the author saw no reason to further besmirch the Oniads' reputation. Scholarly consensus holds that exile occurred with Onias IV, e.g. John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem:Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 61; but see also Joan Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias", *JSJ* 29:3 (1998): 297-321, for a strong argument that it was in fact Onias III who was exiled, Onias IV being too young at the time of exile.

men" made with the nations was not idolatrous or concomitant with false worship, but merely an agreement of cultural values and friendship.

However, in 1 Macc 1:56-64, the author gives a different treatment to *diathēkē* v. *diathēkas hagias*. Here, διαθήκης is used in conjunction with βιβλίον to give βιβλίον διαθήκης, "the book of the covenant".[386] Possession of this book, according to king Antiochus Epiphanus IV's decree, warrants the death penalty. Yet this is not a strong enough punishment to deter "many in Israel" who "stood firm and resolved in their hearts not to eat unclean food. They chose to die rather than be defiled by food or to profane the *holy covenant* (διαθήκην ἁγίαν); and they did die".[387] In this passage, *diathēkē* and *diathēkē hagias* both reference the covenant between God and Israel. This shows that, for the author of 1 Maccabees, the differentiation given to *diathēkē* and *diathēkē hagia* in 1:11-15 is not a matter of technical terminology, but a contextual strategy which emphasizes, again, the non-sacred nature of the covenant made with the surrounding nations. When the author does not wish to make that contrast, *diathēkē* and *diathēkē hagia* may be used interchangeably.

1 Macc 2:49-70 describes the farewell speech of Mattathias. In this passage, Mattathias tells his sons to "give [their] lives for the covenant of our fathers (διαθήκης πατέρων)".[388] Covenant is mentioned again in verse 54, which gives: "Phinehas our father, because he was deeply zealous, received the covenant of everlasting priesthood (διαθήκην ἱερωσύνης αἰωνίας)". The covenant of the fathers is mentioned again in 1 Macc 4:10, when Judas and his men arrive at the camp of, presumably, Ptolemy son of Dorymenes and Nicanor.[389] As they arrive, when

[386] As in Ben Sira, above.
[387] 1 Macc 1:62-63.
[388] 1 Macc 2:50.
[389] In 1 Macc 3:38-40, Lysias selects "Ptolemy the son of Dorymenes, and Nicanor and Gorgias, mighty men among the friends of the king, and sent with them forty thousand infantry and seven thousand cavalry to go into the land of Judah and destroy it, as the king had commanded. So they departed with their entire force, and when they arrived

Judas's men see the well-trained and well-equipped soldiers, Judas tells them not to fear their numerical superiority, but to "remember how our fathers were saved at the Red Sea, when Pharoah with his forces pursued them. And now let us cry to Heaven, to see whether he will favor us and remember his covenant with our fathers (διαθήκης πατέρων) and crush this army today".[390]

Therefore, while Deut 1-11 exerts a strong influence on 1 Maccabees, as much as 28-30 as Choi as shown, nevertheless the purposes of the author in this case condition the effects of the covenantal influences of Deut 1-11. It is important for the author of 1 Maccabees that the covenants with the surrounding nations be depicted as less severe than the agreements shown in Deut 1-11, for his own use of covenant, admittedly tenuous, itself relies upon resonances with Numbers to justify the Hasmonean priesthood by means of the zeal, and eternal priestly covenant, made with Phinehas. It is also important for the author not to vilify the Oniads, presumably for political purposes; it is sufficient to extol the validity of the Hasmoneans without excessively criticizing the Oniads. Further, to invoke the covenantal model of Deut 1-11 in its entirety would, by contrast, overshadow the author's creative and important use of covenant for his own purposes. Therefore, the impact of the covenantal teachings found in Deut 1-11 must be minimized; and this is exactly what we find in the author's use of Deut 1-11 with respect to covenant.

---

they encamped near Emmaus in the plain". In 1 Macc 4:1, Gorgias leaves the camp with a specially selected force; only hours later, Judas Maccabeus arrives at Emmaus. Since, after the ensuing battle, Judas later claims that Gorgias is nearby in the hills (1 Macc 4:18), Judas must have confronted only Ptolemy and Nicanor.

[390] 1 Macc 4:9-10. *Diathēkē* is also mentioned in 1 Macc 11:9, in which Ptolemy seeks to make an alliance with Demetrius, son of Demetrius, against Alexander Balas. Ptolemy sends this message by way of *presbeis*, or elders: "Come, let us make a covenant (διαθήκην) with each other, and I will give you in marriage my daughter who was Alexander's wife, and you shall reign over your father's kingdom".

3.10. 1 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Wisdom

The most obvious wisdom theme present in 1 Maccabees is the advancement of wicked men.[391] This is first seen in 1 Macc 1:11: "In those days lawless men came forth from Israel, and misled many, saying, 'Let us go and make a covenant with the Gentiles round about us, for since we separated from them many evils have come upon us'". While these wicked men are not to be viewed as the same type that is seen in Wisdom and Proverbs, nevertheless their arrangement with the surrounding nations results in their reversal of circumcision, a serious crime and a violation of covenant.[392] Wisdom concerns return, however, when Mattathias repudiates the offer of the king's officers, to join in the general apostasy: "Even in all the nations that live under the rule of the king obey him," Mattathias answers while alluding to Deuteronomic phrase of the right and left hand:

> and have chosen to do his commandments, departing each one from the religion of his fathers, yet I and my sons and my brothers will live by the covenant of our fathers. Far be it from us to desert the law and the ordinances. We will not obey the king's words by turning aside from our religion to the right hand or to the left.[393]

Here we also find an interweaving of the three basic themes, in this case wisdom and covenant, although to a much lesser extent than in Ben Sira.

Wisdom teachings continue in the farewell speech of Mattathias to his sons. This speech shares a surface resemblance to the benediction of Jacob/Israel to his sons, given that it is a

[391] The familiar dichotomy of the righteous and the wicked; Prov 12:21; Ps 1; Deut 7.
[392] Prov 1:10-19; Wis 2:1-21.
[393] 1 Macc 2:19-22; also see above.

deathbed summary of the father's teachings. But its content is far closer in substance to Sir 44-50, although greatly abbreviated. Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, Elijah, Hananiah, Azariel, Mishael, and finally Daniel are all praised for their fidelity to God's commands. This roster is followed by a generalized statement of the circuitous fate, seemingly prosperous but ultimately disastrous, that awaits the wicked. This common binary observation in wisdom literature is given as follows: "Do not fear the words of a sinner, for his splendor will turn into dung and worms. Today he will be exalted, but tomorrow he will not be found, because he has returned to the dust, and his plans will perish".[394] Yet this is presented in close connection with the exhortation to "remember" and the situation of a father instructing his son, clear markers of *paideia*. Again, the author of 1 Maccabees does not linger on these themes at length, but employs them when they serve his narrative goals; also, wisdom and *paideia* concerns are here seen as interconnected. These same themes—memory and retribution—are found within the encomium of Judas Maccabeus that follows in 1 Macc 3:3-9. This passage first gives general praise of Judas's abilities in combat, then notes that:

> he searched out and pursued those who broke the law; he burned those who troubled his people. Lawbreakers shrank back in fear of him; all the evildoers were confounded, and deliverance prospered by his hand ... he made Jacob glad by his deeds, and his memory is blessed forever ... he destroyed the ungodly out of the land ... he gathered in those who were perishing.

[394] 1 Macc 2:62-63.

Yet the most concrete presence of wisdom ideas in 1 Maccabees resides in the author's treatment of the "snare". References to dangerous snares occur often in wisdom literature.[395] In 1 Macc 1:35, the wicked become a "great snare", or μεγάλην παγίδα. *Pagis* also occurs in 1 Macc 5:4, this time used to describe "the evil of the sons of Baian, who were to the people as a snare (παγίδα) and as a trap by ambushing them on the roads". In both of these cases, *pagis* connotes the machinations of enemies, both in their presence and their activities to disrupt the Jews. This sense of *pagis* is reinforced in its fifty-seven other LXX appearances. In each of these cases, except nine, the *pagis* describes the hostile plans of the enemy.[396] These exceptions include seven instances in which the snares are presented in a divine context; out of these seven, three specifically mention priestly operations. Contrast this with the word *skōlon*, which appears in Deut 7:16 and describes the gods of the surrounding nations. Each of the five appearances of *skōlon* in the LXX features a reference to worship or priestly functionality, including the Judges verse which details Jephthah's regret at having promised his daughter in a consecrated vow.[397] Although its frequency of appearance is far lower, *skōlon* is used in priestly or liturgical context in 100% of its uses, whereas *pagis* is priestly or liturgical in 5.2% of its uses. By using *pagis* rather than *skōlon*, the author of 1 Maccabees suggests that, rather than false worship, the covenant which the dissenting Jews have made with the Greeks (1 Macc 1:11) is a cultural alliance rather than a commitment to worshiping the gods of the Greeks.[398] This is not to say, however, that this cultural alliance does not require the Jews to abandon their covenant with God, as 1 Macc 1:15 asserts that by "removing the marks of circumcision" the Jews "abandon the

[395] See references below, note 79.
[396] The cases where *pagis* references a snare laid by an enemy, or oneself acting as one's own enemy, are Josh 23:13; 1 Sam 28:9; Tob 14:10; Ps 9:31; 17:6; 30:5; 34:7, 8; 56:7; 63:6; 68:23; 90:3; 118:110; 123:7; 139:6; 140:9; 141:4; Prov 6:2, 5; 7:23; 11:9; 12:13; 13:14; 14:27; 18:7; 21:6; 22:5; 29:6; Eccl 9:12; Job 18:8, 9; 22:10; Sir 9:3, 13; 27:20, 26, 29; 51:2; Amos 3:5; Isa 8:14; 24:17, 18; 42:22; Jer 5:26, 27; 18:22; and 31:43, 44. The nine exceptions are Ps 9:16; 10:6; 24:15; 65:11; Prov 20:25; Wis 14:11; Hos 5:1, 9:8; and Ezek 29:4.
[397] Exod 10:7, Deut 7:16; Judg (A) 11:35; Judg 8:27; 2 Chr 28:23.
[398] See Peter Schäfer, *The History of the Jews in the Greco-Roman World* (London: Routledge, 1995), 37.

holy covenant (διαθήκης ἁγίας). Rather, it simply means that the sort of worship which provokes Mattathias, the worship mandated by Antiochus IV Epiphanus in 1 Macc 1:41-42, has not yet been imposed upon the Jews. Until Antiochus's decree in 1 Macc 1:41-42, while the Greeks are certainly oppressing the Jews, the "abomination of desolation" has not yet been realized. By 1 Macc 1:54, this worship does become explicit, as the name of the pagan god now honored in the temple was not omitted or changed, but openly declared for all to recognize.[399] This is in keeping with the proper interpretation of Deut 7:26, again according to Goldstein.

This preference for *pagis* also coincides with the author's specific method of vindicating the Hasmonean priesthood. Scholarly consensus holds that by mentioning Mattathias's zeal for the covenant and law, the author implies that the priestly covenant given to Phinehas in Numbers 25:13 extends to Mattathias and his sons.[400] This observation, along with Mattathias's priestly descent from Joarib, is the primary argument for the Maccabean possession of the Jerusalem priesthood. But whether or not the Hasmoneans qualify for the *high* priesthood is a separate question, and this becomes a notorious debate in other Second Temple documents. It seems that the author of 1 Maccabees has, with well-informed prescience, anticipated these objections and crafted his argument accordingly. The high priesthood is simply not mentioned in the portions of 1 Maccabees that present reasons for the Hasmonean priesthood. Instead, while the Hasmonean legitimacy is certainly argued, it is presented as broadly as possible, possibly so as not to provoke specific questions relating to priestly functionality. So by using *pagis* rather than *skōlon*, the author of 1 Maccabees minimizes the religious element. This is in agreement with the author's established aim not to make explicit claims about the Hasmonean priesthood, but to merely suggest that through the Phinehas-like murder of the false worshipper and the "zeal for

[399] See Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 147: "Deut 7:26 did not mean, 'Change its name to abomination', but "Treat it as an abomination"'.
[400] See Don Chang et al.

the law", the Hasmoneans have priestly prerogative. Too much emphasis on the Deuteronomic language here might lead the reader to believe that the Jews were tempted to follow false gods, rather than strictly compelled to do so out of fear for their lives. If so, one might argue that a problem had arisen that the Hasmonean priesthood was not equipped to address. But by minimizing this, and keeping apostasy not as a problem of the Jews's religious affections but as a result of the unfair laws placed upon them, the author of 1 Macc presents the situation as one which can be solved militarily, and which does not require priestly authority that is beyond the Hasmonean ability to provide.

Therefore, the author of 1 Maccabees often employs wisdom ideas to support his goal of edifying the Hasmoneans, especially in the areas of wicked men and the farewell speech. In his use of the "snare" idea, however, a direct interaction with Deut 1-11 that, again, supports his authorial purposes, depicting the initial alliance between the Greeks and Jews as cultural rather than religious. This specific use of *pagis* for "snare", rather than *skōlon*, also serves the author's purpose of de-emphasizing the Hasmonean priesthood without directly invalidating it; rather, again, the author seeks to defend the Hasmonean priesthood through indirect means.

3.11. 1 Macc and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*

The word *paideia* does not occur in 1 Maccabees. Therefore, I investigate the theme of *paideia* conceptually below. The first and perhaps most significant intersection of 1 Macc and *paideia* is in its prominent mention of the gymnasium, the construction of which the "lawless men" instigate.[401] The gymnasium began its life as a place to exercise and improve one's appearance, as well as to become more skillful in various individual sport activities. It was for

[401] 1 Macc 1:14.

all intents and purposes nearly identical to the modern fitness gym, even featuring music to accompany athletic activity.[402] The gymnasium was in its early days restricted to the nobility but became popularized during the fifth century, the period of Athenian democracy.[403] Plato's gymnasium, however, was a place for mental as well as physical education, hosting the Museion which might be seen as a precursor to the *enkuklia paideia*.[404] After the Alexandrian conquest, the gymnasium spread to the various annexed territories which formed the Greek Empire.[405] In Hellenistic Egypt, the gymnasium became something of a political nexus, funded by established Greek colonizers; further, by the Hellenistic period the gymnasium had become a place not only for physical education but for training in literature, poetry, music, philosophy, and rhetoric, pillars of the *enkuklia paideia*.[406]

Construction of the gymnasium in Jerusalem, then, likely afforded political privileges to the "lawless men", establishing them as prominent citizens of Antioch.[407] It also provided training in arts and sciences which particularly defined the Greek mind and way of life. Yet it was very likely not a place of Torah training, and in fact may have still carried the subtle Greek tendency to pederasty and excessively close relationships between older male instructors and younger male students.[408] This is especially troubling given the emphasis that Deut 1-11 places on the educative relationship between fathers and sons.[409] Deut 8:5 gives: "Know then in your heart that as a man disciplines his son, יהוה your God disciplines you". Such an explicit

[402] Mark Griffith, "The Earliest Greek Systems of Education", in *A Companion to Ancient Education*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, ed. W. Martin Bloomer (Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2015), 37.
[403] H.I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, tr. George Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 39.
[404] Although the Museion is often exaggerated in importance; see M.L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London: Routledge, 1971), 59.
[405] James Bowen, *A History of Western Education, Vol I: The Ancient World* (London: Methuen & Co, 1972), 139.
[406] Marrou, *Education*, 186-187; Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 117.
[407] Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 117.
[408] See Marrou, *Education*, 26-35.
[409] E.g. Deut 6:20-21; 8:5.

connection, and perhaps even to Jewish eyes perversion, of Deuteronomic teachings possibly seemed too horrible to directly address, and there is no direct condemnation of the gymnasium on these grounds.[410] Nonetheless, the context of Deut 1-11 undoubtedly assists in provoking the author's outrage at the "lawless men" who have initiated such an alliance with the Greeks.

The particular emphasis of father-son connection as an element of *paideia* may also be seen in the author's treatment of Mattathias and his sons. Mattathias laments the downfall of the temple, and not only he but his sons tear their clothes and wear the customary sackcloth of mourning (1 Macc 2:14). The officers of king Antiochus IV Epiphanes "invite" Matthias to offer sacrifice in accordance with the king's demands, and they assume that Mattathias's sons will follow his lead; they assert that his sons support him, and that if Mattathias offers the apostate sacrifice, not only he but his sons will become friends of the king and receive monetary rewards.

Thus far the author presents an equivalence between father and sons attested not only by the third person narrator, reporting the actions of Mattathias and his sons, but also the dialogue of the king's officers, who equally assume that the actions of Mattathias, the father, should be counted as the actions of the sons. Matthias then speaks and confirms this pattern, as he refuses to comply and speaks not only for himself, but for his sons:

> Even if all the nations that live under the rule of the king obey him, and have chosen to do his commandments, departing each one from the religion of his fathers, yet I and my sons and my brothers will live by the covenant of our fathers. Far be it from us to desert

[410] But see the mention of the *petasos* in 2 Macc 4:12, possibly a subtle nod toward the nude exercise habits of the Greeks; Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, AB 41A (London: Doubleday, 1983), 230. Nudity is hinted at the removal of the "marks of circumcision", alluding to the attachment of artificial foreskins; Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 200.

> the law and the ordinances. We will not obey the king's words by turning aside from our religion.[411]

This passage precedes the arrival of the apostate Jew who offers improper sacrifice, and whom Mattathias executes. As a result, the author writes of Mattathias's "zeal", beginning a chain of attribution that will culminate in the assumption that Mattathias and his sons are heirs to the eternal priestly covenant of Phinehas.[412]

During the entirety of his life, Mattathias is presented as the spokesman and surrogate agent for his sons. Throughout the narrative, the author never depicts the sons as asserting their own ethical independence; rather, it is Mattathias who speaks and acts on their behalf. This is, however, in stark opposition to Deuteronomy 1-11, which routinely separates accountability between one generation and the next.[413] Here, the author again does not use Deut 1-11 when it counters his primary purpose of establishing Hasmonean rule and, to a lesser extent, priesthood. The text of Deut 5:2-3 gives: " יהוה our God made a covenant with in Horeb. Not with our fathers did יהוה make this covenant, but with us, who are all of us here alive this day". This text is ambiguous; while the surrounding text implies covenantal continuity between the present generation and the previous one, with an emphasis placed on the covenant's applicability to the present generation, the cited passage might also be interpreted to suggest a covenantal discontinuity. This text, along with the other texts in Deut 1-11 that emphasize each generation's culpability for its own decisions, somewhat opposes the author's method of establishing the

---

[411] 1 Macc 2:19-22.
[412] 1 Macc 2:24, 54; Chang, *Phinehas*, as cited above.
[413] E.g. Deut 1:34-35, 39; also 5:3, which emphasizes the responsibility of the present generation, rather than repudiating the covenant made with a previous generation.

Hasmonean dynasty, to wit, by presenting the narrative of Mattathias's zeal and covenantal inclusion as implicitly transferring to his sons.[414]

In comparison to this dignified transfer of power, the author of 1 Maccabees presents the Greeks as troubled and chaotic, with their own interactions between fathers and sons sharply opposing the relationship between Mattathias and his sons. In 1 Macc 3:32-33, Antiochus IV visits Persia to raise funds and entrusts his son, Antiochus V, to the care of one Lysias. This financial venture fails, as Antiochus IV has imposed such harsh measures upon his subjects that they are unable or sufficiently unwilling to surrender the expected amounts of tribute. It is at this point that Antiochus IV receives word of his fortunes in Judea, and how Judas Maccabeus has defeated the generals that Antiochus IV left behind. Antiochus IV is fatally distraught, and on his deathbed repents, in a way, of what he has done. This deathbed "confession", detailed in 1 Macc 6:11-17, has theological ramifications when considered alongside Deut 1-11, as is explored above. However, it is at this time that Antiochus gives his last wishes regarding his son and heir, Antiochus V. Despite having left half his army, and the totality of his elephants, with Lysias, Antiochus IV awards *Philip* the care of his son Antiochus V. Therefore, we find genuine unreliability in the succession, as it creates an extreme point of vulnerability in the position of the educator, or *paedagōgos*. Presumably, Antiochus IV considered Lysias a trustworthy ally, not only so much so that he warranted the authority to command an army that could, very likely, defeat the forces which Antiochus IV had allotted to himself, but also the more subtle and powerful authority of ward to the young heir to the throne. Yet if this was the case, why would Antiochus IV suddenly shift that power to Philip? It is strange to think that Antiochus IV would not have foreseen the power struggles, and the threat to Antiochus V's own life, that would result from such a seemingly capricious distribution of power.

[414] This is also accomplished by the praise section in 1 Macc 2:49-68.

Deut 1-11, however, carefully describes the succession of power as beyond the whim of a single dispositor. Moses is fully aware of his limitations as he admits: "How can I bear alone the weight and the burden of you and your strife? Choose wise, understanding, and experienced men, according to your tribes, and I will appoint them as your heads".[415] The Israelites agree, and Moses creates subdivisions of authority amongst the Jews. This entire administrative process seems to succeed, resulting in the apprehension of Achan in Joshua 7:13-24. The difference in administrative competence perhaps arises from the particular nature of Antiochus IV's deathbed "confession". Although he regrets stealing the valuable goods of the Jewish temple, he does not mention God or any regret for having defied the God of the Jews. This cannot be excused through his position as an alien conqueror, for as depicted in the roughly contemporary book of Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar easily repents and acknowledges God after having been visited with an animalistic metamorphosis.[416] In comparison with Deut 1-11, Antiochus's failure to acknowledge God cannot be separated from his failure to properly dispose of his kingdom, both militarily and politically.

This instability in succession, and its ramifications for the standard transmission of power from father to son, will continue to influence 1 Maccabees. Most specifically, this institution of the *paedagōgos*, or a child's caretaker, will notably suffer from the chaotic rule of the Antiochenes and their non-Jewish opposition. In 1 Macc 6:55-63, Lysias defeats Philip in the easily foreseen conflict that follows Antiochus IV's disposition of power. But rather than resulting in a new, stable governor not only for the region but for Antiochus V, Demetrius son of Seleucus appears on the scene and slays both Lysias and Antiochus V.[417] The *paedagōgos* system, then, in this case has utterly failed, as father, son, and both appointed caretakers have

[415] Deut 1:12-13.
[416] Dan 4:31-36.
[417] 1 Macc 7:1-3.

died through administrative incompetence which has produced political weakness and, predictably, the opportunistic seizure of power by a rival to the throne. Political marriages are no more trustworthy, for in 1 Macc 11:9-10, Ptolemy of Egypt has given his daughter to Alexander Balas, but sends a message to Demetrius son of Demetrius (the grandson of Seleucus above), promising to remove his daughter from Alexander and give her to Demetrius. Demetrius eventually takes power away from Alexander Balas, with the expected consequence that Alexander's former troops resent him, and Alexander's former lieutenant Trypho visits Imalkue the Arab, who is the caretaker of Alexander Balas's son. Once he arrives, Trypho demands that Imalkue surrender the young Antiochus, son of Alexander, into *his* care. This is only, however, so that Trypho can murder the young king and assume the throne for himself.[418]

To sum up, the author of 1 Macc, then, uses the concept of the *paedagōgos*, and its inevitable attachment to relations between fathers and sons, to reinforce his depiction of Matthiatas and Judas Maccabeus as rightful leaders and occupants of not only temporal but spiritual authority. As such, their transition of power is as orderly as that shown in Deut 1-11, in which Moses wisely distributes power to a lower administration. But when the Greeks rely upon the *paedagōgos*, this is inevitably corrupted by incompetence and violent ambitions. *Paideia* appears in two prominent contexts within 1 Maccabees, each in conversation with Deut 1-11, and each concerning the relationship between fathers and sons. The first is the appearance of the Greek gymnasium, which in many ways opposes the view of training and education, especially between a father and son as given in Deut 6:20-21 and 8:5. Father and son interactions are also extensively mentioned as the author of 1 Maccabees details the history of the Greeks who assert political dominion over the Jews. In contrast to this is the well-established relationship between

[418] 1 Macc 11:38-40.

Mattathias and his sons, and the orderly transmission of power which follows, as modelled by Deut 1:12-13.

3.12. Conclusion

The author of 1 Maccabees presents the Hasmoneans as righteous deliverers of Israel from their Hellenistic kingly rulers, and even possible contenders to the priesthood. But the author does not wish to make too strong a claim in this latter regard, and mitigates his intimations of priestly eligibility by limiting his assertions of supernaturalism in the events of 1 Macc. While the influence of Deut 1-11 is evident throughout the text, the author especially makes use of this influence to reinforce his objective of de-supernaturalism. This is in keeping with the broad tenor of Deut 1-11, distinguishing the Israelites from God and Moses by means of a speech in which the chief concerns are the commands of God and how the Israelites are to follow these commands.

Deut 1-11 is often referenced within 1 Maccabees. Typically, these references occur on the level of phrases or lexemes, showing the importance of Deut 1-11 as an influence on the author of 1 Maccabees—but only that. Other examples, however, show the author's purpose to justify the Hasmonean dynasty, and these examples are redolent of Deut 1-11 not only through linguistic similarity but through thematic similarity. This is sometimes seen in the author's de-emphasis of supernatural activity, as in his treatment of power, the courage of Judas Maccabeus, and the connections between Deut 1-11 and the Babel narrative. Other examples, such as the theological narrative of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Jewish espionage, and oath-breaking, explicitly support the author's desire to support the Hasmonean dynasty.

Deut 1-11 is also seen in the author's treatment of covenant, not only Deut 28-30 as shown by Choi. As the author of 1 Maccabees uses subtle references to covenant to establish the validity of the Hasmonean priesthood as a descendant of the priestly covenant with Phinehas, it is important that other references do not compete with or overshadow this purpose; again, this is what 1 Maccabees demonstrates. Wisdom ideas, in 1 Maccabees, support the author of 1 Maccabees, notably when discussing wicked men and the farewell speech; but it is primarily in the discussion of the "snare" that Deut 1-11 supports the author's goal of carefully qualifying the initial covenant made with the Greeks, so as not to compete with or create problems for his indirect method of validating the Hasmonean priesthood. *Paideia* in 1 Maccabees deals with the interactions between fathers and sons, to some degree regarding the Greek gymnasium, but especially when the author discusses the transmission of power; in these examples, Deut 1-11 contrasts with Greek practice to show the excellence of Mattathias and his sons when compared to the Greeks which oppose them.

Finally, it should be noted that the anti-supernaturalism shown in 1 Macc is a startling contrast to the supernaturalism of Deut 1-11. In those chapters, the dependence of Israel upon God is not only commanded by Moses at length, but attested through the memorial narraitve of their immediately preceding forebears' failure to successfully claim the promised land for this very reason—a failure to acknowledge God and take him at his word. It is itself a witness to the strong authorial hand of 1 Macc that Deuteronomic materials are used so skillfully, yet subversively, echoing the themes of Deuteronomy when they suit the author's purpose, but omitting their claims, and perhaps even the real point of the book, when it opposes the aims of 1 Macc.

Chapter 4. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11: Wisdom, Covenant, *Mûsar/Paideia*

In 2 Macc, the author/epitomizer seeks to defend the Jerusalem temple, in both its leadership and its liturgical practices. This defense should not be construed to extend to birthright or lineage, however, since the priestly hero and villain of the narrative—Onias and Jason—are brothers. Rather, God's favor over Jerusalem is shown by the supernatural occurrences that protect the city and the temple, as well as the successful military action of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers. The author, or as the creator of this text might be designated, "epitomizer", also wishes to stress that it is the Jews themselves, the collective people of not only Jerusalem but presumably the diaspora as well, that are God's primary concern.[419] God established the temple, and other temples as well, for the sake of this people, and it is with this people that much responsibility for holiness resides.

To this end, the author of 2 Macc engages with wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar*/*paideia*, as they are especially relevant for the author's purposes. Wisdom traditions stress teaching and practices that may be employed by not only professional priests, but people from all walks of life. Although covenant may be used to specifically defend the priesthood, it is also equally useful to characterize God's involvement with the totality of Israel and the Jews.[420] And *paideia*, as presented in the Jewish scriptures (*mûsar*), defines a training or discipline which is applicable

[419] In the following, I will speak of the final assembler of 2 Macc as exercising editorial control over the documents as presented. Jason of Cyrene's original document is lost; our only record of it remains in the abridgment presented by an anonymous author/epitomizer. This author I treat as also having appended the two corollary documents which appear in 2 Macc 1:1-9 and 1:10-2:18, and therefore exerting final editorial control over these documents as well. I will use the Kappler edition for the Greek and the Revised Standard Version for English translations; Werner Kappler, *Maccabaeorum liber II*, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum IX.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008).

[420] Covenant is invoked in a second-hand manner, however, by the author of 1 Macc to defend the Jerusalem priesthood, specifically the priestly covenant of Phinehas; see previous chapter on 1 Macc.

and necessary for all Jewish boys and girls, as well as presumably the children of the nations, to ensure right action and a proper attitude towards God.

As will be shown, the author of 2 Macc engages significantly with Deut 1-11. However, this interaction is somewhat convoluted, as occasionally a strict ideological commitment to Deut 1-11, as a literary unit, would frustrate the author's goals. In these cases, Deut 1-11 is mediated through other texts; sometimes through other portions of Jewish scripture, and sometimes through Deuteronomy as a whole. Below I show that, while Deut 1-11 especially assists the author in making important observations, the author never allows Deut 1-11 to restrict those observations or divert them from the author's goals, which are 1) defense of the Jerusalem temple; 2) explanation of the role, variegated in its moral integrity, that the priesthood plays in the historical situation presented in 2 Macc; and 3) the important role that the Jewish people themselves play in Israel's redemption before God.[421]

Unless otherwise noted, all translations will be taken from the NRSV.

4.1. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Nehemiah and Jonathan's Prayer

Wisdom concerns first emerge, within 2 Macc, within the author's presented account of Nehemiah and Jonathan in 2 Macc 1:20. When Cyrus, king of Persia, releases the Jews in Babylon to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple, Nehemiah, being in possession of the knowledge of *naphtha*, a thick fire-producing liquid, "sent the descendants of the priests who had hidden the fire to get it" in order that they might offer sacrifice.[422] The supernatural fire is

[421] Deuteronomy is only explicitly cited once in 2 Macc, and this is a quotation from Deut 32 in the context of the 2 Macc 7:5-6 torture narrative. See Lincicum, *Paul*, 88.

[422] 2 Macc 1:20. This is likely some sort of petroleum-based fuel, also attested by Strabo (16.1.15). See Jonathan Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, AB 41A (London: Doubleday, 1983), 176. As the text attests that ὕδωρ, "water" in the

retrieved, the sacrifice consumed, and all present—Jonathan, Nehemiah, and the officiating priests—begin to pray:

Οκύριος , κύριος God, Creator of all things, who art awe-inspiring and strong and just and merciful, who alone are King and art kind, who alone art bountiful, who alone art just and almighty and eternal, who dost rescue Israel from every evil, who didst choose the fathers and consecrate them ... Gather together our scattered people, set free those who are slaves among the Gentiles, look upon those who are wretched and despised, and let the Gentiles know that thou art our God. Afflict those who oppress and are insolent with pride. Plant thy people in thy holy place, as Moses said.[423]

In this prayer, we will find that, while influences from wisdom writings and Deut 1-11 are well evidenced, these areas of influence rarely overlap and, while present, manifest themselves intermittently. This prayer begins with a theological summary of God's attributes. God is the Creator of all things (πάντων κτίστης), strong (ἰσχυρὸς), just (δίκαιος), merciful (ἐλεήμων), the only King (μόνος βασιλεὺς), kind (χρηστός), the only bountiful (μόνος χορηγός), the only just, mighty, and eternal (μόνος δίκαιος καὶ παντοκράτωρ καὶ αἰώνιος). These descriptive terms show God's status as the sole creator, ruler, and provider, explicitly in *monos basilieus* and *monos choregos*, and implicitly in *pantōn ktistes*, for if God has created all that exists, there is

---

strict sense, was used to douse a thick liquid, it is possible that the Greek translates a Hebrew מַיִם, which not only means "water" but also "liquid" and could more easily mean another liquid besides water; this would suggest a Hebrew original. See Daniel Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, CEJL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 153; also Robert Doran, *2 Maccabees*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012), for Dioscorides (*Mat.Med.*1.73.2) and Plutarch (*Alex*.35.6) on *napththa* and theories for its viability.

[423] 2 Macc 1:24-29. The duplication of יהוה is attested elsewhere in Second Temple writings (LXX Esth 13:9; 3 Macc 2:2; *Jub.*14:2,8); there is also an intimation that God governs the universe as a chorus leader or perhaps orchestra conductor, due to *chorēgos* and its presence in *Ep. Arist,* 259; Plato, *Leg*.665A, 653D-E; Dio Chrysostom, *Or*.12.34; Euripides, *Bacch*.20-22. See Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 49.

nothing left for others to create: therefore, God is the only creator.[424] God is also strong and just, powerful qualities of rulership, but also merciful and kind, attributes of benevolence. Proverbs 8 details many of these qualities in a brief departure from commandment, description of wisdom, and description of Wisdom itself found in Prov 1-7. In Proverbs 8, personified Wisdom begins to disclose a series of self-descriptive statements: "good advice and sound wisdom" and "insight", which is to be expected, but also "strength". By Wisdom, "kings reign, and rulers decree what is just ... rulers rule, and nobles, all who govern rightly".[425] Justice and plentiful provision are detailed in Prov 8:18-21: "riches and honor ... enduring wealth and prosperity ... my fruit is better than gold ... my yield [is better] than choice silver ... I walk in the way of righteousness, along the paths of justice, endowing with wealth those who love me, and filling their treasuries". Further, in a lengthy sub-narrative, personified Wisdom describes itself as pre-existing creation, having been originated by God before all other things, and having been present during the creation of the world: " יהוה created me at the beginning of his work ... at the first, before the beginning of the earth ... When he established the heavens, I was there, when he drew a circle on the face of the deep ... then I was beside him, like a master worker ... rejoicing in his inhabited world and delighting in the human race".[426]

We are here confronted with Wisdom personified, a well-established wisdom trope, but also with a theological elaboration of God's attributes. This raises the question: how can this use of Lady Wisdom be clearly identified with the attributes of God, given the presence of these attributes elsewhere in Jewish scripture? As noted above, Israel did not strictly separate its

[424] For more on God as creator in this prayer see Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 155. *Pantōn ktiōtes* will return in the mother's prayer of 2 Macc 7:22; see Christiane Zimmermann, *Die Namen des Vaters: Studien zu ausgewählten neutestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnungen vor ihrem früjüdischen und paganen Sprachhorizont*, AJEC 69 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 350; *pantōn krator* also distinguishes κύριος from earthly powers such as Nicanor (Zimmermann, *Die Namen des Vaters*, 248-249).
[425] Prov 8:14-16.
[426] Prov 8:22-31.

theology from its wisdom teachings.[427] Patriarchal stories and practical advice cooperated to produce a holistic view of life, relying upon God's action in the world but also man's judicious decisions. In the Second Temple period, this trend will become textually explicit in the equivalence of Torah as wisdom/fear of God, as well as the necessity of God's intervention to attain wisdom at all.[428] Given the strong correlation between the attributes of God and the attributes listed in the Wisdom pericope, it is reasonable to assume that in 2 Macc we find yet another equivalence between God and wisdom, in this instance relying upon another theme of the wisdom tradition, that of personified Lady Wisdom. By alluding to Lady Wisdom in his description of God's attributes, the author of 2 Macc creates a subtle echo of Proverbs and further reinforces the connection between God and wisdom.

Therefore, the prayer of Jonathan and Nehemiah in 2 Maccabees makes use of wisdom traditions as is shown by Prov 8. Mercy, however, is not included within the encomiastic roster of praise which personified Wisdom discusses. To find mercy we must consider the Moses traditions found in Exodus and, specifically, Deut 1-11. Mercy is seen within Exod 34:6, the well-known passage which states that God is "a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for the thousandth generation, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin". This passage further considers יהוה 's justice as co-existing with God's mercy, but the proclamation of God does not unpack these theological issues. Mercy is also seen in Deut 4:31: "Because יהוה your God is a merciful God, he will neither abandon you nor destroy you; he will not forget the covenant with your ancestors that he swore to them". But this is in fact the only mention of mercy in Deut 1-11, except for

[427] See Introduction.
[428] As in Sir above.

Deut 7:2 which only mentions mercy to depict its unfortunate corollary, mercilessness: "when יהוה your God gives [seven nations mightier than you] over to you and you defeat them, then you must utterly destroy them. Make no covenant with them and show them no mercy".

So this prayer, in its adoration of God, while drawing upon the wisdom traditions of Prov 8, is less clear in its use of Deut 1-11. Exod 34:6 may equally well be the source of mercy, and given Deut 7:2's commandment to the Israelites *not* to be merciful as well as Deut 4:31's clear attribution of mercy to God, one might argue that Exod 34:6 more likely influenced the composition of the 2 Maccabees prayer, as Deut 1-11's view of mercy, generally speaking, is ambivalent at best. It is true that Deut 4:31 should be differentiated from Deut 7:2, in that Deut 4:31 is dealing with יהוה 's mercy, not to be confused with the mercy, or lack thereof, which God commands the Israelites to display in Deut 7:2. But the praises of God in this prayer, broadly considered, should much more be considered *wisdom* praises, as seen in their overwhelming use of Prov 8. The influences of Deut 1-11, in this respect, are much weaker. While these attributes of God find a strong analog in Prov 8, the presentation of mercy is less clearly derived from a specific biblical text, due to the unsuitability of the exact presentation of mercy in the Exod and Deut passages. The author, therefore, alludes to mercy in a general sense, and relies upon the specific grounding of the Prov 8 tradition to support mercy by association. The author, here, is likely motivated to emphasize mercy due to the exigencies of the historical situation; the priesthood has been compromised, and due to the presence of the gymnasium, Jewish priests and non-priests alike may have engaged in unlawful actions, for which mercy is required.

This is, of course, a sort of "negative interaction" with Deut 1-11, and to make any meaningful statement of interpretation we must assume that the author of 2 Macc knew Deuteronomy. Given the substantial interaction with Deuteronomy 1-11 in other Second Temple

texts, this is a reasonable assumptiion to make. That being the case, we may view the author's lack of engagement with the specifically Deuteronomic issue of mercy, relevant in this context of wisdom theology, as an intentional choice, a very subtle echo to be heard by readers likewise familiar with the Deuteronomic text. Yet this echo would create a motivation to question the author's motives; in short, a recognition of what I have observed above, that a biblical passage relevant to the discussion has been omitted and that this omission should be carefully considered alongside the author's other claims.

Concerns specific to Deut 1-11 do emerge in the concluding portion of the prayer, namely the rescue of Israel, election and consecration of the fathers, and the proclamation of Israel's faith to the gentiles. 2 Macc 1:25b gives "You rescue Israel from every evil ...". As the Israelites cower in fear before Amorites and Anakim in Deut 1:28, Moses tells them that God "will fight for them, just as he did ... in Egypt ... and in the wilderness, where ... יהוה your God carried you ... until you reached this place".[429] God rescued Israel not only against enemies in battle but also against wilderness hardships: "these forty years יהוה your God has been with you; you have lacked nothing".[430] Twice on the way to the eastern border of the promised land, the Israelites are rescued, or perhaps more accurately preserved, in battle against Sihon and Og.[431] God "brought Israel out of Egypt with his own presence, by his great power" and even in the face of overwhelming odds, the Israelites should "remember what יהוה your God did to all Egypt ... יהוה your God will do the same to all the peoples of whom you are afraid".[432]

[429] Deut 1:30-31.
[430] Deut 2:7.
[431] Deut 2:32-33; 3:1-4.
[432] Deut 4:37; 7:18-19. See also Deut 4:34; 5:6; 6:21; 7:8; 9:26; 11:4-5.

Rescue, then, is amply attested within Deut 1-11, and informs 2 Macc 1:25b. Similar evidence is found within Deut 1-11 for the election and consecration of the fathers, another theme found in 2 Macc 1:24-29. But while Deut and 2 Macc unanimously attest the rescue of Israel, these two biblical sources differ in their understanding of election and consecration of the fathers; in fact, while Deut attests election, consecration is not to be found within Deut. 2 Macc 1:25b gives: "you chose the ancestors and consecrated them."[433] The election of the ancestors occurs often in Deut 1-11. As the Israelites prepare to leave Horeb and begin their eleven-day journey to Kadesh-Barnea where they will unsuccessfully attempt to enter the promised land, God informs them: "See, I have set the land before you; go in and take possession of the land that I swore to your ancestors, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give to them and their descendants after them".[434] Thus, God's motivation is partially—but not entirely—based in the promise which he gave the ancestors of the Israelites.[435] Yet according to the 2 Macc prayer, God not only has elected the ancestors, but consecrated them. This word, ἁγιάσας, does not appear in Deut 1-11. Nor is it clear from the 2 Macc prayer how Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob could be considered consecrated or priestly; in fact, after the battle of nine kings at the plain of Shinar, as detailed in Gen 14 and in which Lot, caught in the crossfire and captured by Chederlaomer's faction, is rescued by Abraham, Abraham meets with the king of Sodom and the king of righteousness, Melchizedek, and presents a tithe to Melchizedek. This action, according to Hebrews, establishes Melchizedek as a type of priest, but not Abraham. Further, while in the

---

[433] However, neither Abraham nor Isaac are considered *eklektos* (chosen) in Genesis; patriarchal *eklektos* first appears in Nehemiah 9:7, and is commonly attested in Philo (*Abr*. 82-83; *Cher*. 7; *Gig*. 64; *Mut*. 66, 69, 71). See Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 50. For Schwartz, this is more useful for demonstrating the continuities between the First and Second Temples rather than temple restoration; Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 155.

[434] Deut 1:8. See also Deut 4:1 ("the land that יהוה, the god of your ancestors, is giving you"); 4:31b ("he will not forget the covenant with your ancestors that he swore to them"); 4:37 ("and because he loved your ancestors, he chose their descendants after them"); also 6:10, 18; 7:8; 9:5; 10:11; 11:9, 21.

[435] God's installment of the Israelites is also motivated by the wickedness of the Amorites, the present inhabitants of the promised land (Gen 15:16).

famous *Akedah* sequence of Gen 22 Isaac is bound as a sacrifice, this does not bestow priestly status upon Abraham, nor is it implied anywhere in the text or elsewhere that Abraham is to be considered a priest due to this interrupted sacrifice. The author of 2 Macc here mentions that the ancestors were "consecrated" in accordance with his overall goal; to show the holiness of Israel and God's continued granting of favor to the Jerusalem temple, possibly God's prioritization of this temple as the highest or "first among equals", even though other temples might have some sacred value.[436] However, the author emphasizes the consecration of the ancestors as a counterbalance to the idea of the consecrated *priesthood*, which, as the actions of Jason have shown, is not infallible. Deut 1-11 is used to further this end, but any counterargument it might levy against the author's literary goals is minimized. The author here may be said to invoke Deut 1-11 by way of allusion, but carefully curated so as to remove and chance of the Deuteronomic text opposing the author's intent.

The 2 Macc prayer also mentions propagation of knowledge of Israel's faith through the earth, as is given in 2 Macc 1:27b. This is the announcement to the Gentiles that Israel honors God: "and let the Gentiles know that you are our God".[437] This is echoed in Deut 4:6-8, which discusses the results of Israel's obedience to the statutes and ordinances which God has given them: "You must observe them diligently, for this will show your *wisdom* and discernment to the peoples, who, when they hear all these statutes, will say, 'Surely this great nation is a *wise* and discerning people!'".[438] Here, we see the author engaging in theological reasoning which results in an early publication of God's presence among Israel to the nations. This begins, as noted, with Deut 4:6-8 stating that the *wisdom* of God, which is Israel's wisdom also, will be known to the

[436] Goldstein finds a strong propagandistic statement here, reading the mention of the "holy place" (2 Macc 2:29) as an attempt to denigrate the independence of the Oniad temple in Egypt. See Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 177.
[437] 2 Macc 1:27.
[438] For Schwartz, this signifies that God will alert the surrounding peoples that He exists; Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 156.

nations. With Isaiah, we find that Israel must become known to the nations as a "light", developing this Deuteronomic idea.[439] Ben Sira will provide an additional puzzle piece, giving rough equivalences between God, fear of God, and wisdom.[440] Finally, 2 Macc will assemble these ideas, with the startling statement that the Gentiles will know Israel's God, an affirmation of evangelistic zeal that finds its ancestry in the appeals to wisdom found in Deut 4:6-8.[441] Again, the author/epitomizer shows that the people reaffirm their commitment to God and the proclamation of his rule over the Jews. This once more deflects agency from the priesthood, which as we have seen cannot be attributed with unqualified corruption, and instead places the capacity for meaningful sacred action with the Jewish people. Here, the author creates a complex allusion between wisdom and the fame of Israel in conjunction with Deut 1-11 to highlight the role of the Israelite nation, not just the priesthood, in announcing God to the world.

4.2. 2 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Widows' and Orphans' Deposits

Therefore, while we have seen both wisdom ideas and influences from Deut 1-11 in Nehemiah and Jonathan's prayer, these areas rarely converge, and are themselves not consistently present. Wisdom ideas are also present in 2 Macc 3:9-11. Simon, a wicked "temple captain" (ἱεροῦ καθεσταμένος), of the tribe of Bilgah, is quarrelling with the ethical high priest Onias over "the administration of the city market".[442] Angered that he cannot sway Onias's judgment,

[439] Isa 60:3.
[440] See preceding chapter on Ben Sira.
[441] Although, as is seen in 2 Macc 3, this is not necessarily a benevolent evangelism, as Heliodorus will learn at his own peril.
[442] 2 Macc 3:4. Many translations (e.g., RSV) give "Benjamin"; according to Jonathan Goldstein, Simon is not of the *phule*, or "tribe/clan", of Benjamin but of Bilgah. As evidence, Goldstein presents variant readings in four Old Latin manuscripts and the Armenian version, which present "Balcea", "Balgei", "Bargea", and "Balgeus" as the name of Simon's tribe/clan. These names are corroborated in Neh 12:5, 12:18, and 1 Chr 24:14 which give the name of "Bilgah", a priestly clan. On these grounds, Goldstein reasons that Simon must have actually been a member of

Simon appeals to Apollonius of Tarsus, governor of Coele-Syria and Cilicia, and tells him a convincing lie that the temple holds massive wealth. Apollonius then sends Heliodorus to the temple to retrieve this wealth, on the pretext of surveying the area. When Heliodorus arrives, Onias tells him that there are no great stores of wealth, only "some deposits belonging to widows and orphans, and also some money of Hyrcanus son of Tobias, a man of very prominent position, and that it totalled in all four hundred talents of silver and two hundred of gold".[443] The vulnerability of widows (χηρῶν) and orphans (ὀρφανῶν) is well attested in wisdom texts, as is the responsibility of the community to care for them. In Job 22:9, Eliphaz rebukes Job for, among other crimes of avarice, "[sending] widows away empty and [crushing] the arms of the fatherless". Job responds in 24:3 that it is in fact a crime of the impious, for "they [drove] away the ass of the fatherless and [took] the widow's ox for a pledge". Job continues his defense in 29:12-13, asserting that he did in fact assist orphans; this pericope presents orphans and widows as a single unit, with widows blessing those who are the benefactors of orphans. Still more evidence is presented even more forcefully in 31:16-22, in which Job claims to have not "caused the eye of the widow to fail" and even swears that "if [he] raised a hand against an orphan ... may my shoulder separate from its socket and my arm be crushed from the elbow". Sir continues this emphasis, giving a description of the righteous in which, among other good deeds, is included the affirmation that "he will never ignore an orphan's supplication, nor a widow, if she pours out speech".[444] Caring for widows and orphans is, again, an established wisdom theme.[445] In Deut

---

the priestly clan Bilgah. There is also rabbinic evidence for this version of the history; e.g. *m. Sukkah* 8:8, *t. Sukkah* 4:28. The Hanhart edition of 2 Macc gives *Beniamin*; however, Kappler gives *Balgea*. See Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 201.

[443] 2 Macc 3:10-11; also 2 Macc 8:30, where after defeating Timothy and Bacchides, Judas Maccabeus distributes plunder to the "widows and orphans". Here, the author/epitomizer promotes the legitimacy of the Oniads; this preservation of temple deposits, however, is practiced by Greek and Jew alike. See Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 207.

[444] Sir 35:14-15; also 4:10: "Be a father to orphans, and a husband to their mother". Schwartz comments on Judean inheritance laws in the Hellenistic period (Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 194); on the inheritance of childless widows see Elias J. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (London: Harvard University Press, 1988), 197. If this passage is

1-11, the provision for widows and orphans is set beside the declaration of God's attributes in Deut 10:18.

In 2 Macc 3:9-11, the author/epitomizer defends the Jerusalem priesthood, and specifically Onias, but does not embark on a philosophical justification for Onias's actions, using the idea of widows and orphans as a point of departure to praise the wisdom of Onias. Instead, the author merely states that Onias is keeping safe the deposits of widows and orphans, as well as a deposit of Hyrcanus son of Tobias "a man of very prominent position".[446] For Goldstein, this is "the key to understanding the story". If Hyrcanus was poorly regarded by the Seleucids, Onias might have compromised himself by keeping his deposits. But if by keeping safe the deposits of widows and orphans, Onias establishes himself as an upstanding priest, then this in turn lends credence to the upright status of Hyrcanus; otherwise, Onias, shown to be a proper priest, is assisting a criminal, a more implausible scenario. By defending Onias in this way, the author of 2 Maccabees presents an apology for the Oniad priesthood that is specifically tailored to Seleucid interests.[447] Wisdom concerns, here, are not the focus; the author does not engage with them in favor of more compelling motivations. In this case, these motivations are to show that the Jerusalem priesthood, while the source of the lawlessness that resulted in Antiochus IV's eventual defilement of the temple and oppression of the Jews, is not inherently unfit as the virtuous actions of Onias indicate. In this instance, literary techniques are eschewed in favor of a direct historical presentation which is in accordance with the author's goals as well as Deut 1-11 and wisdom texts.

---

taken in the objective genitive, however, the deposits have been made by others, on behalf of widows and orphans; Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 82.

[445] See Weinfeld, *School*, 278; Introduction, above.

[446] 2 Macc 3:11.

[447] See Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 207. Occasionally the author/epitomizer obscures Seleucid connections, e.g., 2 Macc 12:19, 14:19. See Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 479.

4.3. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Wealth and Bribery

Another strong wisdom theme in 2 Macc is wealth and its concomitant temptation, bribery. The author investigates this through the person of Menelaus, brother of Simon and a chief villain of the narrative. As we have seen, it is the reputed wealth of the temple that originally motivates Antiochus to investigate Simon's claims. Further, the priesthood will be wrongfully shifted as a result of a series of bribes. When Simon's scheme to remove Onias fails due to miraculous horsemen, Simon shifts the blame to Onias himself. At last, Antiochus dies, Antiochus IV takes the throne, and Onias's brother Jason obtains the priesthood from him by means of a combined bribe of four hundred and forty talents.[448] Three years later, Menelaus, the brother of Simon, offers Antiochus a counter-bribe of seven hundred and forty talents, and secures the high priesthood for himself.[449] Menelaus's greed is so extreme that, after promising the bribe and receiving the office of high priest, he reneges on his promised payments to Antiochus IV, as well as covertly selling many of the valuable temple implements. When Antiochus investigates, an uprising in Tarsus and Mallus (cities which Antiochus had gifted to his concubine Antiochis) prevents him from personally overseeing the affair. Amidst Antiochus's assignment of deputies, Menelaus seizes his chance to steal *more* wealth, in this case temple trappings, and overtly so. This results in a final outcry of Onias, who according to 2 Maccabees is slain by Antiochus's deputy Andronicus at a "place of sanctuary at Daphne" at the behest of Menelaus, who it should be noted does *not* offer money to Andronicus but only "sworn

[448] 2 Macc 4:7-9.
[449] 2 Macc 4:23-24. Menelaus, a villain, is nonetheless attributed with Oniad ancestry; this helps to legitimize the later Hasmonean acquisition of the priesthood. See Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 236.

pledges" and "his right hand".[450] Too greedy even to hire an assassin when it suits his purposes, Menelaus continues his villainy by enlisting Lysimachus, his own deputy, to commit more sacrilegious acts. The people of Jerusalem, then brought to their breaking point, begin to act aggressively and are subjected to violence by Lysimachus, to which the crowds respond predictably and violent rioting ensues. Menelaus is brought up on charges for all this before Ptolemy son of Dorymenes and escapes punishment by, predictably, offering a bribe, which he very likely fails to pay (although the text is silent on this matter). Finally, after a series of battles in which Antiochus attacks Egypt and Jason storms Jerusalem, Antiochus returns to Jerusalem to quench the internecine fighting. Antiochus and Menelaus emerge from the conflict as allies; Antiochus—guided by Menelaus—then completes the plundering of the temple and absconds with eighteen hundred talents.[451]

It is only after this exhaustive narrative, in which wealth and bribery play so significant a part, that the author/epitomizer of 2 Macc introduces the character of Judas Maccabeus. Judas is well known, as is the text of 1 Macc which precedes 2 Macc; the readers of 2 Macc undoubtedly were likely to have knowledge not only of the Hasmonean wars in Judea at firsthand or of the stories from parents and grandparents, but also from the text of 1 Macc. By introducing the character of Judas at this point, the author/epitomizer highlights the excessive iniquity and avarice of the Jerusalem priests and rulers. These, then, are the "renegades" briefly described in 1 Maccabees 1:11; evil men of Israel, even connected with the priesthood, but having wrongfully taken the priesthood for themselves. But nevertheless, God's favor rests on the temple, as the miraculous interventions indicate.

---

[450] 2 Maccabees 4:25-34. The historicity of Onias's murder is disputed (Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 239*;* Hengel, *Hellenism and Judaism*, vol. 2:183 note 132; Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 469 note 40; Taylor, "Temple", 301-302). Literary attestation for the murder's significance may be found in Dan 9:26: again, see Tcherikover, 469 note 40.

[451] 2 Macc 5:1-21. Bribery will continue to plague Judas Maccabeus and his brothers during their military maneuvres: see 2 Macc 10:18-23.

Wisdom authors often describe wealth as a positive blessing from God, as in Prov 10:22: "The blessing of יהוה makes rich, and he adds no sorrow with it".[452] Job is described as wealthy before his trials begin, and when those trials have concluded, his wealth is restored to him even greater than before.[453] This quality of wealth is amply attested in Deut 1-11. The centerpiece of the narrative, the bestowal of land—wealth in antiquity as today—which has dominated the Israelite saga since Abraham's promise in Gen 12, underpins Moses's speech at Moab, and serves as the culmination of the Israelites' journey and the ultimate motivation for Moses's commands and exhortations. In Deut 1:25, it is the wealth of the land that the spies report, unable to admit that the land is wholly unfit for occupation. The bounty of this land is further attested in Deut 6:3, which promises that the land will be "flowing with milk and honey".[454] Deut 6:10-11 continues, listing this wealth in more detail: "fine, large cities that you did not build, houses filled with all sorts of goods that you did not fill, hewn cisterns that you did not hew, vineyards and olive groves that you did not plant". Obedience will result in a blessing of "the fruit of your womb and the fruit of your ground, your grain and your wine and your oil, the increase of your cattle and the issue of your flock".[455] Deut 8:17 goes further, clarifying that God is the *source* of wealth: "Do not say to yourself, 'My power and the might of my own hand have gained me this wealth'. But rememberיהוה , for it is he who gives you the power to get wealth". As noted above, the procurement of material prosperity is one of the chief goals of the wisdom traditions.[456]

[452] Also Sir 10:30; 44:6.
[453] Job 1:3; 42:12-15.
[454] Also Deut 11:9.
[455] Deut 7:13.
[456] See Introduction above.

Yet wealth is also perilous, often leading to temptation and pride. Sir 8:2 gives: "Do not quarrel with a rich man, lest his resources outweigh yours; for gold has ruined many, and has perverted the minds of kings". Prov 28:6 gives: "Better is a poor man who walks in his integrity than a rich man who is perverse in his ways".[457] Note that these verses do not condemn wealth, *per se*; such an idea would counter the Deuteronomic idea that wealth originates with God. Instead, they only warn that wealth often leads to poor conduct and even apostasy, albeit not invariably so. Deut 7:12 echoes this: "*If you heed these ordinances* ... יהוה ... will love you, bless you, and multiply you; he will bless the fruit of your womb and the fruit of your ground, your grain and your wine and your oil, the increase of your cattle and the issue of your flock". Prov 17:23 explicitly condemns bribery: "A wicked man accepts a bribe ... to pervert the ways of justice".[458] The author of 2 Macc has no need to defend Menelaus; in fact, Menelaus is, for the author of 2 Macc, one of the legitimate causes of the Hasmonean rebellion against the Greeks. Therefore, Menelaus's overwhelming desire for wealth needs no conditioning, and is presented in accord with Deut 1-11, with no competing motivations compelling the author of 2 Macc to do otherwise. As we have seen before, the author's use of Deut 1-11 is indirect, relying upon the reader's presumed knowledge of the text to support the author's positive presentation of Onias and the Hasmoneans. This is in keeping with the author's overall awareness of the surrounding milieu, for it is this milieu that provides the motivation for the author's overarching historical emphasis. Wisdom themes are presented so as to broadly conform with Deut 1-11, as well as other biblical texts, to provide justification for the Oniads in a subtle yet effective act of literary *Realpolitik*.

[457] Also Prov 11:28; 18:23; 28:11, 20.
[458] Bribery is also condemned in Exod 23:8; Deut 16:19, 27:25; and 1 Sam (1 Kgs) 8:3. See Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 116.

To sum up, we have found that wisdom concerns, in 2 Macc, may be generally grouped within three areas: the prayer of Nehemiah and Jonathan; the deposits of widows and orphans kept within the Jerusalem temple; and the account of Menelaus's desire for wealth and employment of bribery. These wisdom themes are mitigated or minimized if they do not support the author's governing themes. Within these three areas, influences from Deut 1-11 emerge sometimes intermittently, sometimes not at all, and sometimes considerably so. Again, these uses of Deut 1-11 conform to the author's goals of defending the Jerusalem temple, explaining the subtleties of the Jerusalem priesthood and its culpability in Judea's present historical situation, and highlighting the importance of the Jewish people.

4.4. An Interlude: Friendship in 2 Macc as the Intersection Between Wisdom and Covenant

I will soon begin to discuss the ways the author of 2 Macc views Deut 1-11 through the lens of covenant. But first, I examine a prominent topic within 2 Macc that cannot be separated from either wisdom ideas or covenantal thought; that idea is friendship, which the author of 2 Macc employs in his narrative to mediate the presentation of Nicanor as an arch-villain. While the author of 2 Macc uses the conflict with Nicanor to frame the narrative, ending the account long before the conclusion of Jason of Cyrene's source text, the author's goal is to primarily defend the rightness of the Jerusalem priesthood, while not necessarily its *exclusive* rightness—i.e., its sole claim to priestly legitimacy over and against, as an example, the Leontopolis temple in Egypt—or its inherent infallibility. To this end, the author encourages a generalized belief in the power of supernatural events, empowering the Jerusalem temple without necessarily disenfranchising other temples. An excessive focus on Nicanor as a purely malevolent figure

would transform the narrative into a natural account in which the Jews, led by Judas Maccabeus, repel an enemy leader. Emphasizing Nicanor would bring the reader's attention to the logistics of the military conflict, and away from the miraculous occurrences and martyrdom stories that serve the epitomizer's primary narrative objective.

Therefore, the author introduces a sub-narrative not present in 1 Macc but presumably present in the account of Jason of Cyrene; the friendship between Judas Maccabeus and Nicanor. In 2 Macc 14, Demetrius has seized power after arriving at Tripolis. Alcimus, the former high priest, delivers a condemnation of "the Jews, who are called Hasideans, whose leader is Judas Maccabeus" and tells Demetrius that he has "laid aside his ancestral glory—I mean the high priesthood—and have now come here, first because I am genuinely concerned for the interests of the king, and second because I have regard also for my compatriots".[459] Alcimus concludes with, "as long as Judas lives, it is impossible for the government to find peace".[460] This conclusion is sufficient to compel Demetrius to reappoint Alcimus as high priest, appoint Nicanor governor of Judea, and send Nicanor with orders to find and kill Judas. Nicanor meets the Jews and battle is initiated at Dessau; the narrative does not detail exactly how the conflict is resolved, but it is certain that Nicanor "shrank from deciding the issue by bloodshed".[461] Instead, he "sent Posidonius, Theodotus, and Mattathias to give and receive pledges of friendship" and the Jews "agreed to the covenant".[462] Yet this while this may have begun as a political alliance, or perhaps better, a truce, a strong friendship quickly develops between Nicanor and Judas:

---

[459] 2 Macc 14:7-8. Breaking with his usual practice, Josephus adapts this speech rather than its counterpart in 1 Macc 7:25. See Goldstein, *2 Macc*, 485; also Josephus, *A.J.* 12.10.3.401. Further, Alcimus here attests his Aaronic ancestry, according to Goldstein, *2 Macc*, 486; however, ancestry is no guarantee of priestly legitimacy, as the author/epitomizer has shown in his treatment of Menelaus, and the specifics of Alcimus's ancestry are by no means settled (Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 266-267).

[460] 2 Macc 14:10. This speech, deceitfully presenting Alcimus's selfish desires as benefitting the general welfare of the Jews, has precedent in LXX Esther 3:13; see Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 472; Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 267.

[461] 2 Macc 14:19.

[462] 2 Macc 14:19-20. Covenant will be discussed more thoroughly below.

"[Nicanor] kept Judas always in his presence; he was warmly attached to the man. He urged him to marry and have children; so Judas married, settled down, and shared the common life".[463] Unfortunately, Alcimus learns of this covenant—although possibly not of the friendship between Nicanor and Judas—and reports the covenant to Demetrius, while adding the false claim that Nicanor is attempting to subvert Demetrius's government by appointing Judas as his successor to the post of governor of Judea.[464] This results in Demetrius immediately sending an order to Nicanor, demanding that he violate the covenant and capture Judas.

At this point, the narrative takes a bizarre turn. Nicanor, who has become genuinely fond of Judas, is understandably upset by Demetrius's orders. He cannot defy Demetrius, and so he "watches for an opportunity to accomplish [the breaking of the covenant] by a stratagem".[465] This results in a changing of his demeanor toward Judas, in a manner which is not entirely clear from the narrative. Judas, however, perceives this shift in attitude, and shrewdly concludes that it bodes ill for him. Therefore he assembles "not a few of his best men, and [goes] into hiding from Nicanor".[466] However, when he realizes that Judas has vanished, Nicanor immediately assumes that Judas has gone to the temple. Why he would assume this is unclear—especially since Judas's enemy, Alcimus, has just been appointed high priest—but this is nonetheless Nicanor's supposition. Nicanor demands that the priests surrender Judas, but the priests declare, and swear an oath, that Judas is not taking refuge in the temple and that they do not know Judas's present location. Nicanor then becomes furious and swears his own oath: "If you do not hand

[463] 2 Macc 14:24-25.
[464] 2 Macc 14:26-27.
[465] 2 Macc 14:29.
[466] 2 Macc 14:30.

Judas over to me as a prisoner, I will level this shrine of God to the ground and tear down the altar and build here a splendid temple to Dionysus".[467]

This is not the author's first introduction of Nicanor. Earlier in 2 Macc, Nicanor is sent by Ptolemy, governor of Coele-Syria, at the behest of Philip, governor of Jerusalem, to assist in the extermination of Judas Maccabeus.[468] Here as later, Nicanor is not necessarily committed to bloodshed, but instead plans to capture the Jews and sell them into slavery to satisfy Roman creditors. Judas and his army react as expected, but the story differs from the typical 1 Maccabees battle narrative. Unlike the 1 Macc accounts in which the Jews constantly implore "Heaven" to assist them, here the Jews explicitly call upon "the Almighty God".[469] Jewish combat in 2 Macc is much more sacralized than in 1 Macc; before his battle with Nicanor, Judas not only organizes troops but "[appoints] Eleazar to read aloud from the holy book, and [gives] the watchword, 'The help of God'; then, leading the first division himself, he [joins] battle with Nicanor".[470] The battle is won, "with the Almighty as their ally"; so successful are Judas's forces that Nicanor and his men are routed, but Judas refuses to pursue them as "it was the day before the sabbath".[471] Work is however not forbidden on this day, and the soldiers loot the fallen enemies before keeping the sabbath, "giving great thanks and praise to the Lord, who had preserved them for that day and allotted it to them as the beginning of mercy". These spoils are distributed to the survivors and wounded, along with the widows and orphans of defeated Jewish

[467] 2 Macc 14:33. Extension of the hand is tantamount to exalting oneself above God, in contrast to the pious raising of the hands toward heaven; see Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 484-4867.
[468] 2 Macc 5:22; 8:8-9.
[469] 1 Macc 3:18, 50; 4:10, 40; 2 Macc 8:18.
[470] 2 Macc 8:23. 2 Maccabees has no extant Hebrew text, and scholarly consensus holds it was originally written in Greek, but "Eleazar" likely means "help of God" in Hebrew, making the name of the reader itself the watchword and further sacralizing the scenario depicted in the narrative.
[471] 2 Macc 8:24,26.

soldiers, at which point Judas and his men "[make] common supplication and [implore] the merciful Lord to be wholly reconciled with his servants".[472]

So we see the author of 2 Macc presenting a very different picture of Judas Maccabeus from his counterpart in 1 Macc. In 1 Macc, Judas is reluctant even to explicitly name the divinity; while his father Mattathias exhaustively details the piety of his—and his sons'—ancestors, Judas himself prefers to conduct his wars on a "secular" dimension, in keeping with the author's goals of promoting the legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty but without inviting too close of an examination of their occupancy of the priesthood. But the author of 2 Macc has a very different aim, concerned with the Jerusalem temple and its continuing piety in the face of shifting priestly lines and families. Hence, military affairs receive a supernatural layering, often in the form of miraculous supernatural interventions, but in this case the extraordinary piety of Judas Maccabeus and his soldiers. This is all the more notable given the stark contrast between sabbath concerns in 1 and 2 Macc; in 1 Macc, Mattathias and other Jews, in opposition to the convictions of their Hasidean neighbors, decide "to fight against anyone who comes to attack us on the sabbath day; let us not all die as our kindred died in their hiding places".[473] For these reasons, the author presents the friendship between Nicanor and Judah, elaborated to maintain an emphasis on spiritual concerns and the Jerusalem temple. This friendship serves to mitigate the otherwise uniform characterization of Nicanor as a villain, and prevents him from looming too large over the author's narrative goals.[474]

---

[472] 2 Macc 8:27, 29.
[473] 1 Macc 2:39; this is not necessarily a blatant contradiction or authorial oversight, as Mattathias is concerned with defensive warfare, while in 2 Macc Judas is careful not to go on the offensive during the sabbath.
[474] This is keeping with a general tendency on the part of the author/epitomizer to present Gentiles as not uniformly wicked; Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 275.

This complex pitcure of Judah and Nicanor shows the author providing historical narrative data to support his authorial goals. Allusion here is used in very subtle ways, relying upon the audience's familiarity with this work's historical counterpart in 1 Macc.

4.5. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Covenant: The First Epistle

Diathēkē occurs in only three instances within 2 Macc: 1:2, 7:36, and 8:15. In 2 Macc 1:2, the letter's author reveals an unusual preoccupation with the interior landscape of the letter's recipients. The letter's author also discusses prayer and temple sacrifice. The letter begins with a benedictory statement hoping that God will "do good" to the recipient, and that he will "remember his covenant (διαθήκη) with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, his faithful servants".[475] This is followed, however, with a series of appeals to the καρδία, or "heart", of the recipient. The letter's author desires the heart of the recipient to incline the recipient to worship of God, and that the heart would be made strong, μεγάλῃ, in this effort. Further, the letter's author strives to motivate the recipient to comply with God's will, in this case assisted by a willing "spirit", or ψυχῇ.[476] This is, however, the only mention of ψυχῇ within this brief epistle, and the author continues to elaborate on the καρδία, hoping that God will open it to "his law and his commandments".[477]

Diathēkē is extensively attested in Deut 1-11.[478] *Diathēkē* is commonly mentioned in association with the "fathers", a reference to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but also to the earlier

[475] 2 Macc 1:2. Goldstein notes the clumsiness of vv. 1 and 2; see Goldstein, *2 Macc*, 139. In v. 1, nominative and dative clauses have been reversed around an infinitive verb, a pattern which continues between vv. 1 and 2 in the benedictory portion of the greeting. See Kappler, *Maccabaeorum liber II*, 47.
[476] 2 Macc 1:3.
[477] 2 Macc 1:4.
[478] Deut 4:13, 23, 31; 5:2, 3; 7:2, 9, 12; 8:18; 9:5, 9, 11; 10:8.

generation that first, and unsuccessfully, approached the promised land. Deut 1-11 makes this connection with the "fathers" four times. The first, Deut 4:31: "... κύριος your God ... will not ... forget the covenant (διαθήκη) with your fathers which he swore to them"; also Deut 5:2-3: " κύριος our God made a covenant (διαθήκη) with us ... *not* with our fathers did κύριος make this covenant (διαθήκη), but with us, who are all of us alive here this day"; Deut 8:18: "You shall remember κύριος your God ... that he may confirm his covenant (διαθήκη) which he swore to your fathers"; Deut 9:5: "that he may confirm the word (διαθήκη) which κύριος swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob". But Deut 9:5 also mentions the heart, as it is "not because of the righteousness or uprightness of your heart (καρδία)" that the Israelites have been brought to the land.

These references often direct the Israelites to God's commandments, as in 4:13: "And he declared to you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, that is, the ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone". Likewise, Deut 4:23 gives: "Take heed to yourselves, lest you forget the covenant of יהוה your God, which he made with you, and make a graven image in the form of anything which יהוה your God has forbidden you". Deut 9:9 gives: "When I went up the mountain to receive the tables of stone, the tables of the covenant", and 9:11: "... יהוה gave me the two tables of stone, the tables of the covenant". The motif of the "tables of stone", as established in Deut 4:13, again are covenantal references to the ten commandments.

Deut 7:9 and 7:12 bind together these three motifs of the fathers, the commandments, and the heart. Deut 7:9 affirms the permanence of the covenant for those who keep commandments, but also includes the necessity of love and God's inter-generational care for his people: " ... יהוה

your God is God, the faithful God who keeps covenant with those who love him and keep his commandments, to a thousand generations". Deut 7:12 follows suit but explicitly mentions "the fathers": "And because you hearken to these ordinances, and keep and do them, the LORD your God will keep with you the covenant and the steadfast love which he swore to your fathers to keep".[479]

Therefore, we find that the three prominent motifs in the first half of the first epistle in 2 Maccabees neatly encompass the references to *diathēkē* found in Deut 1-11. The author has created a web of allusions to reinforce his indebtedness to Deut 1-11. But the second half discusses different material; prayer and priestly offerings. Prayer is first mentioned in 2 Macc 1:5-6, as the author of the first epistle not only encourages the recipient, assuring him or her that their prayers are being heard and acknowledged, but that the author also prays for the recipient. And it is prayer, as well as priestly offering, that the author describes in the second part of the letter. This is in keeping with the general goals of 2 Maccabees: to defend the Jerusalem priesthood and temple as under the favor of God, as is seen by the emphases in the text and the prominent supernatural episodes which characterize 2 Maccabees. This favor and activity of the temple is not exclusive, however, as the author encourages the Jews in Egypt to continue their liturgical activity, but to do so in accordance with Jerusalem practice.

Does the author intentionally invoke Deut 1-11, with covenant as an ideological linking motif, to reinforce his twofold purpose of establishing Jerusalem worship as appropriate, and advising the Egyptian temple to conform to Jerusalem practice? The well-established name- and dwelling-theology, prominent in later chapters of Deuteronomy and used to defend the exclusivity of the Jerusalem temple, is not to be found in Deut 1-11. As name- and dwelling-

[479] Deut 5:3, however, notes the difference between covenants; this difference will allow the distinction between the righteous and unfaithful in maryrdom.

theology not only establishes the Jerusalem temple as a center of worship but *the* center of worship, exclusively, these ideas would create a problem for the letter's author. It is telling, then, that the covenant motif dovetails neatly with Deut 1-11. Additional clues may also be found in two verses of Deut 1-11 not yet discussed, 7:2 and 10:8. 7:2 mentions the covenant in direct terms of conquest and military power, important themes in 1 Maccabees. As the author of 2 Maccabees almost certainly knew the text of 1 Maccabees, but demonstrates very different authorial goals, it is likely that this verse escaped mention for that reason. Further, the motif of the heart may have been derived from 10:8, which tells of Levi (Hebrew, "my heart") and his priestly work of transporting the ark of the covenant. Again, this would have been a subtle nod to the role of the priesthood in Deut 1-11, but would have required Hebrew knowledge on the part of the first epistle's author, which is by no means certain.

To sum up, there is strong textual evidence that the author of the first epistle in 2 Maccabees drew upon Deut 1-11 in his use of *diathēkē* in 2 Macc 1:2, as is evidenced in his use of the "heart", "commandment", and "fathers" motifs. Other traces and subtle resonances may be possibly present in the avoidance of Deut 7:2 and 10:8, but these observations are much more tenuous.

4.6. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Immortality of the Martyrs

The next occurrence of *diathēkē* may be found at 7:36. This mention occurs in the final verses of a self-contained literary unit, comprised of chapters 6 and 7 and set apart not only by its uniformity of subject matter—martyrdom and bravery in the face of death—and by the final verse in chapter 7 that summarizes 6 and 7 with its narrative aside, "Let this be enough, then, about the eating of sacrifices and the extreme tortures", but also by the introduction of Judas Maccabeus, whose entry into the narrative punctuates the story of the "lawless men" of Judea, and whose actions are immediately described once more by the epitomizer once chapters 6 and 7 are concluded.[480] Therefore, we may view this mention of *diathēkē* as influenced by, and influencing, the segments which come before and follow it.

It should first be noted that this *diathēkē* provides ἀενάου ζωῆς, "everflowing life". As 2 Macc 7:36 gives: "For our brothers after enduring a brief suffering have drunk of everflowing life (ἀενάου ζωῆς) under God's covenant; but you, by the judgment of God, will receive just punishment for your arrogance". Yet it is not life, but death, that dominates chapters 6 and 7. In fact, life is the reward for compliance with the Greek tyrants who demand that the Jews compromise their religious principles and cooperate with pagan practices. But consistently throughout chapters 6 and 7, Jewish practices are described *not* as covenant, but in other terms: "laws of their fathers"; "laws of God"; "laws"; "feasts of his fathers"; "holy God-given law"; "revered and holy laws" "law that was given to our fathers through Moses".[481] The connection between these laws and everlasting life is made in 2 Macc 7:9 and 7:23. In these verses, the second brother to be martyred claims that after the death of himself and his brothers, "the King

[480] 2 Macc 7:42.
[481] 2 Macc 6:1; 6:5; 6:6; 6:23; 6:28; 7:2; 7:9; 7:30.

of the universe will raise us up to an everlasting renewal of life, because we have died for his laws", and the mother of all seven brothers promises that "the Creator of the world ... will in his mercy give life and breath back to you again, since you now forget yourselves for the sake of his laws". Yet nowhere in this section are laws and covenant equated. We are left, then, with the following proposition: obedience to the law brings everlasting life; the covenant provides everlasting life; but the relationship between covenant and law remains undefined, excepting that both provide everlasting life.[482]

In Deut 1-11, as noted above, covenant and law *are* strongly correlated, specifically the equivalence between the covenant and the "tables of stone", or the commandments, the law given at Sinai/Horeb.[483] However, there is no mention of immortality in Deut 1-11. Instead, life is the reward for obedience, as well as continued occupation of the land; and these commandments include the forcible expulsion of wicked nations from this land. Disobedience, on the other hand, brings death. But in 2 Maccabees, these wicked nations have retaken the land, and are so powerful that the Judaeans are unable—as yet—to expel them. These wicked nations compel the Jews to break the commandments, and if they do not, they are killed; it can be said, then, that it is now not disobedience but obedience that brings death. The irony of this inversion could not have been lost on the epitomizer, even if it had been lost on Jason of Cyrene.

Further, there is active involvement with Deuteronomy in this passage, but it is Deut 32, the Song of Moses, which is specifically referenced, and the compassion which God will have on his servants: "The Lord God is watching over us and in truth has compassion on his servants, as

[482] A third quality is described in 2 Macc 7:14, everlasting life by means of, presumably, the obedience mentioned throughout 2 Macc: "... One cannot but choose to die at the hands of men and to cherish the hope that God gives of being raised again by him. But for you there will be no resurrection to life!". Whether or not eternal life is contingent upon suffering is debated, and the use of *diathēkē* as "testament" lends support to the idea that the martyrs "inherit" eternal life upon their own deaths; see Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 316-317. However, Doran interprets ὑπὸ as presenting an encompassing covenant, in which the martyr's actions are included, rather than a metaphysical structure that is triggered by obedience; see Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 163.

[483] Deut 4:13; 4:23; 5:2; 7:9; 7:12; 9:9; 9:11. Also 5:3, which differentiates between covenants.

Moses declared in his song *which bore witness against the people to their face*, when he said, 'And he will have compassion on his servants'".[484] This passage provides some relevant interpretation for the situation at hand, but it presupposes that the persecuted Jews have already apostasized and must now repent. Given the realities of the Babylonian exile, the Jews in 2 Macc would likely acknowledge, within their history, a punishment for sins. Now that the oppression continues, the opportunity for redemption lies in the continued obedience of God's law. But as death is imminent and seemingly cannot be avoided, nor is likely to be averted by God, the author must present an ultimate justification to vindicate the suffering of the Jews. That reason is immortality, hinted at nowhere in Deuteronomy. By being resurrected, the faithful Jews are promised an eventual reward for obedience, even if that reward is not immediately at hand.[485]

Therefore, in chapters 6 and 7 of 2 Macc, the author presents a narrative of martyrdom that is on cautious and uncertain terms with Deut 1-11. It cannot be doubted that the author knew Deuteronomy, for chapter 32 is explicitly cited in 2 Macc 7:6. Yet the situation presented in 2 Macc 6-7 is almost an exact inversion of that which Moses presents to Israel at the plains of Moab in Deut 1-11. If Deut 1-11 is taken as a solitary unit, it seems to provide little hope, if any, to the Jewish martyrs in their time of need. Deut 32 provides more hope, that God will have compassion on sinful Israel: and this information is actively interpreted by the martyred brother, to give himself solace. But it does not answer the questions that a consideration of Deut 1-11, in light of the present crisis that faces the Jews, must provoke: how are we to escape, when

[484] Deut 32:36.
[485] For death as triumph see Naomi Janowitz, *The Family Romance of Martyrdom in Second Maccabees* (London: Routledge, 2017), 16. Immortality is often attested in the Hebrew scriptures: Isa 25:8; 26:19; 30:26; 54:13; 57:18-19; 65:20; 66:14; Dan 12:2-3; T. Mos. 10; Jub. 23:16-31; see Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 293; see also George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*, HTS 56 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 30-38. Martyrdom is elsewhere attested to deflect divine wrath: see Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 317; *As. Mos.* 9:7.

obedience brings not life but death? Immortality is the answer which the author provides, as a result of a dialectic interaction between Deut 1-11 and the Jewish oppression by the Greeks, mediated by Deut 32.[486] Again, as we have seen before in 1 Macc, the absence of Deut 1-11's voice in this context must be seen as a distant echo indeed, heard only be a receptive audience as aware of Deuteronomy as must have been the author of 2 Macc. Yet Deut 1-11 cannot be ignored due to the presence of Deut 32 in immediate context. Rather, we should view the omission of Deut 1-11 as a statement in and of itself, the creation of a space in which echoes may be heard by the knowledgeable reader, and in far too conspicuous a location to absolve the author of all creative intention regarding the creation of this "echo chamber".

4.7. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Enslaved Jews

Finally, *diathēkē* appears at 2 Macc 8:15. Here, the Jews are in danger of being enslaved and sold by the wicked Nicanor, as a means of recovering Antiochus's debt. While some Jews flee, others sell their property and pray for the Jews "who had been sold by the ungodly Nicanor before ever he met them, if not for their own sake, yet for the sake of the covenants made with their fathers, and because he had called them by his holy and glorious name".[487] According to Honigman, this passage emplots the author/epitomizer's defense of the Hasmonean dynasty, specifically through re-establishment of the Jerusalem temple.[488] For John Collins, this is

[486] According to Daniel Schwartz, "the blood of the martyrs caused God's wrath to turn to mercy"; although 2 Macc 8:5 does in fact state that God's wrath turned to mercy, why this mercy was caused by the martyr's blood is not clear. See Schwartz, *Maccabees*, 323.

[487] 2 Macc 8:15. A traditional prayer based on Lev 26:42-45; 1 Sam 12:22; Isa 43:7; Jer 14:7; *et al*. See Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 329.

[488] Although for Honigman, the temple is important in 2 Maccabees chiefly as a means of establishing the legitimacy of dynastic rule. See Honigman, *Tales of High Priests and Taxes*, 142.

evidence of covenantal nomism.[489] As above, we find interaction with both Deut 1-11 and later portions of Deuteronomy. Despite the "lawless men" Jason and Menelaus having severed the covenants, these Jews still invoke the covenant while praying for the safety of their countrymen. This is in accordance with Deut 4:30-31: "When you are in tribulation, and all these things come upon you in the latter days, you will return to יהוה your God and obey his voice, for יהוה your God is a merciful God; he will not fail you or destroy you or forget the covenant with your fathers which he swore to them". Yet there is also mention of the "name", seen in Deut 12:5 in the context for which it is most well known, the establishment of the temple as "the place which יהוה your God will choose out of all your tribes to put his name and make his habitation there".[490] But in this excerpt from 2 Maccabees, the use of the "name" is explicitly assigned to Israel. Part of the reason that God will preserve them, the pious Jews reason in 2 Macc 8:15, is that God has "called them by his holy and glorious name". This is found in Deut 28:9-10:

> יהוה will establish you as a people holy to himself, as he has sworn to you, if you keep the commandments of יהוה your God, and walk in his ways. And all the peoples of the earth shall see that you are called by the name of יהוה your God, and walk in his ways.

As above, covenantal interaction in this 2 Macc pericope makes use of not only Deut 1-11, but later portions of Deuteronomy as well. But unlike the covenantal references in the account of the martyrs, we find that both Deut 1-11 and later portions of Deuteronomy provide a solution for

[489] Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 79.
[490] Also in Deut 12:11, 21; 14:23-24; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2.

the problem at hand. This is possibly due to the specific nature of the oppression which is being visited upon the Jews in 2 Maccabees 8; in this pericope, the Jews are threatened with slavery, a distinctive feature of the Decalogue as given in Deut 5. Here, we are told that the Jews are not to do any labor on the Sabbath day, not them, or their families, or their livestock, or their servants.[491] This is because "you were a servant in the land of Egypt, and יהוה your God brought you out thence ... therefore יהוה your God commanded you to keep the sabbath day".[492] Most importantly, this passage has little bearing on the overarching goals of the author of 2 Macc, except for its depiction of the piety of the Jews which supports his emphasis on the Jewish people. Hence Deut 1-11 is used without influence from other texts or traditions, and in concert with other portions of Deuteronomy that likewise support the author's goals. What we find here are allusions to Deut 1-11 and more direct references to later portions of Deuteronomy by using "name"; these literary techniques are not complicated by the author's governing social and political motivations.

4.8. 2 Maccabees and Deut 1-11— Covenant: Conclusion

Therefore, we again find a variety of results when we investigate the intersection of 2 Macc and Deut 1-11, this time through the lens of covenant. In the first epistle of 2 Macc, we find strong evidence for the use of Deut 1-11, here addressing covenant, the heart, and the commandments. It is likely that Deut 1-11 is used in this discussion by virtue of the ideas which

[491] Deut 5:14.

[492] Although the exact lexical evidence requires interpretation; Deut 5:15 gives οἰκέτης, "servants, slaves", while 2 Macc 8:11 gives Ιουδαίων σωμάτων, "Jewish bodies" which are to be purchased, ἀγορασμὸν. See Montanari, *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, 19, 1430. *Diathēkē* also occurs in the plural here, a rare occurrence only attested in Second Temple literature (Wis 18:22; Sir 44:11, 18; 45:17). See Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 174.

it does not mention in comparison with later portions of Deuteronomy, namely the name-place theology used to establish the Jerusalem temple to the exclusion of other locations. Covenant is also invoked regarding martyrdom and immortality; here, covenant and law interact with Deut 1-11 to provide a relevant argument for the author/epitomizer's need to explain the ultimate success of the martyrs. Finally, covenant is used to anticipate the protection and ultimate liberation of the Jews who have been driven away and captured by Nicanor. In this case, Deut is used in its totality, not merely 1-11 but also 12:5 and 28:9-10, possibly due to the governing influence of the Decalogue as given in Deut 5, which specifically mentions slavery as the motivation for Sabbath keeping.

4.9. Excursus—*Sunthēkē* in 2 Macc

A final word should be said about *sunthēkē*, a very rare word in LXX which occurs most often in 2 Macc.[493] This word first appears in 12:1, where the agreements of the previous chapter are called *sunthekōn*: "When these agreements (συνθηκῶν) had been reached, Lysias departed on his way to the king, and the Judeans went about their farming".[494] However, according to Daniel Schwartz, the preceding agreements are not *sunthekai* at all, but sovereign declarations of intent.[495] In this case, the word is likely used to show the exclusively human parties within the "agreement", in comparison to the ubiquitous presence of a divine agent in the LXX's use of *diathēkē*.

---

[493] Five appearances here (12:1; 13:25; 14:20, 26,27). Compare with one appearance in 1 Macc (10:26); two in Wis (1:16; 12:21); one in Psalms (8:10); two in Isaiah (28:15; 30:1); and two in Daniel (11:6; 11:17).
[494] 2 Macc 12:1.
[495] Daniel Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 419-420; also P. Kussmaul, *Synthekai* (diss. Basel: 1969) and H. H. Schmidt, *Die Verträge der grieschisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v.Chr.* (München: Beck, 1969), 438-439. According to Doran, the use of *sunthēkē* elevates the Jews in status; see Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 235.

Sunthēkē next appears in 2 Macc 13:25, a retelling of 1 Macc 6:17-63. In 2 Macc, it is made clear that Antiochus V Eupator is, at the time of his father's death, old enough to oversee battle, and that according to the author, he is the "king" in question rather than Lysias, his appointed guardian. Certain elements are duplicated, such as the siege of Beth-zur and the heroic slaying of an elephant.[496] The accounts also agree on the outcome of the battle; once Lysias learns that his rival Philip is claiming power in Antioch, he hastily breaks off the siege of Beth-zur and leaves to consolidate his own power, with Antiochus V presumably in tow. However, according to 2 Macc 13:25, the agreements between Lysias and Judas Maccabeus are not taken well by the people of Ptolemais: "The people of Ptolemais were indignant over the treaty (συνθηκῶν); in fact they were so angry that they wanted to annul its terms". Unlike the previous *sunthekon*, these are not sovereignly given, but the result of negotiations between to military rivals, neither of whom have the upper hand, although Judas arguably obtained the better deal given that Lysias found himself in an extremely precarious position with Philip exerting power in Antioch. This is not the same, however, as Lysias being entirely at the mercy of Judas, and forced to accept any terms Judas might have seen fit to impose. Further, Doran notes that Ptolemais was famously hostile to Jews; the fact that the treaty made the inhabitants of Ptolemais even angrier suggests jealousy of good terms secured by successful Jewish negotiation, not the imposition of a despot.[497] Again, *sunthekon* describes agreements between human parties, and is still differentiated from the use of *diathēkē* within the LXX.

The final example of *sunthēkē*, one that appears in 2 Macc 14:20, 26, and 27, is a closer examination of a human relationship that results from a secret bargain, one to which 1 Macc

[496] 1 Macc 6:31-33/2 Macc 13:19; 1 Macc 6:43-46/2 Macc 13:15. Schwartz omits "rider" and finds a discrepancy, arguing that in 2 Maccabees one of the elephants was stabbed at night; however see Rahlfs and Kappler, which include κατοικίαν, "dweller", for the soldier housed atop the elephant. The elephant is itself designated as πρωτεύοντα, "first", suggesting more agreement with 1 Maccabees than Schwartz might lead us to believe.
[497] Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 260-261.

alludes but only in vague terms that conceal, perhaps, more than they reveal.[498] In 2 Macc 14, Demetrius has recently assumed the throne after defeating Lysias and Antiochus V. As told in 1 Macc, Alcimus aligns himself with him and slanders the Jews. In response, Demetrius re-commissions Nicanor to finish off the Jews once and for all. Unlike in 1 Macc, where Nicanor is presented as a cunning strategist, here he enters into a *sunthēkē* that resembles a truce, so as to avoid bloodshed. This is done with Posidonius, Theodotus, and Mattathias as his emissaries, and is in direct conflict with Demetrius's orders. It also results in a genuine friendship being formed between Judas and Nicanor, one which is interrupted when Demetrius learns, via Alcimus, that Nicanor is relenting from his mission. Once again, *sunthēkē* is used to describe a human relationship, whose closest biblical parallel is perhaps that between David and Jonathan as is depicted in 1 Samuel (1 Kings, LXX). Yet we have seen ambiguities in Alcimus's motivation, as well as considerable scholarly attestation that the epitomizer of 2 Macc might malign Alcimus for his own purposes of defending the Hasmonean priesthood.[499] At any rate, by characterizing the truce between Judas and Nicanor as *sunthēkē*, three purposes are accomplished: 1) the trends observable in the LXX of using *sunthēkē* are honored once again, showing more evidence for a consistent approach within Second Temple Jewish authors; 2) Alcimus is not shown as having the ability to disrupt a *diathēkē*, which would present considerable theological problems; and 3) Nicanor, who it must be remembered will ultimately emerge from the narrative as a villain, is not shown as having participated in a *diathēkē*. As in Deut 1-11 covenants with the surrounding nations are forbidden, and thereby distinguished from the covenant with God, so does 2 Macc distinguish between human and divine covenants and even reinforces this distinction through its

[498] Although the truce need not have been kept secret from the Jews, only the Greeks; see Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 273. This secrecy was wise, as informal friendships between Greeks had a more binding nature than their Roman equivalents; see Erich Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (London: University of California Press, 1984), 1.95.

[499] This entire sequence is omitted in 1 Macc, and no reason is given there for Alcimus's petition. See Goldstein, *2 Macc*, 490.

use of specific covenantal terminology. And as the author's goals are exclusively concerned with affairs of the Jewish people, this position of Deut 1-11 presents no problems and is therefore maintained uncritically.

4.10. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: The *Gymnasium*

In the classical period, the Greeks had always trained their children and viewed this activity as essential for survival. Their word for this, *paideia*, may at this time be seen as a rough equivalent for the Hebrew *mûsar*, and evidence for this is especially seen in Spartan accounts. Later, in the Hellenistic period, the ruling Greeks dominated the cultural life of the Mediterranean, near East, and much of the Asian steppes to a lesser extent. *Paideia* gradually became subsumed into the *enkuklia paideia*, a course of study for youths that, for the Greeks and others, represented "Greekness". It consisted of intellectual disciplines, especially study of Homer, and refinement of manners, but also enculturation into a way of life, specifically the physical culture for which the Greeks were well known. During the Hellenistic period, *mûsar* as practiced by Jews bore little resemblance to the *enkuklia paideia* of the Greeks, and 2 Macc engages with the tensions created by these differences.

The author of 2 Macc significantly engages with *paideia*, as is seen in his treatment of two chief points of focus with which *paideia* is interconnected. The first is his examination of Greek *paideia*'s famous emblem, the *gymnasium*, and his condemnation of the manner in which this institution distracted the Jerusalem priesthood from their essential duties.[500] The second is more extensive, and deals with a more traditionally Jewish idea of *mûsar*, or "discipline", here used to show the underlying reasons behind the persecutions that befell the Jews. These

[500] *Paideia* is attested as a Greek colonization tool; see Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 105; Plutarch, *Phil*. 16.5-6.

misfortunes, the author argues, occurred partially because of the sins of the Jews, but also because God wished to encourage them to repent before, presumably, they could no longer turn from the disobedient path they had taken.

Below we will see that Deut 1-11 assists the author in explaining why, even though the installed Jerusalem *gymnasium* does not violate specifically religious laws, it still tempts the Jews to violate the divine law, or *nomos*. Deut 1-11 will also assist the author in emphasizing "place" theology as opposed to "name" theology, and will assume importance over the remainder of Deuteronomy which emphasizes "name-place" theology and, correspondingly, the exclusive importance of the Jerusalem temple. Finally, Deut 1-11 will provide a solution to martyrdom, in this case helping to show how martyrdom is, when viewed inter-generationally, a type of *paideia*. As such, this use of Deut 1-11 does not compromise the author's main goals, and is therefore employed without nuance.

The first interaction of the author/epitomizer with *paideia* is found in 2 Macc 4:9-17. In this passage, Jason, the corrupt brother of Onias who has acquired the priesthood from Antiochus IV by means of bribery, also negotiates with Antiochus to install both a *gymnasium* and "to enroll the people of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch".[501] These measures are, in and of themselves, not necessarily opposed to proper worship, as is seen in Judas Maccabeus's later speech in chapter 8. Here, while he states that the "ancestral way of life", or προγονικῆς πολιτείας, perhaps better translated as "polity/citizenship of the progenitors", has been compromised, he separates this complaint from "the lawless outrage that the Gentiles had committed against the holy place" and does so with the Greek particle ἔτι.[502] Judas Maccabeus, then, does not treat the offense against the polity of Jerusalem—the *gymnasium* and Antiochene

[501] I have also discussed this above in my study of 1 Maccabees.
[502] 2 Macc 8:17.

citizenship enrollment—as synonymous with the religious crimes that the Greeks have also committed.[503] But these actions of the Greeks, instigated by Jason, nonetheless create an insidious and unavoidable influence in the lives of the priests. Before Antiochus IV's rule, the Jews had gained certain freedoms which were now cancelled; the *gymnasium* was constructed underneath the "acropolis", which was likely either the temple or the citadel later to be occupied by the Greeks, and the Jews there were drawn into wearing the "Greek hat", or πέτασον, a shorthand for nude athletic competition as the wide-brimmed hat protected the athletes from the sun.[504] The author continues, stating that "the priests were no longer intent upon their ministry at the altar. Rather, despising the shrine and neglecting the sacrifices, they hurried to take part in the unlawful distribution of the oil in the wrestling arena after the signal for the discus throwing".[505] "Discus throwing", as the RSV renders δίσκου πρόσκλησιν, could also mean "gong", and here suggests that the priests are so tempted by the sports activities in the *gymnasium* that they are appropriating oil supplies which have not been allocated to them, eager to compete as soon as the gong strikes.[506] Again, the *gymnasium* is not directly interfering with the temple's operation; it is rather the priests who are unable to resist the allure of the athletic competitions.

The author provides an aside here, beginning with added motivation for the priests' actions; they "[disdained] the honors prized by their fathers and [put] the highest value upon

---

[503] The strangeness of the religious measures imposed upon the Jews by Antiochus IV—measures which did *not* include the *gymnasium*—have been substantively observed and debated. These religious practices were not Antiochus's own, yet they were forced upon the Jews who obviously did not practice them either. Tcherikover argued that the enforced religious measures originated in a Syrian population with whom the Jews were forced to assimilate; Bickerman attributes the measures to innovations conceived by Menelaus and his faction; according to Goldstein, the innovations are Antiochus's own, in an attempt to imitate Roman practices which Antiochus admired. See Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 189-200; Bickerman, *The God of The Maccabees*, 1110-1122; Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 98-112; also Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 103.

[504] On the citadel vs. temple see Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 229; Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 219; Kah and Scholz, *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*; also Goldstein, *1 Macc*. On *petasos* see Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 230.

[505] 2 Macc 4:14.

[506] Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 231; Cicero, *De oratore* 2.5.21.

Greek forms of prestige".[507] Again, the priests are not charged with specific abuses of their positions or failures to perform their duties correctly.[508] Instead, they are interrupted in their priestly labors by a desire for involvement in specifically Greek activities. That this aping of Greek practice should not be tolerated, and constitutes a divine infraction, is articulated by the author thus: "there was such an extreme of Hellenization and increase in the adoption of foreign ways [that the priests pursued athletics] ... For this reason heavy disaster overtook them, and those whose ways of living they admired and wished to imitate completely became their enemies and punished them. For it is no light thing to show irreverence to the divine laws".[509] This authorial comment, with nearly every word, alludes to Deut 1-11. The author draws upon Deut not only to validate his dim view of the priests' new Hellenistic hobbies, but to substantiate his belief that the disaster which would befall these priests originated with those who provided the means of temptation. First, the author states that the priests have shown "irreverence to the divine laws", *nomoi*, as given in Deut 4:44: "This is the law (*nomos*) which Moses set before the children of Israel". For the author, then, the actions of the priests are equivalent to disobeying the laws given in Deut 1-11. Further, by suffering under the hands of those they sought to imitate, the Jews conform to the model of false worship given in Deut 4:23-28. Here, the crime of idolatry is addressed, and Moses warns Israel not to "make a graven image for yourselves, in the form of any figure".[510] This infraction will cause Israel to be "[scattered] among the peoples ... left few in number among the nations ... And there you will serve gods of wood and stone, the work of men's hands".[511] Just as the worship of images results in Israel's enforced servitude to

[507] 2 Macc 4:15.
[508] E.g. 1 Sam (1 Kgs LXX) 2:13-17, 34; Lev 10:1-2.
[509] 2 Macc 4:13-17.
[510] Deut 4:16.
[511] Deut 4:27-28.

images, so will the adoption of Greek ways and customs—a violation of the *nomos*—result in the Jews' eventual religious bondage under Greek worship practice.

4.11. 2 Macc and Deut 1-11—Discipline

Paideia itself occurs four times in 2 Macc: 6:12; 6:16; 7:33; and 10:4. Two of these mentions are found in a theological manifesto provided by the author, which I provide in full below:

> Now I urge those who read this book not to be depressed by such calamities, but to recognize that these punishments were designed not to destroy but to discipline (παιδείαν) our people. In fact, it is a sign of great kindness not to let the impious alone for long but to punish them immediately. For in the case of the other nations the Lord waits patiently to punish them until they have reached the full measure of their sins, but he does not deal in this way with us in order that he may not take vengeance on us afterward, when our sins have reached their height. Therefore he never withdraws his mercy from us. While he disciplines (παιδεύων) us with calamities, he does not forsake his own people.[512]

This summary statement follows an account of the rivalry between Jason and Menelaus for the high priesthood and how Antiochus IV, mistaking their violent feud for popular revolt,

[512] 2 Macc 6:12-16. Schwartz notes that in 4:16-17, the author/epitomizer does not characterize the suffering of the impious priests as *paideia*; presumably, this is to suggest that these priests are permanently confirmed in their wrongdoing and are irredeemable. See Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 284. This should also be compared to the permanent destruction of other peoples; see Schwartz, ibid., Gen 15:16; Dan 8:23 (LXX); CD 9:20; Pseudo-Philo, *LAB* 26:13.

assumes armed control of Jerusalem and defiles the temple. But the author informs the reader that "יהוה was angered for a little while because of the sins of those who dwelt in the city". Therefore, in this instance, Antiochus IV becomes an instrument of discipline, or *paideia*, used by God to deliver merciful chastening to Israel.[513] This is not to suggest, however, that Antiochus is not to blame for crimes of his own, for as we see *paideia* delivered to Israel, so is the punishment mentioned in the author's manifesto meted out to the Greeks. But according to the author, this punishment is always conditioned upon God's dealings with the Jews, as is given in 2 Macc 5:18: "But if it had not happened that they were involved in many sins, this man would have been scourged and turned back from his rash act as soon as he came forward, just as Heliodorus was". This is referencing the miraculous apprehension and punishment of Heliodorus, who is scourged (μαστιγωθεὶς) for his attempt to rob the temple of deposits. At that time, the temple was under the supervision of the righteous priest Onias, and as there had been no wrongdoing yet accrued in Judea by Jews, the author reports, consistently with his manifesto, that Heliodorus is promptly punished. But after the transgressions of Jason and the involvement of the priests with athletics, the desecration of the temple is now regarded as *paideia*, and the Greek crime is permitted to continue.

Yet while Deut 1-11 concerns itself with the behavior of the people, 2 Maccabees only specifically describes the wrongdoing of priests. This is complicated by the attestation in 2 Macc 5:19 that:

> κύριος did not choose the nation for the sake of the holy place, but the place for the sake of the nation. Therefore the place itself shared in the misfortunes that befell the nation

[513] *Paideia* is rightly given as "training" or "discipline": "God is training, disciplining, educating the people in how to behave". Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 150.

> and afterward participated in its benefits; and what was forsaken in the wrath of the Almighty was restored again in all its glory when the great lord became reconciled.

Here, we find the author interacting both with Deut 1-11 and subsequent portions of Deuteronomy which may be differentiated by the presence of "name-place-dwelling" theology, present in Deut 12:5 and subsequent portions of Deuteronomy, but nowhere in Deut 1-11. For the author, the holy place is not associated with the *name* of יהוה , but the *nation* of the Jews.

This further explains the positioning of the temple as a *locus* of wrongdoing and retribution as a surrogate for the punishment of the people which will follow.[514] By minimizing the presence of "name-place" theology found in later sections of Deuteronomy, the author provides additional credence for his use of Deut 1-11 retribution theology in an unorthodox way; by interpreting Deut 1-11 as applicable to the actions of the priesthood, the author preserves the important focus on the priesthood and temple as the place both of the Jews' transgression and redemption.

4.12. 2 Maccabees and Deut 1-11—Martyrdom (Revisited)

This neat treatment of *paideia*, dovetailed with the author's aim to defend the Jerusalem temple, does not explain the use of *paideia* in the martyrdom passages which follow. In 2 Macc 7:32-33, the youngest brother, soon to be martyred, claims: "For we are suffering because of our own sins. And if our living κύριος is angry for a little while, to rebuke and discipline (παιδείας) us, he will again be reconciled with his own servants". We have seen how the motif of immortality provides a solution for the covenantal problems that the phenomenon of martyrdom

[514] But not to be confused with vicarious or substitutionary atonement; see Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 316.

inevitably presents. Here, the author/epitomizer continues to harmonize his account of the martyrs with theological concepts, in this case *paideia*. The author is in this case confronted with an irregularity given the historical circumstances of Jason of Cyrene's account and *paideia* as it is presented in Deut 1-11. The youngest brother does not seem to perceive that in his case, *paideia* will not result in the preservation of his life, but of its loss. However, this is not as incongruous as it might initially appear, for in Deut 1-11 *paideia* may be shown to signify "training" as much as "discipline", and that in a corporate sense.

This is first seen in Deut 4:36, in which the present generation, assembled at Moab, is told by Moses: "Out of heaven he let you hear his voice, that he might discipline (παιδεῦσαί) you". This is an address to a large group, some of which were not yet born or perhaps unable to comprehend the import of the message given at Sinai/Horeb, the message to which Moses refers that is a message bringing *paideia*. Many of the Israelites present to hear this message would not live to enter the promised land, yet they are here subject to *paideia* nonetheless. The multi-generational emphasis of *paideia* continues in Deut 8:5, in which Moses says, "Know then in your heart that, as a man disciplines (παιδεύσαι) his son, κύριος your God disciplines (παιδεύσει) you". This is set amidst an account of wilderness wandering, during which the Israelites' clothes remained intact and were fed miraculously by manna.[515] This applies to all the Israelites in the desert, several living generations, many of whom died before reaching the borders of the promised land a second time. Here, again, Deut presents an image of *paideia* that is intergenerational, in which Israel is disciplined corporately. While some may not live to see the fruits of the discipline, Israel as a whole will not cease to exist but will learn from the *paideia* which God has brought upon them before it is too late for Israel to change course. Finally, Deut

[515] Deut 8:3-4.

11:2 has Moses explicitly address not Israelites of the past, who did not enter the promised land, but Israelites of the present. These Israelites are also included within the *paideia* of Israel, although it should be noted that *future* Israelites are not assured inclusion. Moses states:

> consider this day (since I am not speaking to your children who have not known or seen it), consider the discipline (παιδείαν) of κύριος your God ... his signs and his deeds which he did in Egypt to Pharoah ... what he did to the army of Egypt ... and what he did to you in the wilderness.[516]

Therefore, all Israel which has existed resides under God's *paideia*; but the survival of Israel is seemingly not assured. It lies within the responsibility of the present generation to respond well to the divine *paideia*, to choose obedience; by doing so, they can alleviate the punishments that God has brought for disobedience. This is, presumably, what motivates the martyrs in 2 Maccabees. Although it is too late for them to escape death, nonetheless by means of obedience they may do their part to alleviate the sins of corporate Israel and create a benevolent future for the Jews to come.[517]

---

[516] Deut 11:2-5.

[517] For more on justification of suffering, expressed as theodicy, see Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 280; See also 2 Macc 6:31: "So in this way he died, leaving in his death an example of nobility and a memorial of courage, *not only to the young* but to the great body of his nation" (italics mine).

4.13. 2 Maccabees and *Paideia*—Conclusion

In conclusion, we find that Deut 1-11 proves to be especially useful for the author/epitomizer of 2 Maccabees's treatment of *paideia*. Deut 1-11 supports the necessary realization that participation in the gymnasium constitutes a violation of *nomos*, and as such implicates the Jewish people in wrongdoing. Emphasizing Deut 1-11 allows the author/epitomizer to differentiate between the physical location of the Jerusalem temple, which the author/epitomizer wishes to defend, over and against the complete "name-place" theology found in later portions of Deuteronomy that would prohibit other temples from exerting claims to legitimacy. Finally, Deut 1-11 enables an inter-generational *paideia* solution to the problem of martyrdom, allowing the deaths of faithful Jews to play a functional role in the redemption of the nation as a whole.

4.14. General Conclusion

The author/epitomizer of 2 Maccabees advances three goals in this work, which may be described as 1) a need to exonerate the Jerusalem temple from any detractors, and show its continued legitimacy as a proper house of God; 2) a need to explain the political nuances that have emerged within the Jerusalem priesthood, and to explain how it has engendered both faithful servants of God (Onias) and evil impostors who only seek the priesthood to further their own worldly ambition and greed (Jason); and 3) to stress the importance, and ultimate final efficacy, of the Jewish people themselves in the redemption of Judea from its Greek overlords. These goals are advanced, among other means, through the use of ideas borrowed from wisdom

teaching, the concept of the covenant, and the resonances of *paideia/mûsar*. As such, Deut 1-11, itself rich with these three *loci* of ideas, plays an important role as the author/epitomizer draws upon this portion of text to support the relevant literary goals. However, Deut 1-11 is not universally useful and occasionally even advances ideas that are neutral or unhelpful for the author/epitomizer; in these cases, the author/epitomizer freely brings other texts to bear, mediating Deut 1-11 through these other biblical books and Deuteronomy considered as a whole. This is always done with a view towards the author/epitomizer's overarching goals.

As a historian and apologist, the author/epitomizer seeks to demonstrate certain reassuring continuities in the face of a rapidly changing priestly landscape. The Hasmoneans, proven in their military ability to liberate Judea, also have taken possession of the priesthood; while they can trace their lineage to Aaron, their eligibility for the high priesthood, as traced through Zadok, is not conclusive. The author/epitomizer of 2 Maccabees must account for this, both defending the Jerusalem priesthood and simultaneously minimizing its agency in a discussion of Judea's position with respect to God. As the first epistle shows, this is partially accomplished by encouraging the operation of other temples, but also by showing that the temple in Jerusalem itself, while not the *only* temple, is protected by God even if the priesthood itself should be compromised. It is with the Jewish people, the author/epitomizer suggests, that the true responsibility for Israel's standing with God resides. Therefore, the author/epitomizer manages to depict a dynamic between God and Israel which, while not denigrating the Hasmonean priesthood *per se*, minimizes its final responsibility in securing, in God's eyes, a desirable position for Israel.

Chapter 5. Philo and Deut 1-11—Introduction

Philo's life, even today, remains mysterious. An Alexandrian Jew, he was well-versed in both Hellenistic philosophy and the Jewish scriptures. At some point in his life, he took up the task of producing a voluminous set of writings, including allegorical commentaries, for the purpose of showing the compatibility of Hellenistic philosophy and the scriptures. He was known to frequent sporting events on a few occasions, and was sufficiently well-respected by his community to have led a delegation to Gaius Caligula seeking to alleviate Jewish persecution.[518]

Although there is little explicitly stated in his writings, Philo's personal details can be reconstructed by the historian—to a degree. Very little of Philo's personal information survives from antiquity. All that is given by Josephus is that he led a Jewish embassy to Gaius Caligula and was an experienced philosopher. For the rest, then, we must rely upon Philo's works themselves. Yet there is a rough correspondence between the known events of Philo's life and his literary output. It could be wondered if these life events, as they occurred, inspired these writings.[519] Philo is best approached, initially, by framing him as not only an Alexandrian but a Jew. It is clear that Philo's philosophical-theological writings were not merely academic exercise, but the labor of a man devoted to the practice of Judaism and the study of the Scriptures.[520] Circumcision was practiced throughout the Near East, and was mandatory for the Egyptian priesthood; the ubiquitous defense of circumcision found in Philo and Josephus likely stems from the specific interactions between Greeks and Romans, on the one hand, and Jews on

[518] For more see Erwin R. Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962).
[519] Josephus, *A.J.*18.259-260; Maren R. Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography*, AYBRL (London: Yale University Press, 2018), 1.
[520] Mireille Hadas-Lebel, *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora*, trans. Robyn Fréchet, SPA 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 91.

the other.[521] This is illustrated in the famous incident seen in 1 Macc. Philo omits mention of covenant as this would link Jewish practice specifically to the nation of the Jewish people and discourage other peoples from embracing the philosophies and religion of Judaism.[522] Philo has no difficulty, however, justifying arcane Jewish practices through philosophical and allegorical means, as when he explains that the law requiring Jews to eat only animals with *both* cloven hooves and ruminant digestion allegorically points to the necessity for both ongoing intellectual meditation and the right use of dialectic to determine truth from falsehood.

It is his position between seemingly incompatible worlds, the Hellenistic and the Jewish, that results in his being commonly labeled *Philo Alexandrinus* or *Philo Judaeus*.[523] He has been hailed as the founder of Western theology and philosophy, but easily impresses the informed reader as a well-meaning dilettante, reliant upon popular manuals and philosophical aids, whose real goal is to excite interest in the Jewish scriptures among Jews and Greeks alike.[524] But it is unhelpful to judge Philo by the standards of contemporary scholarship and methodology, for we are dealing not with an academic or possibly not even a true philosopher but a thinker and author whose orientation is inarguably religious, perhaps even mystical in the sense that Philo believed his work to be often directly received in communion with God: "I have approached my work empty and suddenly become full, the ideas falling in a shower from above and being sown invisibly, so that under the influence of the Divine possession I have been filled with corybantic frenzy and been unconscious of anything ... For I obtained language, ideas ... as the result of clearest showing".[525]

---

[521] See Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 93.
[522] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 113.
[523] Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, 3rd. rev. ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962); Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, xi.
[524] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, xii, et al.
[525] *Migr.*34-35; Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, xiii.

To better understand Philo, it is important to first gain some understanding of Alexandria, the major metropolis that shaped so much of Philo's life and thought. One may ask why, in antiquity, Alexandria did not emerge as the titular capital of either the Greek or Roman empires. In the case of the Greeks, this is easily answered; the "empire" itself did not outlive Alexander, but was immediately divided into kingdoms of the Diadochi. In this sense, Alexandria was the political seat of the Ptolemies, but immediately lost prominence once Rome consolidated its control of the Greek territories and absorbed them into its own growing empire. Lacking any military advantages, Alexandria could not compete with Rome or the eventual emergence of Constantinople, and despite its proven excellence as a center of trade and culture these defensive drawbacks perhaps prevented the Romans from bestowing the site with more political importance. Not until the Christian era, when it became a patriarchal center, did Alexandria assume any weight within an administrative system. It is in this light that we may best view the city, as a chief defining element of Philo's character; cheerfully chaotic, fortunately able to remain absorbed in the pursuits of economic and artistic labor, always surrounded by lands well secured by a ruling authority.

If Rome and Constantinople were fortresses, then Alexandria was a palace, *Pharia*, "City of the Lighthouse".[526] The city was renowned for its scientific and philological activity, the latter especially influential on Philo's writing, as well as its great library.[527] The same sorts of *gymnasia* seen in Jerusalem (1 Macc) also appear in Alexandria, as does the miraculously averted elephant massacre of 3 Macc.[528] Jews in Alexandria were not as assimilated as the cosmopolitan nature of the city might lead one to believe, and Philo could not escape the awareness of remaining something of an outsider among Greeks, perhaps marginally better

[526] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 1.
[527] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 12, 15.
[528] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 15.

accepted than native Egyptians. Philo could remain a Jew while absent from Jerusalem, as could the Greeks in Egypt, Asia Minor, and the eastern Mediterranean remain Greek while absent from the Greek mainland; it is the phenomenon of the Greek diaspora, in fact, which helps justify Philo's view of the Jewish diaspora rightfully united by their religious beliefs and way of life.[529]

Alexandria was also host to much syncretic blending of Greek and Egyptian belief, such as Isis-Pharia and the cult of Serapis.[530] Philo could not avoid exposure to this religious phenomenon and, while actively opposing it and viewing it as the inevitable consequence of polytheistic paganism, perhaps owed it more than he realized in his own synthesis of Hellenistic thought and Jewish conviction. The ambivalence many Jews felt regarding Greek culture undoubtedly affected Philo's engagement with Greek culture; while there was indeed animosity between Jews and Greeks, as Josephus relates in *C.Ap.*, the benefits and excellence of Greek culture could not be denied, underlying Philo's ostensibly respectful—but quite possibly merely pragmatic—attestation that Moses commands that Jews respect the gods of others and not to engage in frivolous insults, while simultaneously decrying Egyptian animal worship and the materialism Philo believed it engendered.[531]

Philo could not escape some degree of instability during his life, and this should be noted when considering his works which perhaps did not emerge in as finished a condition as he would have liked. While the Greeks had managed to secure privileges from the Greeks, once the Romans assumed control of Alexandria that process had to be undertaken again, but with difficulty as the Romans, ethnically dividing the northern Mediterranean from the south and east,

[529] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 32.
[530] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 18.
[531] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 42, 71; also this circumstance should be considered when considering rabbinic responses to Deut 4:19, which could be construed as permitting Gentile worship of the heavens.

viewed the Jews not as Greeks but as Egyptians.[532] This perhaps encouraged Augustus to subject the Jews to the *laographia* tax, which under the Greeks the Jews had managed to avoid, even Augustus still permitted the Jews sabbath privileges.[533]

Philo read the Greek version of Deuteronomy. While some scholars hold that Philo did have significant mastery of Hebrew, most hold that Philo's knowledge of Hebrew was only minimal, if he had real knowledge of the language at all apart from etymological "lore".[534] Since the Greek version of Deuteronomy, especially 1-11, is virtually identical to the Hebrew text, issues of Greek v. Hebrew versions do not concern us here. Philo's work in Deuteronomy is not rooted in any unique quality of the Greek translation, but the themes which Deuteronomy contains and upon which Philo comments. Given the proximity of the legendary Greek translation as recounted in *Letter of Aristeas*, having been translated in Alexandria for the library of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, it is unsurprising that Philo would have a high view of the Greek. He comments on the translation in *Mos.*, adding details that emphasize the piety of the translators and describing them holding books to heaven before the day's translation began.[535] As we have seen, Philo's description of his own writing process could be seen as an "enthusiasm", or benign possession by God; this sentiment he also ascribes to the translators of the Jewish scriptures.[536] As we read Philo, then, we should be aware that he has gone on record in ascribing the same sort of supernatural validity to his own work as he does the translation of the Jewish scriptures into Greek. Whether or not he would extend the same supernaturalism to the origin of those texts

[532] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 49-50.
[533] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 49, 69.
[534] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 59.
[535] *Mos.*37; Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 64.
[536] *Mos.*37; Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 64. The grandson of Ben Sira has a different estimation of the Greek translation (see above) and, as Hadas-Lebel notes, more believable as he *does* know Greek and Hebrew, unlike Philo (Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 65), especially in the case of Deuteronomy which as we have noted was exceptionally stable.

themselves is uncertain. From a more cynical perspective, for Philo the Greek was his *only* text, again as he very likely had little to no Hebrew.

Despite this, we cannot subject Philo's fondness for allegorical exegesis to the same problematization, for he clearly believed the Greeks to be philosophically indebted to the Jews and that Plato, Socrates, and Pythagoras merely repeated what Moses had already averred; to use their technique of allegorical exegesis could not display any indebtedness to the Greeks as any insights gained thereby would only return to the original Jewish conceptions.[537] Philo believed this in good faith; we of course might ask, how can one fail to credit the Greeks when it is *their* literary techniques that yielded these new insights? But Philo is silent on these matters.[538]

Philo was not the only practitioner of exegesis in his lifetime; the famous Pharisees, detailed by Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament, were renowned for their exegetical efforts, and while their name may have meant "separated" it may also have indicated, in addition to or instead of their community status, their activity as exegetes and interpreters.[539] Exegesis was also practiced in synagogues during assemblies, and while Philo's works are perhaps too complex to reasonably consider them to have been initially presented as oral expositions of Scripture, he may nevertheless have been an esteemed interpreter on the Law within his own synagogal community.[540] In the same vein, it is possible to think of Philo as an early proponent of *midrash*, the commentaries produced by rabbinic Judaism. While there are many similarities between Philo's approach and the *midrash*—attention to detail, adventurous etymologies—there are many more differences, and while Philo's work may be viewed as a parallel development of the same motivation to recast the Jewish scriptures in a new form, it is unlikely that either is the

[537] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 67.
[538] See Nikiprowetzky, *Commentaire*, 101.
[539] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 122.
[540] *Mos*.2.216; *Spec*.2.61-62; *Hypoth*.7.13; Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 127.

ancestor, or sibling, of the other.[541] Niehoff suggests that various areas of Philo's life must be considered alongside one another.[542] There are "political, philosophical, theological, and literary" dimensions to consider; "Philo the historian cannot be separated from Philo the exegete". Here we again find validation for broad Kristevan intertextuality. If Niehoff's argument is correct, the writings of Philo the man must be considered exactly that; the localized thought of an Alexandrian Jew who held great wealth, education, and such prominence in his community that he was selected to lead a critical embassy to Rome, upon which rested the lives of the Alexandrian Jews if not the entire diaspora. It would be naive to assume that these circumstances had no bearing on Philo's literary output. The danger is to overextend and over-interpret a few facts of Philo's life, significant as they may be, to have impacted *all* of Philo's writings, committing the error of unwarranted associations or a kind of "parallelomania" in the phrasing of Sandmel.[543]

Nor should this be viewed as a trend or theoretic correspondence in Philo's life and work. In demonstrable examples, ancient authors produced significant portions of their work during times that afforded them the opportunity or occasions which specifically suggested the need or applicability of these writings.[544] It is possible, then, that Philo like other authors produced his works during periods in his life in whcih circumstances required or would greatly benefit from his written work. For example, it is not unreasonable to suppose that, in preparation for his embassy to Gaius, Philo wrote works of an apologetic nature to defend Judaism in the eyes of Romans. Gaius's lack of philosophical sympathies being unknown at the time, perhaps Philo intended this work for Gaius himself.

---

[541] Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 154-155.
[542] Niehoff, *Philo*, 2.
[543] Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania", *JBL* 81/1 (1962): 1-13.
[544] E.g. Cicero's *Brut*., *Parad*., *De or*., *Fin*., *Tusc*., *Acad*., *Nat.d*., *Div*., *Amic*., and *Off*., written between 46-44 BCE; Hadas-Lebel, *Philo*, 28.

In general, Philo's work may be divided into two phases: his early allegorical commentaries, Platonic in their emphases, and his later works which are more sympathetic to the late Stoic ethical framework favored by the Romans.[545] Maren Niehoff divides Philo's works into three rough divisions: early allegorical and metaphysical works influenced by Alexandrian exegesis and Platonic philosophy, late historiographical works which owe more to Stoicism and show a strong affinity for Roman ideals, and another series of works, the *Exposition*, which includes historiography but also presents biblical materials for what appears to be a non-Jewish readership.[546] In phase one, Philo makes an attempt to systematically interpret Scripture in the Alexandrian manner, fusing Platonic thought with the Jewish scriptures by using Alexandrian allegorical exegesis. This style continued to be adopted by select early church fathers as well as "Gnostic" theologians. In phase two, Philo presents Stoicism and Judaism in terms sympathetic to Roman ideals which promote a view of Romans that "embrace a code of worldly ethics based on creation, enjoy traveling all over the empire, and are well-disciplined citizens".[547] This new Stoicism was promoted in Rome by Attalus, Arius Didymus, Cicero, and Seneca, and recast Greek thought with an emphasis on practical life and self-improvement, away from literary and philosophical abstraction.[548] This blend of Roman priorities with the raw materials of Greek literary culture became known as the Second Sophistic, of which Plutarch is the most famous member. But Niehoff suggests that Philo also be treated as a member of this movement, interpreting Judaism amongst this hybrid of Greek and Roman culture, just as would Plutarch recast his own religious tradition.[549]

---

[545] Niehoff, *Philo*, 11.
[546] Niehoff, *Philo*, 14-16.
[547] Niehoff, *Philo*, 11.
[548] Niehoff, *Philo*, 17; see also Epictetus.
[549] Niehoff, *Philo*, 21-22.

When interpreting Deut 1-11, Philo's chief method is allegorical interpretation, which he uses to exegete several passages from the Jewish scriptures. Passages from Deut 1-11 are used as secondary lemmae, to further explain his exegesis of the original passages. He does recognize the themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant within these passages, and consistently enough that his brief observations serve as evidence for the identification of the themes within Deut 1-11. But his remarks are, as said, brief, and he soon returns to his primary purpose of allegorical interpretation. We will find this pattern repeatedly in Philo's interpretations of Deut 1-11.[551] For Philo, these allegories may be considered highly creative interactions with texts, or responses puzzling sections that, for the allegorist, are solved through abstract ideas that can be shown to resemble the concrete but problematic pericopes of the text. Broad intertextuality is therefore recorded by the allegorist as the accumulated repository of a life's involvement with literary culture is brought to bear upon a specific textual problem.

Unless otherwise noted, all translations of Philo will be taken from the Loeb Classical Library editions.

5.1. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Material Goods

In *Agr*.172-173, Philo interprets Deut 8:18 in the service of Noah's agricultural activity as described in Gen 9:20. It is presented in the context of a summary of Deut 8:17-18 and, generally speaking, can be said to concern God's providence: "Moreover in his Exhortations the lawgiver charges those who have obtained large possession of good things not to inscribe themselves in their hearts as authors of their wealth, but "to remember God who giveth strength

[551] For text and translations I will use the Loeb edition of Philo (trans. C.L. Colson and G.H. Whitaker: London: Heinemann).

to acquire power".[552] Philo continues, writing that according to Moses this perpetual cultivation of God within the memory is the reason why the wealth was granted in the first place, so as to provide a reason to continually dwell on God's blessing.[553] However, this is not clear from Deut 9:18, which merely states the power is acquired with no mention of a gradual process. Without God in the memory, calamity awaits, for:

> those who forget the end of their acquisitions cannot any longer derive real benefit from their beginning. The disasters which befall these men are self-chosen, the outcome of selfishness. They cannot bear to acknowledge as the Author of the good things which they enjoy the God Who brings to perfection the gifts which He loves to bestow.[554]

Here Philo provides practical advice. He specifically warns against developing a prideful attitude concerning the wealth which one accrues. This sort of financial guidance, like the provisions made for widows and orphans, finds much corroboration in the biblical wisdom writings. In his mention of "bringing to perfection", Philo here also recalls themes of *mûsar*/*paideia*; here, however, he suggests a developmental aspect more suggestive of the change which God visits upon those who remember God's role in their having grown wealthy, and which is evident in Deut 6:7 but not in the Deuteronomic verse that Philo quotes. It is unusual that in this example Philo would engage two prominent themes of wisdom and *mûsar/paideia*, practical concerns and the training of memory, yet connect them with a concept of developmentalism that is not only incongruous with his usual practice but not really defensible from the quoted Deuteronomic text. Most likely, Philo is inspired by the governing pericope of

---

[552] Philo, *Agr*.172.
[553] Philo, *Agr*.173.
[554] Philo, *Agr*.173.

Noah's vineyard and likewise adopts a model of progress within the individual like the growth of vines.[555]

Philo will continue to engage with the relative importance of material goods elsewhere, in the context of Deut 1-11. Material provision is an important wisdom theme; yet we will find a consistent de-emphasis on physical provision, in contrast to this theme in Deut 1-11 which invariably stresses the goodness of the material wealth which God has bestowed upon Israel. This will be made clear through comparison to painting, as a quality of the individual. In doing this, Philo is reliant upon the establishment of the Levitical priesthood, which for Philo serves as an example of a virtuous life, detached from physical wealth, that Philo will clarify through comparison to painting, as a quality of the individual. Of course, not all Israelites are Levites, nor can one merely "opt in" to the Levitical priesthood should one aspire to an ascetic existence. The Levitical priesthood, again, also serves allegorically, representing the ideal state of virtue to which, according to Philo, the wise should seek to attain. Virtue is provided by God, as is detailed in *Fug.*175 and Philo's interpretation of Deut 6:10 which he gives as the place "where the Lawgiver seems to me most clearly to supply an example of finding without seeking".[556] Here, Philo reads the cities, houses, vineyards, and olive orchards detailed in the text allegorically, as "the lavish abundance of the good things showered upon them, great and ready for possession and enjoyment" representing generic and specific virtues, natural mental ability, contemplation, and the resulting intellectual and spiritual development.[557] As the Deuteronomic

[555] Philo, *Agr.*158.
[556] Philo, *Fug.*175.
[557] Philo, *Fug.*176. Geljon and Runia note the word used here for "plant", *kataphuteuō,* is rarely seen before the LXX, and that every usage of this word and its related *phuteuo* is examined by Philo. The majority of Philo's interpretations, however, construe *phuteuō/kataphuteuō* as an allegory for spiritual development, "progress toward perfection"; the interpretation in *Fug.*176 is the exception. See Albert C. Geljon and David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: On Planting*: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 85-87. Goodenough writes that the Israelites never reached these structures under Moses's leadership, and that this narrative

reference suggests, these qualities are provided *gratis*. This motif is continued in *Deus* 94-98, in which Philo interprets the same Deuteronomic passage as representative of virtues and their fruits.[558]

In *Plant*.62-72, Philo explains the Levite inheritance given in Deut 10:9. Here Philo begins to examine the priestly tradition, allegorically interpreting the passage to reveal that Levi represents detachment from materiality. Here, Philo carefully examines what it means to have God as a possession; "The tribe of Levi shall have no lot or portion among the children of Israel, for the Lord is their portion". Possession of the Lord, as Philo explains, is the sole preoccupation with God over material goods, or perhaps better the sole priority which is awarded to God above all else; "for who is at liberty to say 'God Himself is alone (and all) to me,' save one who has no welcome for aught that comes after him?".[559] It is the relationship between God and the devoted which is stressed here as a mode of possession; "that intimate association with the Uncreated, to possess Whom, they are convinced, is the only wealth, the only gauge of consummate happiness".

However, the non-Levites should also view God as their "possession". Much of Philo's writing concerns the idea of the family line as an inheritor of God, as in *Somn*.1.157-159, in which Philo analyzes Deut 10:9, "the Lord Himself is his inheritance", as a metaphorical treatment of God's great power.[560] In this passage, Philo connects Jacob's dream and the promise

---

represents an unattained, and possibly unattainable, goal; Erwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969), 220-221.

[558] See footnote 128 referencing *kataphuteuō/phuteuō*; the same observation applies to *Deus* 95-96 (Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 86). Philo is discussing the arrival of knowledge and virtue unlooked-for in comparison to fruitless labor. The virtues are compared to the cisterns and houses unbuilt and undug by the Israelites, but this is all in the greater context of an understanding of destiny, or predestination, as governing the virtues and who receives them. A footnote by Colson directs the reader to another discussion in *Sacr*.113-117, in which Philo asserts that moral effort is not wasted, even if the ultimate gain of virtue is never achieved (see footnote 128 again for Goodenough's interpretation). There is a connection between inebriation and gladness in *Deus* 96 (Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 259).

[559] *Plant*.64.

[560] In this passage the Deuteronomic reference is adduced to explain Yahweh's statement at the top of the stairway to heaven in Genesis 28:13 that he is "the Lord of God of Abraham thy father and the God of Isaac". In this way, as a

of inheritance. God is the inheritance of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *because* God is the creator and sustainer of all things. God is:

> standing over bodies, over souls, over doings, over words, over angels, over earth, over air, over sky, over powers descried by our senses, over invisible beings, yea all things seen and unseen: for having made the whole universe to depend on and cling to himself, He is the Charioteer of all that vast creation.[561]

The world is created, then, in such a way that God is intrinsically linked to it as Creator and Sustainer; a view of God and creation that encourages us to view both God and creation not in strictly sequential terms, but as interconnected within an existential system in real-time.[562] Philo continues: "For it is because He stablishes and holds it together that the system of created things remains strongly and mightily free of destruction".[563]

In *Somn.*1.159, Philo explains that the concept of inheritance is viewed not as a legal transaction but as a subset within a greater understanding of God as the "inheritance" of the world, insofar as the world is inescapably connected to God; in Philo's words:

> It clearly taught him that He Who is Lord and God of the universe is both Lord and God of his family, registered under both titles as held by father and grandfather, to the end that the

---

familial god, is "the Lord Himself his inheritance". It should be noted that this is not a priestly interpretation, in contrast with Leg.2.49-52.

[561] *Somn.*1.157. Here, Philo references *kubernētēs*, which will be seen again in a context of Deut 1-11 concepts of *musar/paideia*; here, it is God who might be said to be "training" the universe through providential care, rather than the confines of *musar/paideia*, within Deut 1-11, to God and Israel and/or parents and children.

[562] Wolfson remarks that *Leg.*1.2-5 teaches against a strictly temporal creation sequence; see Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.311.

[563] *Somn.*1.158.

world at large and the lover of virtue may have the same inheritance: for it has been said 'the Lord Himself is his inheritance'.[564]

It is noteworthy here that Philo distinguishes between the duality of God as the inheritance of the universe generally and Israel specifically, as his interpretation initially suggests; generally, as the inheritance of the world, generally, and specifically, as the lover of virtue. This is in keeping with what has been observed above concerning God as "Lord" and as "God"; one appellation denoting mastery, another denoting benevolent care.[565]

God's self-presentation as given in Deut 10:9 is explored in *Plant*.62-72 which carefully examines what it means to have God as a possession; "The tribe of Levi shall have no lot or portion among the children of Israel, for the Lord is their portion". The issue in *Plant*.62-72 is that of "having" versus "being". Possession of the Lord, as Philo explains, is the sole preoccupation with God over material goods, or perhaps better the sole priority which is awarded to God above all else; "for who is at liberty to say 'God Himself is alone (and all) to me,' save one who has no welcome for aught that comes after him?"[566] It is the relationship between God and the devoted which is stressed here as a mode of possession; "that intimate association with the Uncreated, to possess Whom, they are convinced, is the only wealth, the only gauge of consummate happiness". Philo further compares the "possession" of God to the possession of vineyards or the ability to paint portraits; not a relationship of control, but of benefit and principally if not wholly for the one who is in "possession" of the gift, although it might be

---

[564] *Somn*.1.159.

[565] Geljon and Runia note that in *Plant*.8 Philo introduces the Logos as an intermediary agent in God's sustenance of creation (Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 103); see also Runia for Platonic parallels; D. T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* (Kampen: VU Boekhandel, 1983), 1.180, 200, 205. For Goodenough this duality is pure mysticism, formulated as Sophia-Light and Logos-Powers (Goodenough, *Light*, 170); Wolfson interprets Philo's ἀρχάγγελον as "archangel" not κύριος ὁ θεὸς as is given in the LXX; see Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.378.

[566] *Plant*.64.

argued that the care of an owner benefits the vineyard just as the exercise of a gift ennobles the gift. These are not possessions, strictly, but rather faculties which certain individuals command. Here, Philo notes the importance of genuine lack of concern for worldly possessions among those who profess to be truly concerned with God above all.[567]

As seen above, Philo compares the "possession" of God to the possession of vineyards or the ability to paint portraits; not a relationship of control, but of benefit and principally if not wholly for the one who is in "possession" of the gift, although it might be argued that the care of an owner benefits the vineyard just as the exercise of a gift ennobles the gift. Painters, Philo claims, "possess" painting, that is, the art of painting, if they are skilled in their art. However, this can just as easily be articulated as an expression of *being*, in that a painter is in some way different than a non-painter. To characterize the art of painting as a "possession" allows for a metaphorical description of "having" rather than being, but it also leads to the question: what exactly is "painting"? Is it a faculty to be exercised and (possibly) acquired? Does it naturally and inescapably proceed from a certain type of being, or can anyone procure this faculty? These are not possessions, strictly, but rather faculties which certain individuals command. Here, Philo notes the importance of genuine lack of concern for worldly possessions among those who profess to be truly concerned with God above all.[568] Runia and Geljon comment on the

[567] David Winston considers the discussion of wisdom and adoption found in *Sobr*.55-57 in this context; note the relationship between familial adoption and the close proximity of artistic gifts with those who possess them. See David Winston, *Philo of Alexandria: The Contemplative Life, The Giants, and Selections* (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), 243. See also Goodenough, *Light,* 302; for the applicability of God as possession according to both the subjective mind and the Universal Logos see ibid. 388. As a mystical attachment to God see David Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati, OH: HUC Press, 1985), 54.

[568] David Winston considers the discussion of wisdom and adoption found in *Sobr*.55-57 in this context; note the relationship between familial adoption and the close proximity of artistic gifts with those who possess them. Winston, *Contemplative*, 243. See also Goodenough, *Light,* 302; for the applicability of God as possession according to both the subjective mind and the Universal Logos see ibid. 388. As a mystical attachment to God see Winston, *Logos,* 54.

intersection of these issues; "the Levite represents the mind that has been completely purified and rejects all that belongs to the world of becoming. This soul knows God only".[569]

This problem is more dramatically highlighted when we consider what Philo uses this metaphor to explain - an allegory of the mind purified that knows only God. Does this mind possess God? Yes - as a painter "possesses" painting. However, God is an entity, while "painting" is a faculty. An exact correspondence is not possible; the easiest interpretation of the two metaphors is the ontological one. Somehow a painter is not the same type of entity as the non-painter, as the mind that is purified is not the same type of entity as the mind that is not purified. Philo is here discussing change and differentiation. There is of course a necessary distinction to be made between the purified mind "possessing" God, but in actuality becoming something else; and the purified mind "becoming" God. Philo makes clear elsewhere that this is not the case: *Leg*.3.100, *Somn*.1.148, *Abr*.122.[570]

In *Spec*.1.131, Philo explains Deut 10:9 as a concise, poetic description of the priesthood's freedom from concerns of mundane provision and its concomitant ability to focus exclusively on spiritual matters.[571] This is further explored in *Fug*.100-102, where Philo again incorporates Deut 10:9 in a discourse which connects the cities of refuge from unintentional crime to the priesthood's freedom from unintentional offence; they exist within the temple not as refugees, but as rightful recipients of God. Birnbaum writes that these cities are linked to a five-fold conception of Powers; like "God" and "Lord", these are aspects or qualities of God with

---

[569] Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 180.

[570] Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 183; Ellen Birnbaum, *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes*, BJS 290 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 79-90; *Plant.*64, 67. See also Winston, *Contemplative*, 33-35, and *Logos*; also Goodenough, *Light*, and Marin R. Niehoff, "What is in a Name? Philo's Mystical Philosophy of Language", *JSQ* 2:3 (1995): 220-252.

[571] See Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 190; this is a specifically liturgical description of the priesthood, a departure from the allegorical treatment we have seen above, which Geljon and Runia credit to "the different purpose of the scriptural commentary in the Exposition of the Law".

which humanity may interact.[572] In *Congr*.168-171, the unleavened bread of the priesthood is explained through Deut 8:1-3, which communicated man's need to rely upon God for sustenance, not only material provender. Philo is interpreting the six cities of refuge as represented by six figures within the sanctuary; 1) tablet 1; 2) tablet 2; 3) the ark lid; 4 and 5) the two cherubim atop the ark; and 6) the invisible presence of Yahweh. The sanctuary is the holiest place; those who have unintentionally fallen are granted a place in the cities of refuge. The symbolic resonances indicate that they are not entirely dismissed from the life of the sanctuary. This reference is used to explain the prohibition on leaven and honey to the altar of sacrifice, as they are reminiscent of bodily pleasures in excess of what is required to feed the body. These pleasures, according to Philo, are "profane and unholy" compared to unleavened bread which is like the manna provided in the Deuteronomic excerpt. For Runia, this Philonic passage echoes Plato's comments on epistemology and cosmology in (respectively) *Phaedrus* 247a.7 and *Timaeus* 29e.1-2; with Plato, Philo affirms that the divine has "no room for a grudging or envious spirit".[573] Runia also makes the connection between Philo's interpretation in *Congr*.168-171 and its ramifications for theodicy as seen not only in *De providentia* but also Jewish wisdom literature "though it is there expressed in terms less influenced by Greek and Roman philosophy".[574]

In *Virt*.161-174, Philo references God's beneficence and power to provide an instructional reading of Deut 8:11-18.[575] The passage is a warning against arrogance in the larger setting of

---

[572] Birnbaum, *Judaism*, 265, 271; also Joan E. Taylor and David M. Hay, *Philo of Alexandria: On the Contemplative Life*: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 129; Winston, *Contemplative*, 24. Pieter W. van der Horst notes that the word used in *Fug.*100 to describe the "places of refuge", *phugadeuteria*, is also found in *In Flaccum* 159 to describe a place of banishment; see *Philo of Alexandria: Philo's Flaccus - The First Pogrom: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 229.

[573] Runia, *Philo/Timaeus*, 109.

[574] Runia, *Philo/Timaeus*, 112. Philo also places high priority on the rituals of Judaism, especially the Sabbath rites, not only because of the inherent virtue of scriptural obedience when one performs the rites, but for their spiritual benefits, providing real yet invisible good for the practitioner. See Jutta Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 293-295.

[575] Colson identifies *Virt.*163-174 as a homily on Deut 8:11; footnote (b), Philo, *Virt.*162 (LCL 341: Colson, trans.), 264.

agricultural harvest laws as detailed in Lev 19:23-24, Deut 20:19, Deut 22:10, and Deut 25:4. Here, Philo notes that while arrogance is present in the insignificant or common, it grows to much more dangerous proportions in the great. As a remedy Philo reminds the reader of Deut 8:18, which exhorts the Israelites to "make power" when God has "[given] them strength". This follows from the warning passages that describe an Israel which, after having grown secure, has also grown arrogant. The "making power" is the response to wealth and good fortune which most imitates God's own power, "that a man should imitate God as much as may be and leave nothing undone that may promote such assimilation as is possible", but Philo's specific observation is that the making of power is a gratitude response, as the greatness of the arrogant, the "vigor and robustness", is really a gift that follows a "natural weakness, the weakness that was his before he enjoyed the gift of God". Philo is discoursing here on pride, and interprets the Deuteronomic passages as exhortations against the excesses of arrogance. Philo also comments that it is the powerful who are particularly susceptible to pride, and that Deuteronomy instructs the powerful to create more "power" - possibilities, opportunities, improvements of life - rather than use their power to the detriment of others. Remembrance of God is in this, as in all things, the key to success and avoiding arrogance.[576] As with bribery, warnings against arrogance are important elements of the wisdom tradition.[577] Philo has here used Deut 8:18 as a secondary lemma to explain and elaborate his allegorical explanation of harvest laws.

Therefore, for Philo, the Deuteronomic texts that describe God's material providence for Israel is an opportunity to engage in allegorical exegesis. The text's emphasis of provision of

[576] Philo, *Virt.*165, 168. Geljon and Runia note the more negative interpretation of Deut 8:11 found in *Agr.*169-173 and *Sacr.*55-56 (Albert C. Geljon and David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: On Cultivation: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 258; the ontological dimensions are further noted in *Virt.*162's discussion concerning disease (Taylor/Hay, *Contemplative*, 114); Walter T. Wilson interprets the passage in view of Plato's ideal state (Walter T. Wilson, *Philo of Alexandria: On Virtues: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 341-343; similarly, see Francesca Calabi, *God's Acting, Man's Acting: Tradition and Philosophy in Philo of Alexandria*, SPhA 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 191.

[577] Prov 16:5, 18; 21:24; 29:23.

material goods becomes a chance to create an allegory in which the material goods of Israel, provided graciously by God, represent the intangible virtue that awaits those who have *God* for a possession. This is theologizing in consistent step with Philo's trend to stress God's nature and characteristics whenever possible. Philo's God-centered focus naturally leads to the question, what more do you need than God? This sentiment is of course not foreign to Deuteronomy in broad strokes, but here we see how covenantal love language and material provision have become translated into more complex, philosophical terms, enabled by Philo's involvement with Hellenistic philosophy.

5.2. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: The Ordered Cosmos

Philo also appears to engage with an important wisdom theme, the orderly world, in *Mos*.1.210-212. However, this will not be the case, and instead a text resonant with wisdom themes will be interpreted theologically, as a meditation of the nature of God. In this passage, Philo continues to analyze the rock motif also explored in *Somn*.2.219-229. According to F.H. Colson, Philo alludes to Deut 8:15 as he describes Moses "under inspiration" striking "a steep rock".[578] This is accomplished by the seemingly miraculous means of Moses's staff cracking or breaking the rock, but Philo continues to note that the world is comprised of many more impressive occurrences which are no less "miraculous": the heavens, planets, stars, sunlight, the earth in space, landmasses, animals, plants, seas, rivers, and streams.[579] This sort of descriptive list is largely congruous with the Gen 1-2 creation narratives, but also recalls Solomon's

[578] See footnote (c), Philo, *Mos*.1.210 (LCL: Colson, trans.), 385.
[579] For Lincicum, this depiction of Moses is in keeping with Philo's view of Moses in Deuteronomy as "king, high priest, legislator, and prophet" and is echoed in Qumran materials. See Lincicum, *Paul*, 105-106.

knowledge of animals and plants.[580] This passage provides knowledge of God's omnipotence, both in creation and sustenance of the universe. The figure of Solomon, renowned for his wisdom, perhaps here informed Philo's digression on the miracles of natural wonders as also Job 38-41. More likely, however, it is a commentary on the Genesis creation sequence and its miraculous character.

Philo's presentations of the created order, then, bear strong resemblances to wisdom traditions, especially in regards to Solomon's wisdom and Job 38-41. However, also as before, Philo does not place his own work within these parameters as might, for example, Ben Sira. Rather, Philo here engages in allegorical interpretation, to provide a philosophical reading of the Jewish scriptures. This orderly world, overseen by God, is not limited to humans, presumably animals, and inanimate objects. *Spec*.1.299-304 mentions an invisible realm populated by angelic beings, which also lies outside the realm of mankind's immediate influence. In *Spec*.1.299-304, Philo considers the phrase "the heaven of heaven", as related in a footnote to Deut 10:14 "the heaven and the heaven of heavens" as indicative of the heaven that can only be perceived by sense which he places alongside the heaven which is not perceivable by the senses:

> Do you not know that to God belongs both the heaven perceived by sense and that known to thought alone, which may quite properly be called the "heaven of heaven", again the earth and its contents and all the universe, both the visible and the invisible and immaterial, the pattern of the visible?[581]

[580] 1 Kgs 4:33.
[581] *Spec*.1.302.

Further, *Spec.* features Philo's interpretive method with respect to the delineation of the mind, the senses, and their proper relationship to each other and to God. In *Spec*.1.13-20, Philo observes the belief that planets are actually gods, and contrasts this to the actual presence of God immaterial and invisible; this division he compares to the division of the mind and senses; "just as sense is the servitor of mind, so too all the beings perceived by sense are the ministers of Him who is perceived by the mind".[582]

So here also, when dealing with what is perhaps the quintessential wisdom theme of the orderly world, Philo does not take the establishment of the principle as permission to delineate practical ways that this regularity might be put to good use. Instead, it becomes yet another opportunity to meditate upon God, by way of contrast with the created order.

5.3. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Widows and Orphans

When Philo interprets Deut 1-11 in his writings with a focus on wisdom concerns as opposed to allegorical interpretation, he exclusively discusses the theme of caring for widows and orphans, which for Philo, by extension, encompasses all those in poverty. This principle, to provide assistance for the most vulnerable of society, is found in Ben Sira but has little attestation in other wisdom writings. It may be said, then, that Philo only minimally interacts with wisdom teachings in his use of Deut 1-11. This is likely due to Philo's all-encompassing involvement with Greek philosophy and literary analysis, the source of his allegorical technique. When Philo engages with *sophia* or *phronēsis*, it is not the practical wisdom teachings that interest him but the complex Greek philosophy, and philosophical theology, that he seeks to reconcile with Jewish scripture. It is unsurprising, then, that when these wisdom ideas do appear

[582] *Spec*.1.17.

in his writings, they emerge in areas notably absent from the Greek world, i.e., the moral duty to care for the less fortunate. Nor does his use of Deut 1-11 compel him to engage with wisdom teachings, for he continues to rely upon other passages from Deut 1-11 in a secondary manner as has been seen thus far.

In *Spec*.1.307-310, Philo revisits the idea of the titles "God" and "Lord" as respectively indicative of God's creative power and his active ruling and reigning creation, in a passage which Colson notes is drawn from Deut 10:17. Philo continues to comment on this passage to emphasize God's transcendent power, which he connects to human piety in what is perhaps the most transactional passage seen thus far. In *Spec*.1.308-311, Philo interprets Deut 10:21 as implying the priority of God among those who most surprisingly are benefitted by God; the immigrant, the orphan, the widow, for whom God provides because they have no other means of sustenance, but also in whom there is a corresponding love of God and reliance upon him. Widows, orphans, and the poor, who have lost their natural protectors and livelihood, are not denied piety and therefore rely upon God as their benefactor and protector.

This passage also links God's power and authority to the degree of his existence, or that God is the most "existent" of all that exists. It is this aspect of God which, Philo suggests, makes him God: "and great He is - *being existent* - and strong and mighty".[583] Further, Philo makes this assertion as part of a reminder that God takes special notice of the destitute and downtrodden. As Colson notes, this is an extended meditation on Deut. 10:18, where God is characterized thus: "the maker of justice for the convert and the orphan and the widow, and he loves the convert, giving him food and clothing".[584] Whereas, according to Philo, God takes special care of the convert because "they have crossed over to piety in whole-hearted love of simplicity and truth",

[583] *Spec*.1.307.
[584] Footnote (a), Philo, *Spec.*1.308 (LCL 320: trans. Colson), 278.

the widows and orphans warrant special consideration "because they have lost their protectors ... and in this desolation no refuge remains that men can give". In this second case, then, Philo asserts that those who have undergone a change in their conditions receive the same consideration from God as those who have made conscious decisions to serve and follow God.

To sum up, care for widows and orphans is a wisdom teaching found in Ben Sira and other Second Temple writings.[585] Here, Philo provides a philosophical connection between concerns for widows and orphans in the wisdom teachings and his own theological explorations. He does so to fill a void created in the Greek world, within which was very little care for the less fortunate. This is the only wisdom teaching given in Deut 1-11, and for that matter the wisdom traditions in general, with which Philo interacts in the context of Deut 1-11. This is likely for two reasons: first, when Philo discusses *sophia* or *phronēsis*, he is more concerned with Greek philosophy and philosophical theology than the practical teachings of the Jewish scriptures; and second, his exclusive use of Deut 1-11 in a secondary manner prevents him from exhaustively engaging those elements present in the text.

5.4. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Rightful Judges and Law

Philo's thoughts on widows and orphans do lead, however, to another area of interest for Philo: that of the law. As we have seen, the right use of law, and the ethical action of judges, is an established and important wisdom concern. As is so often the case, Deut 1-11 passages concerning justice become, for Philo, not occasions to ruminate on the practicality of proper administration of wise adjudication, but to depict the spirituality of these passages by way of allegorical interpretation.

[585] Sir 4:10; 35:14-15.

It should be noted, however, that Philo's treatment of the law in context of Deut 1-11 must be viewed in light of the historical trends, in his own life and his involvement with Rome, that as we have seen shape the development of his writing. Philo, like his contemporary Josephus, will eventually present an argument for the excellence of Moses's laws, not only in a philosophical sense but as a practical code to be implemented in *everyone's* lives, not just the Jews. Before Philo, Jewish writers had promoted the law as an excellent rival, or equal, to the laws of the surrounding nations.[586] But the idea that the law is superior to the laws of the nations is new and likely a response to Rome's own claims of innovation.[587] While Rome is often seen as a great borrower of culture, notably from the Greeks, the excellence and innovation of the Roman legal system may be observed in the abundance of ancient claimants who sought redress, when possible, not in their own courts but in those of Rome due to the established superiority of Roman justice.[588] With this in mind, it is easy to see Philo's response as a historically influenced decision to promote the Jewish laws in such a way as to allow competition to continue even when the culture of dominance began to assert itself in a previously untried area of contention. Never before had a law code been so well regarded that other people sought it out as a regulative mechanism, nor had any Jew argued for their law to be implemented by others in a practical and specific legal sense.

It must also be remembered that this discussion belongs to Philo's later period when he—perhaps uncoincidentally—engages with legal specifics in works which present philosophical viewpoints that are congenial to Roman Stoicism and its adherents. In such a milieu that prioritizes practicalities of life, Philo's comments and beliefs concerning the details of Jewish

[586] Artapanus, Eupolemus, Aristobulus; see Katell Berthelot, "The Superiority and Universality of Torah in Philo's *Life of Moses* 2.12-24: The Significance of the Roman Context", *JSQ* 29/3 (2022), 220.
[587] Berthelot, "Superiority and Universality", 224.
[588] Berthelot, "Superiority and Universality", 231-232.

law must have found not only a receptive audience but could, possibly for the first time, meaningfully compete with the legal code of another nation. Philo's interpretation of Deut 1-11, however, belongs to his earlier period, as is reasonable given that the law found in that textual pericope is not casuistic but apodeictic and, while ripe for philosophical consideration, cannot be easily implemented as a practical code with penalties and punishments. Therefore we will find throughout that Philo's engagement with Deut 1-11 remains philosophical and allegorical. Yet this allegorical emphasis should not be seen as a substitute for the "ceremonial" law, as Philo always emphasizes; even when not specifically advocating for its adoption among all peoples, Philo uniformly recommends observance of Jewish ritual and practice.[589]

This discourse continues within the same text, but Philo shifts his interpretive focus to Deut 4:2 in *Spec*.4.143-148. This passage is an extended meditation on the perfection of the law, which motivates the divine command that the law be left unaltered (Deut 4:2).[590] According to Philo, this naturally proceeds from the understanding that, if the law is given in perfection, any alteration must compromise that perfection. An addition or subtraction, then, must be unjust. Yet Philo continues to compare the law, in its perfection, to the virtues which Philo claims are similarly perfect. Courage, if changed from its moderated ideal, becomes cowardice or rashness; piety likewise becomes superstition or impiety.[591] Again, it is not obedience which is specifically examined here, but the law as a sort of virtue, the possession of which ennobles the practitioner. That pure obedience is not the focus can be seen from Philo's emphasis on the

[589] See Yedidya Etzion, "Philo's Jewish Law: Uncovering the Foundations of a Second-Temple System of Jewish Law" (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley), 27.
[590] This is an example of Philo's frequently straightforward exegesis, as opposed to his allegorizing; see Lincicum, *Paul*, 108.
[591] *Spec*. 4.146-147. Birnbaum and Dillon attribute Philo's selection of these virtues (courage and piety) to an intentional emphasis of virtues in relation to God and to other people. See Ellen Birnbaum and John Dillon, *Philo of Alexandria: On the Life of Abraham: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 398. The underlying framework is Aristotelian, as Wolfson notes (*Philo*, 2.273).

transformative aspects of the law, as well as his comparison of it to virtue as considered in the abstract.

This is perhaps most clearly shown in *Spec*.4.176-182 and Philo's interpretation of Deut 10:17-18, which may also be viewed as a commentary on the law.[592] Here, Philo's emphasis is upon the right action of the judge, hearing the cases of the poor and powerless with impartiality, and the virtuous use of the law—as enacted by the virtuous—rather than the demands of the law itself. Yet in two ways, the demands of the law and the expected obedience are qualified; first, the comparison of the widows, orphans, and strangers with the "Jewish race" itself, and the position of the Jews as bereft of support amongst the nations; second, God's refusal to forsake Israel—even if they are disobedient—but also that, while the presence of sinfulness, generally speaking, is not enough to disqualify Israel from God's care, there is a degree of sinfulness among individuals that serves as a marker of God's displeasure and, in the case of that individual, vulnerability to God's anger.[593] *Spec*.4.176-182 may appear at odds with the earlier passage *Spec.*1.308-309; Birnbaum suggests as much, noting that 1.308-309 differentiates between the active compliance of the proselyte vs. the vulnerable condition of the orphans and widows, whereas 4.176-182 views them as both equally deserving of merciful treatment. However, the emphasis in 1.308-309 is actually upon God, with sojourners, widows, and orphans alike treated

---

[592] Philo views the Decalogue as divided into commandments pertaining to God and commandments pertaining to humanity; he differentiates also, when interpreting other portions of Deut, between the divine apodeictic law of the Decalogue and the Mosaic casuistic law of Deut 12-26. Qumran materials often harmonize these discrepancies, attributing all Deuteronomic law to God. See Lincicum, *Paul*, 107.

[593] By qualifying the inherent value of Jewishness, the importance of proselytes/God-fearers is emphasized; see Birnbaum/Dillon, *Abraham*, 316. Taylor and Hay note the "almost alchemical" comparison of country villas and cities regarding *epimixia* in *Contempl.* 20; this word, used in *Spec*. 179 to indicate the "intercourse" of the nations apart from Israel, brings an interpretive emphasis away from performative justice and attained status, and invites the reader to consider the nations vs. Israel *per se*, an unusual departure from the focus on nationally unspecific virtue (Taylor/Hay, *Contemplative*, 165). However, Walter T. Wilson emphasizes the performative dimension of this passage (Wilson, *Virtues*, 7, 384-385). Also note that Philo asserts a contrary sentiment - that all nations know and respect the Mosaic law - in *Mos.* 2.17, 2.43 (John W. Martens, *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*, SPhAMA 2 (Leiden: Brill,2003), 98), as well as the ambivalence between Mosaic and natural law (ibid. 103). David Winston nuances the discussion, writing that the merits of the fathers benefit the descendants unless they mar their benefit through sin (Winston, *Logos*, 40).

as instances in which God's attribute of mercy is demonstrated. Philo's purpose in 1.308-309 is not to highlight the differences between sojourners and widows/orphans, but as in 4.176-182 to address their treatments as evidences of God's character.[594]

In *Her*.157-160, this same sentiment is examined through the exegesis of Deut 1:17, exploring why it is that the seemingly lowly should be awarded an unbiased trial. Here, Philo considers what the law suggests—that those who seem insignificant are not—and that it would be unjust to disregard them because the weak are, in reality, as important as those who appear strong. This is implied from Deut 1:17, but Philo investigates the moral presuppositions which underlie the text:

For He [God] judged equally about the little and the great, to use Moses' words when He generated and shaped each thing ... For all craftsmen of repute, whatever materials they use, whether they be costly or of the cheapest, wish so to use them, that their work will be worthy of praise. In fact people have been known to produce a higher class of work with the cheaper than with the more costly substances; their feeling for beauty wasenhanced and by additional science they wished to compensate for inferiority of material. But with God no kind of material is held in honour, and therefore He bestowed upon them all the same art ... Now God praised not the material which He had used for His work, material soul-less, discordant and dissoluble, and indeed in itself, perishable, irregular, unequal, but He praised the works of His own art, which were consummated through a single exercise of power equal and uniform, and through knowledge ever one and the same.[595]

[594] For more information see Birnbaum, *Judaism*, chapter 6, "Proselytes in Relation to God, Jews, and Israel", 193-219.
[595] *Her*. 157-160.

The value in each person, then, is derived not from the circumstances of their situation, but from the identity of God in the making. Because God has made all people, they are to be equally valued, even if one appears lesser than another.[596] Here Philo has used the idea of craftsmanship as a metaphor to describe God's good intentions when creating the universe, including humans. Winston and Dillon note that this excerpt (*Her.*157-160) supports the view that Philo did not espouse a doctrine of *ex nihilo* creation, but rather God (roughly speaking) as Shaper of pre-existent matter.[597] Opposing Wolfson in this, they cite *Spec.*1.266 as further evidence: "For nothing is made as to disappear into nonexistence; whence it came in the beginning, thither will it return in the end".[598]

In *Spec*.4.70-71, Philo again interprets Deut 1:17 by providing a detailed elaboration on the verse. The identities of the litigants, according to Philo, are to be forgotten as much as possible by the judge, who is to make a ruling only with respect to "the nature of the facts in their naked simplicity".[599] In *Spec*.4.136-142 there is a special problem originating from Philo's reading of Deut 6:6-8 in the LXX; due to this, of the three interpretations he gives we need only concern ourselves with the first and second.[600] In the first, Philo stresses the importance of internalizing the laws, not merely knowing them; in the second, he also notes the importance of action as an expression of approval. Philo then describes at length the character of those whose

---

[596] Regarding the goodness of the *work* see Calabi, *God's Acting*, 155-156

[597] Roughly, as in reality this work would have been accomplished by demiurgic Powers.

[598] Winston/Dillon, *Contemplative*, 12, 98. The Logos is an exception; see Goodenough, *Light*, 341. Runia notes that in the Jewish writings "no explicit motivation , whether pronounced by God himself or deduced by the writer, is given for the creative act", and that Gen 1:31 is very seldom used by Philo, suggesting that subsequent teaching traditions focused on the act of creation itself rather than divine intentions. See Runia, *Philo/Timaeus*, 107.

[599] *Spec*. 71. Pieter W. van der Horst notes that Philo often uses *allotrion* and *xenos* to indicate a distinctly lower class from a citizen; these words do not however appear in the LXX Deut 1:17 (van der Horst, *Flaccus*, 155). Related are issues of exemplarity as Birnbaum and Dillon note concerning Abraham as a perfect expression of the law (Birnbaum/Dillon, *Abraham*, 398). Philo's conception of courage here is Stoic in origin (Wilson, *Virtues*, 99). Folker Siegert attributes Philo's conception of faith as a virtue to "a very Hellenistic perspective"; Folker Siegert, "Philo and the New Testament", in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. Adam Kamesar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 209.

[600] This concerns a variant of the LXX, in which "frontlet" is given as "unshaken". Colson's footnote observes that Philo's comment "shaking before the eyes" indicates a misreading of the usual LXX rendering.

identities are suffused with the nature of the law, so that "if some less courageous spirit hesitates through modesty and is slow to come near to learn", the virtuous one should "go himself and pour into his ears as into a conduit a continuous flood of instruction until the cisterns of the soul are filled".[601] Again, this shows Philo's predilection to discuss the laws with respect to their impartation of virtue and the effect they have on the character of the pious, not in a transactional or contractual sense.[602]

5.5. Philo and Deut 1-11—Wisdom: Conclusion

So in sum, Philo's engagement with wisdom themes within Deut 1-11 is almost entirely allegorical. Material provision, the orderly cosmos, the rule of law—these themes are all transformed from their practical emphases within their original Deuteronomic contexts, and given new life as allegorical excursions describing the nature and characteristics of God. Only in the case of the theme of widows and orphans does Philo suspend his usual practice, presumably to address a real social need in the Alexandria of his day.

5.6. Excursus: Immortality

A prominent wisdom theme in Deut 1-11 is long life as a reward for obedience. For Philo, however, this concern becomes transmuted into speculations on the nature of immortality. This is a significant theme not only for Philo but for other Second Temple Jewish authors as well

---

[601] *Spec*. 4.140. For an all-inclusive interpretation of *dogmata* and *theōrēmata* see Naomi G. Cohen, *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse*, BEATAJ 24 (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1995), 203 note 3.

[602] Mental apprehension of the law is linked to obedience, in that an expected outcome of immersion within the law is a natural affinity for its principles; this is, however, a type of "natural" or "ontological" obedience, that which proceeds from the entity rather than a set of external actions adopted by the entity. See Wolfson, *Philo*, 2.260.

as the Hellenistic world at large; as such, I will address this idea in its own section, while acknowledging its origins, for Jewish authors, in the wisdom traditions.[603]

In several passages within his works, Philo interprets Deut 4:4 as promising a type of immortality to the virtuous. In *Fug*.55-57, an allegorized figure of "Consideration" instructs the narrator that there is a type of life which is separate from the physical life of the body; "bad people, prolonging their days to extreme old age, are dead men deprived of the life in association with virtue, while good people, even if cut off from their partnership with the body, live for ever, and are granted immortality".[604] According to Philo this affirms Deut 4:4, "Ye that did cleave unto the Lord your God are alive all of you at this day", which states that those who cleave to God possess this virtuous immortality. Philo also discusses immortality in *Spec*.1.31, and here returns to Deut 4:4 but in the context of anti-idolatry and sealing of the holy, "a thrice-happy and thrice-blessed life, to cling lovingly to the service of the most ancient Cause of all", a "true life" which "stands inscribed on the tables of nature as deathless and agelong".[605] Much later in the same work, Philo equates knowledge of God with immortality; "But we, the scholars and disciples of Moses, will not forgo our quest of the Existent, holding that the knowledge of Him is the consummation of happiness. It is also agelong life".[606] This life is available to those who cleave to God, and Philo directly contrasts this to the godless who are "dead in soul" by stating in no uncertain terms "those who have taken service in the ranks of the God Who only is are alive,

---

[603] Immortality is important for other authors in this study and is discussed under their respective headings when relevant.

[604] *Fug*.55. Birnbaum and Dillon mention this passage in the context of *Abr*.99, as another example of Philo having "heard" other interpretations; they note that the *Fug*. reference "appears to be metaphorical", but in our opinion given the personification of Consideration to whom Philo attends, and the clear allusions to Proverbs 1-9 through the invocation of Lady Wisdom (in this case, Lady Consideration), gives the *Fug*. passage much more than an appearance of metaphor. See Birnbaum/Dillon, *Abraham*, 242; but also see Taylor/Hay, *Contemplative*, 69, for the argument that "Consideration", or *Skepsis*, is a woman's name and that Philo consulted a female philosopher regarding this issue, who possibly even served as a chief teacher or leader among the Therapeutae (ibid., 309). Birnbaum notes the use of *hiketikos*, "suppliant" for any proselyte to Judaism, not just ethnic Israel (*Spec.* 1.309, 2.118; Birnbaum, *Judaism*, 107).

[605] *Spec*.1.31.

[606] *Spec*.1.344.

and that life can never die".[607] Here Philo does not only mean a sort of healthy yet finite life, imbued with virtue, but immortality. Again, in the original Deuteronomic context the passage is enmeshed within a larger structure which includes inheritance of the land and obedience to the laws and statutes, and all of this as part of a greater covenantal framework. Philo, however, interprets this verse as revealing the benefits of a philosophical quest for God, which certainly includes but is not limited to the writings of Torah.

Heraclides of Pontus, an early Hellenistic philosopher, also discusses immortality and writes that the soul is comprised of "material" which is synonymous with light; an intangible material, "not subject to the strictures of alterability, and perishability, that were characteristic of sublunary substances", but a material nonetheless, and an immortal material at that.[608] However, this immortality is not necessarily linked to sentience, as an excerpt from Diogenes Laertius demonstrates. In this passage, Heraclides relates an anecdote concerning Pythagoras: that:

> he had once been born Aethalides and was believed to be a son of Hermes, and that Hermes told him to choose anything he wished except immortality. So he requested that while living and while dead he might hold a memory of what happened [to him]. Thus in his life he remembered everything, and when he died he retained the same memory ... and [Pythagoras] told ... of the wandering of his soul ... and in how many plants and animals it came to be present, and how many things his soul suffered in Hades, and what the other souls endure.[609]

---

[607] *Spec*.1.345.

[608] See John Dillon, *The Heirs of Plato: A Study of the Old Academy (347-274 BC)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 213-214. See also Plutarch, *Whether "Live Unknown" is a wise Maxim* 6 1130B (*BT* v.6, fasc. 2, p.221.18-222.2 Pohlenz-Westman) as given in Peter Stork, Jan van Ophuijsen, and Susan Prince, *Heraclides of Pontus: Texts and Translation*, ed. Eckart Schütrumpf (Oxford: Routledge, 2017), 121; "Some of the philosophers believe the soul itself is light in its substance ..." followed by a lengthy conclusion that, as all people naturally hate the dark, it follows that the soul is composed of light.

[609] Peter Stork, Jan van Ophuijsen, and Susan Prince, *Heraclides of Pontus: Texts and Translation*, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities XIV, ed. Eckart Schütrumpf (Oxford: Routledge, 2017), 167.

However, this is not really the same thing as what Philo interprets above as immortality; this is more of an immortal *memory*, an ability to remember the events of previous lives. This anecdote presupposes the immortality of the soul, and the existence of reincarnation or transmigration of souls; the unusual gift which Pythagoras receives is the ability to remember those previous incarnations.[610] Nor is there any connection of virtuous action or living with this gift; the excerpt from Diogenes does not tell us why exactly Pythagoras received this special gift, although it would not be excessive to assume that the paternal bond between Hermes and Pythagoras motivated the favor.

Cicero's *The Dream of Scipio* also provides evidence of a Heraclidean understanding of the soul; the source of the text is likely Heraclides.[611] This text demonstrates a view of the cosmos, and the soul's place within it, roughly contemporary with Philo (slightly before his career) and thus is likely indicative of a prevalent view during Philo's life. In *Scipio* we find that while it is the condition of the soul in the afterlife that is emphasized, as well as the rewards which await the righteous, we find that the element of reincarnation and metempsychosis present in other Heraclidean accounts is also present here, as is given in *De re publica* 6.12:

---

[610] Concerning fragments of Heraclitus and the transmigration of souls see Iamblichus, *On the Soul* 26 378 (1, 4-11 Finamore-Dillon) as given in Stork/Ophuijsen/Prince, *Heraclides: Texts*, 123; "Now another school of the Platonists ... positing that the soul is always in a body ... has it migrate out of lighter bodies back into hard shelled bodies ... it arrives back into a solid body at various times from various regions of the universe. Heraclides Ponticus marked off these regions around the Milky Way ... from which, then, the souls come down here".

[611] See Inna Kupreeva, "Heraclides' *On Soul* (?) and Its Various Readers", in *Heraclides of Pontus*, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities XV, eds. William W. Fortenbaugh and Elizabeth Pender (London: Transaction Publishers, 2009), 111; see also U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 vols, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt; 1955).

For nothing of all that is done on earth is more pleasing to that supreme God who rules the whole universe than the assemblies and gatherings of men associated in justice, which are called States. Their rulers and preservers come from that place, and to that place they return.[612]

The text is ambiguous regarding "that place", whether it is "the heavens" or the "assemblies and gatherings", but it is clear that whichever place is referenced by Cicero, it is both the origin point and the destination of virtuous souls. Further, it is defense of the commonwealth, "all those who have preserved, aided, or enlarged their fatherland", which defines virtue for these souls in *Dream of Scipio*. For Philo virtue is defined very differently, again in Deut 4:4, "Ye that did cleave unto the Lord your God are alive all of you at this day".

For Philo, the very fact of immortality is not to be taken for granted as the *status quo*. It must be "granted", as the above excerpt from *Fug.* indicates, and it is granted to the virtuous. Further, it is not a bodily immortality, but an intangible persistence of the soul. Nor is there any mention of reincarnation or transmigration in the Philonic excerpt. But it seems that Philo considers these souls as retaining their memories and knowledge, as did Pythagoras, leaving us with the conclusion that whereas for Pythagoras the special gift was the ability to retain memories of his soul's successive physical embodiments, for Philo the gift is the possession of an immortal soul at all, or better an *independent* soul able to exist apart from the body and capable of doing so upon the death of the body. Note also that Philo does not speculate in detail about this existence, but remains within the bounds of the text he exegetes.[613] This is an unusual show of restraint for Philo, whose allegorical techniques often allow him to introduce subject matter

[612] LCL 213: trans. Clinton W. Keyes.

[613] Visions of otherworlds are not uncommon in the classical corpus, and are often depicted in Heraclitus's alleged works. For the possibility of such visions see Proclus, *Commentary on Plato's* Republic (*BT* v. 2, p. 121.24-122.21 Kroll), from Stork/Ophuijsen/Prince, *Heraclides: Texts*, 131;

from far afield; it should be noticed, however, that this subject matter is always depicted in terms of abstract virtue, not the specific features of a world beyond.[614]

Goodenough attributes the use of *aphtharsian*, "immortality", in *Fug*.56 to Orphic influence, citing Wis 2:23 and *Sib.Or.*frag.3 lines 17 and 34.[615] The inclusion of *Sib.Or.*, however, is weakened by the descriptions of immortality as pertaining to God and the unique ontology of God which provides immortality, not the means by which humanity may attain immortality; regarding this means, the *Oracles* are in accord with the Jewish Scriptures and thus cannot be used to conclude the presence of an influence apart from Philo's Jewish traditions. *Sib.Or.*1.50-53 gives, "The Immortal became angry with them (Adam and Eve) and expelled them from the place of immortals. For it had been decreed that they remain in a mortal place, since they had not kept the command of the great immortal God, and attended to it".[616] Similarly, 1.80-84, "But Hades received them. They called it Hades, since Adam first went there having tasted death, and earth covered him. Therefore all men who are born on earth are said to go to the House of Hades". 2:150-153: "This is the gate of life and entry into immortality which the heavenly God appointed as reward of victory for most righteous men. But they, when they receive the crown, will pass through this in glory". These references support Philo's belief that immortality is a reward for the virtuous, and does not include reincarnation/transmigration. *Sib.Or.*2.221-226 digresses from these themes:

---

[614] Philo's exact convictions concerning reincarnation are currently debated: for an excellent bibliography and important recent study see Sami Yli-Karjaanmaa, *Reincarnation in Philo of Alexandria*, SPhiloM 7 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015). It must be noted that regardless of the conclusions drawn from an analysis of immortality and reincarnation in Philo's *entire* corpus, for methodological purposes we restrict ourselves to Philo's exegesis of Deuteronomy 1-11.

[615] Goodenough, *Light*, 337.

[616] All references to *Sib.Or.*from *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, ed. James H. Charlesworth (London: Dartman, Longman and Todd, 1983), 316-472.

Then the heavenly one will give souls and breath and voice to the dead and bones fastened with all kinds of joinings ... flesh and sinews and veins and skin about the flesh, and the former hairs. Bodies of humans, made solid in heavenly manner, breathing and set in motion, will be raised on a single day,

as is the Isaianic converse of the presumably benevolent afterlife of these resurrected bodies, as given in *Sib.Or.*2:300-306:

They will not have their fill of tears, nor will their voice be heard as they lament piteously here and there, but in distress they will shout at length below dark, dank Tartarus. In places unholy they will repay threefold what evil deed they committed, burning in much fire. They will all gnash their teeth, wasting away with thirst and raging violence. They will call death fair, and it will evade them. No longer will death or night give these rest.

The fragmentary evidence from *Sib.Or.* gives:

There is one God, who rules alone, exceedingly great, unbegotten, universal ruler, invisible, who himself sees all things. He is not seen by any mortal flesh ...If gods beget and remain immortal, there would have been gods born than men, and mortals would never even have a place to stand ... But if that which comes into being also absolutely perishes, a god cannot be formed from the thighs of man and a womb ...But he alone knows, who made these things

from the beginning, the eternal incorruptible Creator who lives in the sky, who provides for the good a much greater good as reward ...But he is life and imperishable eternal light ....[617]

Goodenough finds Orphic influence within these passages, but it should again be noted that the evidence is well in keeping with the Hebrew Scriptures, and the theme of incorruptibility (presumably what Goodenough finds to be the Orphic element) belongs only to God, never to aspirants or mystic devotees. Further, the reference to Wis 2:24 is also as in conformity with the Jewish Scriptures as much as any Orphic materials or traditions. Goodenough interprets *Fug*.56 as teaching that immortality is available "here and now".[618] However, Philo is clear in *Fug.*—as is Cicero in *Scipio* as well as other Heraclidean sources—that immortality is inextricably bound with the results of physical death, and any immortality that is to be conferred must either follow physical death, as an incorporeal entity (this is presumably Philo's position), or as a succession of incarnations which, again, must follow not one but many physical deaths. Moreover, David Runia differentiates Philo's use of *aion* in *Fug.*57 from the life of God, which is immortality without death; in *Fug.* it simply means an unspecified length of time.[619]

In conclusion, in Philo's interpretations of immortality, within Deut 1-11, he proposes a type of immortality, acquired by the virtuous and gifted by God, which allows the existence of the soul after death. This is entirely congruous with contemporary Jewish writings, which are much closer to Philo's conception of the afterlife than other non-Jewish Hellenistic writings. Therefore we may conclude that Jewish teaching primarily motivates Philo in his Deuteronomy

---

[617] *Sib.Or.* Frag. 1.7-11; 2; 3:1-3, 16-18, 34.
[618] Wis 2:24; "Because God created human beings for incorruption and made them the image of his own nature, but through the envy of the devil death entered the world, and those who belong to his party experience it." See also Gen. 1:27, 3:4-6, 14; for a Philonic contemporary see Rom. 5:12.
[619] Runia, *Philo/Timaeus*, 1:186.

1-11 exegesis, enough to oppose non-Jewish Hellenistic ideas which would compete with or contradict Jewish teachings.

5.7. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: The *Kubernētēs*

As a dramatic example of Philo's interpretive tendencies, let us first consider his use of the "pilot" metaphor in the context of Deut 1-11. Just as the *paedagōgos* leads and directs, so does the *kubernētēs*. The "pilot", or *kubernētēs*, controls a ship or chariot and is a familiar image from Hellenistic literature. Just as the pilot is responsible for the control of horses, so must the wise control their actions. Philo borrows this image, once directly and once through implication, in his use of Deut 1-11. In *Leg*.3.82, Philo quotes Deuteronomy 4:39, "is in heaven above and on earth beneath, and there is none beside Him" in the context of a lengthy allegorical interpretation of Melchizedek. In this passage, Melchizedek, the righteous king, is described as a lawful and peaceful ruler, and presented both metaphorically and allegorically as a giver of instructions to the vessel, or "living being" who will make its way through life "piloted by the good pilot, who is right principle". Melchizedek also brings wine which brings "divine intoxication, more sober than sobriety itself" and he himself is further allegorized as Reason, "priest of the Most High".[620] Again, a Deuteronomic quotation is used to clarify material from Genesis in favor of monotheistic theology, here given as "there is none beside Him". "Most High", according to Philo, does not mean the highest of many gods, as there is only one god. Instead, it describes God as a wholly spiritual being, whom should be thought of "in lofty terms, such as transcend all other greatness and all else that is free of matter". Yet rather than explore the implications of

[620] Philo, *Leg*.3.82. This allegorical treatment of Melchizedek the priest is also in keeping with Philo's stance on ritual worship; see again Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship*, 293-295.

Melchizedek, the good pilot, Philo establishes his allegory and continues to elaborate theological matters. This demonstrates the general trend we will see below, not only with *mûsar/paideia* with Philo's other treatments of Deut 1-11 thematic content. For Philo, allegorical interpretation is always emphasized at the expense of thematic elements.

In *Conf*.171-173, Philo interprets Deut 10:17 in the context of monotheism. Philo distinguishes God, the Highest and the Creator of all, from other agents which, although invisible and powerful, do not share in the Godhead. As Wolfson notes, the actions of the "Charioteer"—again, *kubernētēs*—are ascribed to the Logos, an entity which acts as an agent of God and raises questions concerning strict conceptions of monotheism; yet he also observes the propriety of a single Godhead, as he notes that Philo quotes the following from Aristotle: "The government of the many is not good; let there be one governor, one king".[621] Also in *Conf*.171-173, in context of Deut 10:17, Philo describes these "Potencies" in order to contrast them with God the Creator and to warn against worship of the created order, both visible and invisible. Philo here mentions "Potencies", entities which "assist and protect created being" but which are definitely not God as Philo takes pains to emphasize; "God is one, but He has around Him numerous Potencies".[622]

Therefore, we have seen the idea of the *kubernētēs*, a controller and guide, removed from a natural context of Deut 1-11 *mûsar/paideia* and brought to bear for allegorical purposes. These allegorical treatments explore monotheism and the use of "Powers" or "Potencies". The Powers

[621] Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.340, 1.171.
[622] Philo, *Conf*.171. Francesca Calabi observes that this differentiation between the monotheistic Godhead and the "Potencies" is made explicit in *Conf.* 171; "God is one, but He has around Him numberless Potencies, which all assist and protect created being, and among them are included the powers of chastisement". However, Daniélou interprets this passage as suggesting that the "Potencies", as participants in creation, are therefore uncreated, which problematizes a monotheistic interpretation that allows no room for ambiguity. Cristina Termini notes this may partially be motivated by an attempt to explain the numerous plural verbs which describe God. See Calabi, *God's Acting*, 84, 124; Jean Daniélou, *Philo of Alexandria* (James G. Colbert, trans.; Cambridge: James Clark and Co, 2014), 130; Cristina Termini, "Philo's Thought Within the Context of Middle Judaism", *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. Adam Kamesar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 100.

will continue to play an important role as we explore Philo's use of the concept of chastisement below.

5.8. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: Chastisement

As we have seen, these Powers form the incorporeal and intelligible world, which is the archetype of the material world. Many have wrongly deified the created worlds, not only the material world but the intelligible world of forms.[623] (Philo gives "Lord, Lord, King of the Gods", not "O Lord our God, the God of Gods".) Because of this wrongful identification of the created order with God, Moses declares the above as is recorded in Deut 10:17. The original context of this verse is a warning passage for the Israelites at Moab to "not harden the neck" so that they might "keep the commandments of יהוה your God and his statutes".[624] However, for Philo, this Deuteronomic citation is included in his explanation of the Gen 11:7 text, "Come and let us go down and confuse their tongue there".[625] This text presents a problem for those who hold monotheistic convictions, and Philo takes it upon himself to solve the problem by introducing the idea of the Powers. To this end, he includes the Deuteronomic verse which identifies not only a plurality of divine beings, but God's supremacy among them. As he elaborates the Powers, Philo attributes to them the powers of "chastisement". The original Deuteronomic verse used to warn and prevent disobedience has become part of Philo's argument for a singular God who works in concert with Powers, an argument made necessary by the "chastisement" which God and the Powers promise to deliver in Gen 11:7. Here, Philo

[623] In the Loeb edition the translation provides "Lord, Lord, King of the Gods"; the Greek provided is κύριε, κύριε, βασιλεῦ τῶν θεῶν which according to Colson is an inaccurate quotation by Philo. See footnote (c), Philo, *Conf.*173 (LCL 261: Colson, trans.), 105. See also Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.233.
[624] Deut 10:16, 13.
[625] Philo, *Conf.*168.

emphasizes an important theme of *mûsar/paideia*, chastisement, but his use of Deut 10:17 does not directly reinforce this. Instead, it is used to bring theological clarity to the nature of God and the Powers.

Philo also engages another theological topic, anthropomorphic representations of God, in an interpretation of Deut 1-11 that highlights *mûsar/paideia*. In *Somn*.1.231-237, we find that Philo views anthropomorphic depictions of God in Deut 8:5 as a necessary tool to instruct the dull-witted; "Broadly speaking the lines taken throughout the Law are these two only, one that which keeps truth in view ... the other that which keeps in view the ways of thinking of the duller folk, of whom it is said, 'the Lord God will chasten thee, as if a man should chasten his son' (Deut 8:5)".[626] This leads us first to the conclusion that what Philo envisions here is a condescension of the divine, as God changes to accommodate those with whom He interacts. This may be as simple as Philo's understanding of certain impossibilities as necessary tools, as he will elaborate in *Somn*.233.[627] In *Sacr*.100-101, God's cherishing of Israel as a man his son (Deut 1:31) is also viewed as an anthropomorphic depiction of God - but for Philo, the proof of the non-literality of this expression is to be found in the incongruous image of men, which do not naturally cherish and nurture (according to Philo), as cherishing Israel.[628] Also, as John W. Martens writes, there is the instance of the case made by noting the reverse, those who are "dull in their natures", as he points out in *Somn*.1.236.[629]

---

[626] *Somn*.1.231-237 is examined chiefly as a personification, which Philo considers a grosser method of conceiving of the deity. It is contrasted with Num 23:19, a clear statement of Yahweh's separation from humanity, and grounds the general disciplinary tone of the Deuteronomic quotation "the Lord God will chasten thee, as if a man should chasten his son" in what Philo perceives as a general trend of education in God's revelation to mankind, that this revelation is by necessity educative.

[627] And as Runia will note concerning the *Timaeus*: Runia, *Philo/Timaeus*, 349. According to Wolfson, Philo insists on interpreting all anthropomorphic depictions of God as allegorical (*Philo*, 1.116-117).

[628] *Sacr*.101: "Again welfare in child-bearing is a good thing belonging to women, but the nature of man admits not to it. Thus even the phrase 'as a man' (cherisheth his son) is not used of God in its literal sense, but is a term used in figure, a word of help to our most feeble apprehension".

[629] Martens, *God/Law*, 70.

In *Gig*.45-52, Philo interprets Lev 18:6, and uses Deut 5:31 to do so. *Gig*.45-52 interprets the phrase "I am the Lord" found in Lev 18:6.[630] Here, Philo comments that the stability of God applies not only to "the perfect, the imperishable, the truly good existence" but also to "the sovereign and king and master".[631] Here, this role of the divine as a master is invoked specifically to reinforce the idea of "chastisement" seen earlier in *Conf*.171-173. Nature is mentioned, as in *Post*.28, below, but now it is the nature of the intransigent who fail to honor God through love and respect. For these, Philo writes, "those who of their own nature have no ears for reproof are chastened and controlled by fear".[632] This tendency of God to chastise those who take him lightly is then juxtaposed by Philo into a discussion of God's stability, using Deut 5:31 and its description of "standing". Again, the sense of chastisement is invoked, but Philo's use of Deut 5:31 does not directly support this. It is once more used to provide theological justification for the necessity of chastisement, focusing on God's character primarily, with the necessity of chastisement as a subordinate concern.

Philo also interconnects the theme of *mûsar/paideia* with that of provision, using Deut 8:2-3 to qualify his interpretation of Exod 25:29 and Lev 2:11. In *Congr*.168-174, Philo interprets Deut 8:2-3 not only as a symbolic reading of the priesthood and sanctuary, but of the unleavened bread, depicted in Exod 25:29 and Lev 2:11, as a symbol of the manna provided by God in the wilderness. God provides this manna, according to Philo, out of an abundance of benevolence toward humanity which includes a series of well-intended restrictions. The Israelites are kept from other foods to restrain their thoughts and passions and keep them within the bounds of holiness: "Who then is so impious as to suppose that God ... sends famine ... on

---

[630] This demonstrates what Runia has defined as a system of primary and secondary lemmata in Philonic exegesis. See David T. Runia, "The Structure of Philo's Allegorical Treatises: A Review of Two Recent Studies and Some Additional Comments", *VC* 38 (1984): 238-239.
[631] Philo, *Gig*.45-46.
[632] Philo, *Gig*.46.

those who cannot live without food? For God is good ... say that "afflicted" is equivalent to "disciplined and admonished and chastened", and that "subjected to famine" does not mean that He brought about a dearth of food and drink, but a dearth of pleasures and desires and ... in general all the works of the vices or the passions".[633] Here, Philo introduces themes of *mûsar/paideia* with the phrase "disciplined and admonished and chastened", indicating that an unpleasant process of growth awaits the Israelites. But Philo also explicitly identifies the word "afflicted" as an allegorical representation of this chastening, just as the famine itself is an allegorical representation of the absence of the "works of the vices and passions" which God has brought about.[634]

So once again, while Philo uses Deut 1-11 material in his exegesis of other passages, established themes of *mûsar/paideia* are not explored fully. Instead, Philo continues to engage in allegorical exegesis, in this case the important quality of "chastening", a key element in the differentiation between *mûsar* in its original Hebrew context and the Hellenized sense of *paideia*. For Philo, the presence of "chastening" is once more an opportunity for allegorical exegesis. We have also seen above Philo's examination of chastisement in the context of two other themes, the stability of God and material provision. The stability of God is a theological construct, a favorite theme of Philo in the context of Deut 5:31; material provision is, however, a wisdom theme which has been examined more closely in that section. What we find here, and will find elsewhere, is Philo's multifaceted treatment of *mûsar/paideia* in the context of Deut 1-11. It is

---

[633] *Congr*.171-172; but see Isaiah 45:7, "I am the one that has prepared light, and made darkness; who makes peace, and creates evils; I am the Lord who does all these things" (NETS). This Isaianic passage explains famine not as Philo does, but by attributing both peace and evil to God. Runia considers Philo's unqualified benevolence to be Platonic in origin, citing *Phaedrus* 247.a7 and *Timaeus* 29.e1-2 (Runia, *Philo/Timaeus*, 109). David Winston finds this analogous to *Fug*.137-138; "God distills from on high the ethereal wisdom on minds well endowed and fond of contemplation", or a lofty interpretation of the manna which serves as spiritual food. See Winston, *Contemplative*, 95 note 79. Lévy considers these passions to be "four-footed", needing to be bridled, as in *Agr*.82-83 *et al.* ("Philo's Ethics", 158). According to Termini, the manna symbolizes the salvific function of the Logos. See Termini, "Philo's Thought", 99.

[634] *Congr*.172.

often examined in close proximity to other recognized themes of Deut 1-11, most often wisdom themes. This suggests that, for Philo, *mûsar/paideia* was a complex topic that required a substantial ideological underpinning to fully exposit.

5.9. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: Proselytes

In *Spec*.1.51, Philo makes a thematic comment on the proselyte material found in Deut 10:18-19.[635] This comment follows, and is in the context of, Moses's desire to see God as found in Exod 33:13-23. Moses requests that God reveal himself, and Philo provides a philosophical interpretation to this question. For Philo, to "reveal" means to learn of God's *essence*, of which Moses cannot learn through knowledge of the world.[636] Unfortunately, he cannot learn it from God either, for God tells him he will be unable to comprehend the divine essence in its totality. Only part of this essence may be understood, knowledge which God graciously gives. Moses then asks for knowledge of the Powers, which God later equates to the "forms" and "ideas" and tells Moses that this knowledge, too, is unattainable. The best Moses can hope for is the knowledge of God that can be obtained through the philosophical study of nature. At this point, the proselytes are introduced. According to Philo, anyone who seeks the knowledge that Moses sought is a "proselyte" in the sense of Deut 10:18-19; they are to be welcomed in as a native, even more so actually as they have forsaken their own lands, family, and friends for the sake of truth and right apprehension of God. Yet Philo continues, noting that these newcomers must be cautious, as they have not been trained as have native Israelites and presumably are at greater risk of disobedience. This risk is by no means insubstantial, as the same penalties apply to them

[635] See footnote (a) in Philo, *Spec*.1.51 (LCL 320: Colson, trans.), 127.
[636] See Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.229-233.

as apply to all Israelites. The twin powers of God are used to delineate the two groups, now the natives and proselytes. This use of Deut 10:18-19 mediates the completely spiritual quality of the knowledge imparted according to Exod 33:13-23. Although the means by which this knowledge is attained is unclear, Philo's use of Deut 10:18-19 suggests that the proselyte experience is necessary for a proper implementation of *mûsar/paideia*. The proselytes have not undergone the impartation of discipline that is necessary alongside any spiritual or intellectual apprehension of God. Native Israelites have experienced this from childhood, as is also typical for the *mûsar/paideia* motif; proselytes have not, and allowances must be made for them. However, Deut 10:18-19 does not directly engage with *mûsar/paideia*, but is instead a short list of wisdom themes. Again, Philo has used Deut in a secondary manner, deriving his main theme from Exod and only using Deut to support corollary, but important, observations.

5.10. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: Growth and Training

Thus far, we have seen Philo create complex interactions with the wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* themes, specifically with regard to memory and power. Philo will do the same again, as he begins a series of meditations on growth and development in *Mut.*18-24, fittingly a meditation on Abraham's change of name from Abram. However, he will now engage with all three themes—wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia*—as he begins to seriously consider the development of human spiritual well-being. This is arguably *the* most important theme in Philo's writings, and his allegories can be said to uniformly serve the goal of assisting the reader in this development, but for the present purposes we must limit ourselves to his treatments of Deut 1-11.

In *Mut*.18-24, Philo explores the naming customs that God bestows on different people. The remarks begin with an observation that many believe God to be *their* God, but that God exists in different relationships with different people, and naming protocols reflect this. To the wicked, God is "Lord and Master", but to the good and those "on the way to betterment" God is "Lord and God".[637] Moses especially displays this favored status, as he functions as a "god" to Pharaoh and often acts as God's surrogate in the performance of miracles. This status of Moses is reminiscent of God's use of Powers, which we have seen earlier, and also to a relationship focused on learning and improvement that suggests *mûsar*/*paideia*. Yet wisdom and covenant are suggested as well, as Philo explicitly connects the phrase "Lord God" with "the Lord God of your fathers", a quotation of Deut 4:1 evocative of the father-son relationship important to the depiction of training in Deut 6:20-25, but in the context of land dominion, a wisdom theme, and the "statutes and ordinances" of the law. Covenant is also reinforced in Philo's use of "thy Lord God" in the Decalogue of Exod 20:2, evocative of the covenantal dispensation of the tablets.[638] *Mûsar/paideia* is perhaps best illustrated by *Mut.*24: "that the man of progress should be benefited by Him as God and thus through those kindnesses reach perfection". Yet again, Philo uses Deut as part of a theological discussion explaining a specific quality of God, but not directly to support the theme of *mûsar/paideia*, the theme of "the man of progress ... benefited ... [and] through those kindnesses reach[ed] perfection".[639]

This emphasis on development will continue as Philo interprets *Deus* 51-69; his thematic examinations, however, will become more exclusively traced to *mûsar/paideia*. When dealing with Deut 1-11 in the context of *mûsar/paideia*, Philo does not however exclusively use Deut in this auxiliary manner. In *Deus* 51-69, Philo now finds in Deuteronomy a depiction of manhood

[637] Philo, *Mut*.19.
[638] Philo, *Mut*.23.
[639] Philo, *Mut.*24.

more in keeping with his understanding of the gender's natural function. Deut 8:5, "like a man He shall train his son" is interpreted not as Deut 1:31, an anthropomorphism rooted in an absurdity, but as another necessary accommodation to those who are not sufficiently advanced to comprehend an incorporeal God.[640] As in *Somn.*, Philo argues that anthropomorphic representations of God are not accurate representations of God's nature, but useful fictions which allows the less intellectually and/or spiritually developed to relate to God. God is, in fact, so far from humanity that he possesses no qualities with which he might be described.[641] Of course, this lack of qualities does not mean that God cannot be attributed with any predicates, and these predicates occasionally provide the reasons to dismiss the anthropomorphisms in the first place.

Philo here also introduces the theme of love and fear, the former which emanates from God, the latter often inspired by him. When God reveals himself, it is to those who cannot perceive Him spiritually, and therefore must encounter a living physical being to apprehend Him (even though this physicality is illusionary).[642] But this produces a fearful response in the ones who observe God - and this text serves to provide a link between Deuteronomic concerns and *paideia*, as it is here where Philo elaborates on the use of *paideusei*; "and thus it is for *training*

---

[640] As above, the Greek is translated differently by Colson in the above accounts: LSJ gives "to bring one nourishment, maintain, sustain" for *trophophorēō*, the Greek verb in both Deut 1:31 and 8:5 (43367). Philo is now discussing anthropomorphism beginning with a consideration of the divine nature (see *Sacr*.100-101 for a contrasting interpretation). This is introduced in contrast with Numbers 23:19 ("God is not as a man") with a following discussion on God's impassibility, or lack of emotional contingency. .

[641] Winston discusses this at length in *Contemplative*, 23, notably how love and fear might proceed from a perfectly simple God, by differentiating between *essence* and *powers*; also regarding God's lack of hands and use of ministers, at *Leg*.3.177-178 (179). Calabi describes this as God being "totally unsusceptible to determination" (Calabi, *God's Acting*, 16) and relates this to Stoicism via the 101 Edelstein-Kidd fragment attributed to Posidonius (anecdote of F. Alesse, *God's Acting*, 18). See also David Winston, "Philo's Conception of the Divine Nature" in *Neoplatonism and Jewish Thought*, Studies in Neoplatonism: Ancient and Modern 7, ed. Lenn E. Goodman (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 21–41. These terms "qualities" and "predicates" will receive much more exhaustive philosophical and theological treatment in the Christian era, especially in Augustine's arguments for divine simplicity; I use them in a looser sense here, limiting my discussion to Philo and his predecessors.

[642] As in the attribution of names to various characteristics of God; Calabi, *God's Acting*, 56, 83. David Dawson also considers naming in the Adamic era as a sign of proper perception of God, and that the failure to engage with God's characteristics is a matter of epistemic failure, not an absolute lack of those characteristics in the divine. See David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Philo of Alexandria* (Oxford: University of California Press, 1992), 90-91; also Niehoff, "Name", 220-252.

(*paideias*) and admonition, not because God's nature is such, that these words are used".[643] As this suggests, love is the natural response of the spiritually advanced, and Philo indeed asserts this in *Deus* 51-69.[644] However, the sentiment of love irradiates from God regardless of the audience, for it is with love that God condescends to those who are less spiritually perceptive, just as with those who appreciate His incorporeality; and to illustrate this, Philo uses the metaphor of a mercifully deceptive physician:

> Thus too in dealing with the dangerous sicknesses of the body, the most approved physicians do not allow themselves to tell the truth to their patients, since they know that this will but increase their disheartenment, and bring no recovery from the malady, whereas under the encouragement, which the opposite course of treatment gives, they will bear more contentedly their present trouble, and at the same time the disease will be relieved.[645]

Philo is more explicit about this later: "And thus to love Him is the most suitable for those into whose conception of the Existent no thought of human parts or passions enters, who pay Him the honour meet for God for His own sake only. To fear is most suitable for the others."[646]. It may be said, then, that while Philo's Deut quotation directly concerns the theme of *mûsar/paideia*, there is also an anthropomorphism which Philo prioritizes, giving this anthropomorphism a

---

[643] *Deus* 54. It should also be noted that here Philo uses two words - abstract nouns joined by the conjunction *kai* - one being a form of *paideia*, the other *nouthesias*. Philo employs *nouthetesai* earlier in the same text (*Deus* 52) to express a sentiment of admonishment; "All the same the Lawgiver uses such expressions, just so far as they serve for a kind of elementary lesson, to *admonish* those who could not otherwise be brought to their senses". It is likely that *paideia* and *nouthesias* are synonymous for a type of education that is centered in rebuke and strong discipline; however, the possibility should not be discounted that Philo juxtaposes these words for purposes of contrast. See Patrick Pouchelle, *Dieu educateur*, FAT 77 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), and "*Kyropaideia* versus *Paideia Kyriou*: The Semantic Transformation of Paideia and Cognates in the Translated Books of the Septuagint" in *Pedagogy in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, EJL 41, eds. Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Geoff, and Emma Wasserman (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 101-134.

[644] See Birnbaum, *Judaism*, 145.

[645] *Deus* 65.

[646] *Deus* 68. Daniélou claims this is reconciled in 1 John 4:18 (*Philo*, 168).

careful theological explanation that, while ultimately supporting the *mûsar/paideia* claims of the quoted text, is arguably Philo's chief interest here. An exploration concerning the nature of God takes center stage over a deep elaboration of the "training" itself.

Philo also interprets Deut 4:29 with respect to God's providence. However, he here returns to a more usual mode of allegorical and philosophical interpretation when interpreting, in turn, Exod 16:15. Philo also here engages with *mûsar/paideia* somewhat indirectly, using these passages to describe the role of God and man in the self-education, or "seeking", with which the virtuous human strives to apprehend God. In *Fug*.140-142, Philo reports that God's presence is the catalyst for Moses's prophetic abilities.[647] Yet Moses is also characterized as a "seeker" who wants to know the reason why he is able to deliver prophecies.[648] Here, providence might easily be taken as transactional, with the finding of God becoming a due reward for the seeker; but Philo nuances this verse in *Fug*.140-142 by insisting that God provides knowledge of himself in the very instant that the petitioner begins to seek him; "by reason of His gracious nature He comes to meet us with His pure and virgin graces, and shews Himself to those who yearn to see Him".[649] Virtue is provided by God as well, as is detailed in *Fug*.175 and Philo's interpretation of Deut 6:10 which he gives as the place "where the Lawgiver seems to me most clearly to supply an example of finding without seeking".[650] Here, Philo interprets the cities, houses, vineyards, and olive orchards detailed in the text allegorically, as "the lavish abundance of the

---

[647] Philo, *Fug*.140.
[648] Philo, *Fug*.140.
[649] Philo, *Fug*.141; The finding of God as detailed in the Deuteronomy citation is described by Philo not as a literal vision of God but as the presence of nature's abundant graces to the seeker. Birnbaum and Dillon note that Seneca presents these graces (in Philo, *charisi*) as goddesses which, by participating in a ring dance with interlocked hands, indicate reciprocity of gift-giving (Seneca, *On Benefits*, 1.3.2-10). Birnbaum and Dillon are speaking of *Abr*.54; it should be noted that the form here is *Charites*, suggesting Birnbaum and Dillon's link between *Fug*.141 and *Abr*.54 is tenuous. See Birnbaum/Dillon, *Abraham*, 195. Winston and Dillon cite Cornutus's allegorization of the Graces (again, *Charites*) as "God's sources of grace and beneficence to men". Cornutus, *Summary of the Traditions Concerning Greek Mythology*, ch. 9; Winston, *The Contemplative Life*, 356 note 312.
[650] Philo, *Fug*.175.

good things showered upon them, great and ready for possession and enjoyment" representing generic and specific virtues, natural mental ability, contemplation, and the resulting intellectual and spiritual development.[651] As the Deuteronomic reference suggests, these qualities are provided *gratis*. This motif is continued in *Deus* 94-98, in which Philo interprets the same Deuteronomic passage as representative of virtues and their fruits.[652] Here, the two groups may be considered those who seek and those who do not, as the immediate bestowal of God's self-revelation seems to preclude an arduous process by which the supplicant is able to attain the goal of divine knowledge. It should be noted that the material goods, a wisdom motif, are not shown as elements to be actively sought and mastered, as doing so would detract from Philo's emphasis on God's bestowal of favor.

In *Congr*.131-135, Philo makes the same equivalence with the soul holding fast to virtue and knowledge of God, honoring only God, and through this devotion "the Lord Himself is his *portion*".[653] Philo here interprets Exod 2:1-2 and uses Deut 10:9 to do so. The context is, as Philo claims, Levi's declaration to serve God and only God, and Moses's link to truth by his double Levitic lineage through both his mother and father. This is brought about by a passive "receiving" as opposed to an active acquisition of virtue. The larger context of the passage is

---

[651] Philo, *Fug*.176. Geljon and Runia note the word used here for "plant", *kataphuteuō*, is rarely seen before the LXX, and that every usage of this word and its related *phuteuo* is examined by Philo. The majority of Philo's interpretations, however, construe *phuteuō/kataphuteuō* as an allegory for spiritual development, "progress toward perfection"; the interpretation in *Fug*.176 is the exception. See Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 85-87. Goodenough writes that the Israelites never reached these structures under Moses's leadership, and that this narrative represents an unattained, and possibly unattainable, goal (*Light*, 220-221).

[652] See footnote 128 referencing *kataphuteuō/phuteuō*; the same observation applies to *Deus* 95-96 (Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 86). Philo is discussing the arrival of knowledge and virtue unlooked-for in comparison to fruitless labor. The virtues are compared to the cisterns and houses unbuilt and undug by the Israelites, but this is all in the greater context of an understanding of destiny, or predestination, as governing the virtues and who receives them. A footnote by Colson directs the reader to another discussion in *Sacr*.113-117, in which Philo asserts that moral effort is not wasted, even if the ultimate gain of virtue is never achieved (see footnote 128 again for Goodenough's interpretation). There is a connection between inebriation and gladness in *Deus* 96 (Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 259).

[653] Both here and in the prior citation of Deut 10:9, the version given by Philo is *kurios autos kleros auton*; Colson alternately translates *klēros* as "inheritance" and "portion". LSJ gives "allotment" (24485) but also "inheritance" for *klēronomia* (24482). The LXX, however, gives *kurios autos kleros auto*; see Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 182.

education; Philo is discussing educators who believe themselves responsible for the growth of knowledge within their students. By way of a pregnancy metaphor Philo explains this:

> For the one kind of soul thinks that it receives in the womb, and the other that it has in the womb, and that is a mighty difference. The latter, supposing that they "have", with boastful speech ascribe the choice and the birth to themselves. The former claim but to receive, and confess that they have of themselves nothing which is their own. They accept the seeds of impregnation that are showered on them from outside, and revere the Giver, and thus by honouring God they repel the love of self, repel, that is, the greatest of evils by the perfect good.[654]

Active agency, then, is discouraged in favor of a dependence upon God for even the intangible progress of the educated mind. Philo implicitly attributes this dependence to Levi in *Congr*.133-134 who "[had] the courage to say, God and God alone must I honour" (*Congr*.133), not anything that is created, and "therefore to those who thus cling and serve Him without ceasing He gives Himself as portion, and thus my affirmation is warranted by the oracle which says, 'The Lord Himself is his portion'" (*Congr*.134-135, Deut. 10:9). Philo therefore weaves this Deuteronomic reference into an ongoing concern with inheritance and creation. Now he has added another dimension to the discussion; whether or not it is *only* Israel that may lay claim to the status of an inheritor of God. Here Philo is clear that God decides who will and will not be inheritors, and those who attempt to take that status are doomed to failure. It is the mental attitude of Moses and Levi which, if we are to give priority to Philo's explicit interpretations, sets

---

[654] *Cong*.130.

them apart as inheritors.[655] But Philo describes this receptivity not as a faculty to be exercised, but as a condition which exists within the inheritors, and by the presence of which the inheritors may be distinguished.[656] It should be noted here that, while pregnancy is a growth process, Philo does not engage with pregnancy in these terms for the purposes of his illustration. Instead, there are again two sorts of unborn infants considered: those who claim to "have" in the womb, and those who claim to "receive". Nor is the Deuteronomic passage which Philo quotes especially useful for his governing theme of education. Once again, a passage from Deut 1-11 is borrowed and employed in a theological manner, to illustrate God's role in education rather than to illustrate education itself.

In the above examples, we have traced Philo's engagement with themes of *mûsar/paideia* such as human development, learning, and chastening. Once again, we have seen Philo intertwine examinations of *mûsar/paideia* with other Deut 1-11 themes, in these cases the themes of material provision and inheritance, important wisdom themes. This cross-fertilization of themes again serves Philo's greater purpose of communicating higher truths through allegorical exegesis.

5.11. Philo and Deut 1-11—*Mûsar/Paideia*: Israel and Other Nations

Philo's writings also consider what might be called "affairs domestic and foreign" or the relationships and interactions within Israel itself and between Israel and other nations. Here, Philo continues his concentration on the theme of *mûsar/paideia*, focusing particularly on the

[655] Once again, Jutta Leonhardt's work is applicable, given that Levi and the preisthood are shown to have spiritual value in a transcendant sense. See Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship*, 293-295.
[656] The foregoing is connected to the next Philonic passage by way of parallel exegesis: see Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 190.

need for obedience. *Praem.* treats this subject in two passages, 79-80 and 94-97. These sections analyze Deut 11:26 and 7:20, respectively, and in agreement with Deut 11:26 Philo first notes that obedience to the "ordinances" and "precepts" will result in "victory over your enemies".[657] However, following this statement Philo's commentary is restricted to a reference to Deut 28:1 and 28:7, followed by a philosophical examination of *that* passage, not Deut 11:26.[658] The results of obedience are further explored in *Praem*.94-97 which details the tragedies that befall those who assault "the godly". This defeat will come by means of a great fear (*Praem*.95) as well as "swarms of wasps" (*Praem*.96), as given in Deut 7:20, which will overwhelm the enemy. This defeat is described as the inescapable result of attacking a righteous, godly nation with virtuous leaders. There is no explicit mention of covenantal fidelity here; obedience is merely a conformity to the precepts which the Lawgiver has revealed, with no mention of previous agreements or declaration of law. But the ongoing debate between grace and obedience continues; as Wilson notes in his commentary to *Virt.*, there is an observable system which is easily interpreted as trade. Citing Mendelson as evidence, he writes:

---

[657] *Praem*.79. Philo interprets the Deuteronomic blessings and curses literally, reiterating that God promises to destroy the enemies of his faithful. He follows this simple restatement with a summary of Deut 30:11, asserting that the law is not too distant or difficult to be successfully followed.

[658] Birnbaum and Dillon note that the three "parts of which each of us is constituted" (*Praem.*80) correspond to a tripartite Platonic classification of goods, later sustained by Peripatetic and Stoic thought; the authors consider these goods as rewards for obedience, but note that Philo is actually saying that the presence of goods is indicative of pre-existent obedience, for which the reward is victory over enemies (Birnbaum/Dillon, *Abraham*, 342, 403). Royse writes that, alongside *Spec.*1-4 and *Virt.*, *Praem*. demonstrates "an especially complex manuscript tradition"; however, the lacunae present in *Praem.* likely consist of additional punished peoples (perhaps Egyptians and inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah), and do not present difficulties regarding structural interpretation of Philo's work. Further, we have no reason to believe that a lacuna or other critical problem has occurred at the passage under question here. See James R. Royse, "The Works of Philo", in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. Adam Kamesar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 50; see also Colson's appendices to Philo, LCL 341, 455. The foregoing discussion of primary and secondary lemmae is also helpful here; David T. Runia, "The Structure of Philo's Allegorical Treatises", *VC* 38 (1984): 209-256. Wolfson provides a helpful comment, noting that the "benedictions", or *eucharistia* mentioned in *Praem.*79, are often understood as a subset of prayer, while the Philonic context clarifies that in *Praem.* the "benedictions" are to be understood not as mere words but as tangible benefits; further, the obedience which produces this victory must be real and practical, not merely words of assent.

As Mendelson observes ... 'Philo does not simply encourage his readers to cling to what is just and holy because virtue is intrinsically good. Instead he spells out ... the *quid pro quo* which human beings can expect to operate in their lives. God's role in the interchanges ... is active and interventionist'.[659]

However, Mendelson himself notes earlier in the same article, "Philo's underlying assumption in both *De Virtutibus* and *De Praemiis* is that human virtue is dependent upon divine favor for its very existence ... Without an infusion of light from God, a human soul remains in darkness. *A person achieves virtue only by the grace of God* ".[660] This would seem to mitigate the view of education expressed above in *Congr.*131-135; whereas in that excerpt Philo expresses a strong predilection for divine sovereignty in the realm of training and education, here God's role is more nuanced, and obedience is stressed as a necessary component of success. The links to *mûsar/paideia* here, however, are more tenuous, and Philo's writings in this passage equally address the wisdom concerns of dominion and the practical matters of military success.

This generalized approach is continued in *Spec.* as Philo broadly references several Deuteronomic passages which caution Israel against a wrongful response to defeat. Colson rightly notes that Deuteronomy makes no explicit reference to the Israelites' possible future defeat as a result of disobedience; however, Deut 4:26, 5:33, 6:15, 6:24, 7:4, and 7:10 obliquely reference the destruction of Israel (although the means are not exactly stated), and 7:20 gives "Like the nations that the Lord makes to perish before you, so you shall perish, because you would not obey the voice of the Lord your God". Philo's point in *Spec.*1.314 is that, whereas it may appear that the victorious nation is benefitting at Israel's expense, this is the wrong way to

---

[659] Wilson, *Virtues*, 150.
[660] Alan Mendelson, "Philo's Dialectic of Reward and Punishment", *SPhiloA* 9 (1997): 105.

view the scenario. The defeat is intended as a punishment for Israel; any perceived benefit to the conquering nation is illusory. Philo in fact describes his own community in the same breath as *philotheos politeia*, a "God-loving community", and that this quality of the Jewish community further indicts them against the unrighteous behavior that resulted in defeat.[661] Philo gives in *Spec*.1.314:

> To many their temporary pieces of good fortune have proved to be a pitfall, a trap baited with evils vast and fatal. And it may well be that the triumph of the unworthy comes to pass not for their own sake but that we should be more abundantly distressed and afflicted for our unholy deeds ....[662]

This statement effectively strengthens the relationship between God and Israel while minimizing, if not completely removing, the relationship between Israel and the conquering nation. While it is clear to see how the relationship between Israel and Yahweh still stands, although strained—it is through relationship that Yahweh punishes Israel, after all—the relationship between Israel and the nations is not to be seen even on a transactional basis. What is happening at the defeat of Israel is *not* a transfer of land; although this may be practically happening, Philo emphasizes the purely instrumental role of the conquering nation. They are not the "new owners" of the territory; their role is strictly functional. It might be said that, while Israel is not in relationship with the conquering nation, the conquering nation *is* in a relationship—an instrumental one—with Yahweh. Further, we have previously seen "afflicted" used allegorically to express the concept of *mûsar/paideia*; once again, the idea of affliction is used to express the role played by

---

[661] See Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*, 217.
[662] *Spec*.1.314.

the conquering nation not in the destruction of Israel, but as a type of punishment. In the context of Philo's earlier use of Deut regarding affliction, this too may be considered a type of *mûsar/paideia* in its role as chastener.

So once again, Philo opts to develop ideas of virtue and how virtue is achieved, also considering the role played by grace in the attainment of virtue. These concerns overshadow more concrete discussions of training or obedience, and again Philo's philosophical interests take precedence over a more elementary reading of Deut 1-11's *mûsar/paideia* concerns.

5.12. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant

In two examples, Philo emphasizes the legal context of covenant. These examples describe, respectively, the differentiation between God's laws and human laws, and the need to obey these laws in order to secure God's blessings. But in several other examples—the majority of Philo's writings on Deut 1-11 concerning covenant—Philo views covenantal references as opportunities for allegorical interpretation, weaving in his thoughts on God's graciousness, the common Philonic theme of the warring mind and senses, the *logos*, and the stability of God. As has been shown regarding wisdom and *mûsar/paideia*, Philo's governing interest in allegorically interpreting the Jewish scriptures, showing their texts as confirming Hellenistic philosophy, is the dominant mode with which he interprets these Deut 1-11 passages concerning covenant. Again, there are two likely reasons that Philo does this, apart from his obvious interest in allegorical exegesis: first, much like Josephus, Philo often writes not only for Jews but Gentiles, and it is quite possible he wished to minimize any elements of the Jewish scriptures that might

seem to exclude non-Jews; second, Philo authored two treatises on covenant which have been lost. It is probable that he dedicated these works to exploring the intricacies of covenant as presented in Jewish scripture, allowing him to dedicate himself to allegorical interpretation when covenantal texts were under scrutiny in his other works.

5.13. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Simple Exegesis and Motivic Repetition

Occasionally, Philo's interpretation of covenant is relatively straightforward as in the excerpt below. Here, in a largely literal interpretation of Deut 7:13 within *Praem*.106-107, Philo informs the reader that great wealth will be bestowed upon them, in contrast to the poverty they now suffer.[663] Material provision is an important wisdom theme; however, in this example Philo uses this verse to explain the propriety of Israel's laws. The laws which God gives are also related to this material provision; the chief scriptural "prooftext" which Philo gives in *Decal*.13-17 for the immediacy and relevance of the laws is Deut 8:15, in which the recurring motif of water-from-the-rock is reintroduced.[664] This is a miracle which Philo claims in this context should convince Israel of the goodness of their laws, as the same God who gave these laws provides materially for his people in the wilderness.[665] Philo's emphasis on legal observance in these examples suggests the necessity of fidelity to the covenant as is given in Deut 4:13. However, even in this example, covenantal concerns are combined with Philo's other themes of water-in-the-rock and material provision, which we have seen earlier in Philo's treatment of

[663] This is, for Philo, a concrete depiction of the reality of God's commands and the blessings that follow obedience, in this case, real wealth; as always, despite Philo's complex treatment of ideas, the practical reality of the law is never replaced or even subordinated. This is especially true in his later period (q.v. Niehoff, *Philo*) . See Lincicum, *Paul*, 110-111.
[664] See also *Somn*.2.219-229, *Mos*.1.210-212; again, Lincicum, *Paul*, 105-106.
[665] Wolfson asserts that to follow the law is to become like God (Wolfson, *Philo*, 2.195). This passage is related to *Mut*.18-24 (above) but here the covenant is principally emphasized.

wisdom ideas. Again a straightforward engagement with covenant is sacrificed for a much more complex juxtaposition of ideas, and the divine origin of the laws becomes the central focus of the exegesis.

Philo continues his discussion of covenant in conjunction with two common motifs in his writings, the stability of God and the rock, in *Somn*.2.219-229. However, Philo's simpler approach in *Praem*.106-107 is not maintained in *Somn*., and he returns to his usual allegorical practice. In this text, materials from Deut 1-11 are used to substantiate claims of God's immovability, as well as an equivalency between water and wisdom. We also find an extended discussion of the covenant. *Somn*.2.219 begins with an attestation that "to be unswerving and stable belongs only to God and to friends of God". The phenomenon of standing, as well as the motif of the rock, is continued with a quotation from Exod 17:6. Here we might expect Deut 5:31; instead what we find is Deut 8:15, "Who brought the fountain of water from out the steep rock", used to show God's having been "established on the topmost and most ancient source of power, whence showers forth the birth of all that is, whence streams the tide of wisdom".[666] This mention of "wisdom" could reference the spiritual origins of Wisdom as is detailed in Prov 8, but the reference is uncertain, and could as easily apply to Philo's constant invocations of Greek philosophical ideas and virtues.[667] Philo continues to describe the communicability of this stability, or standing, but now equates it to the covenant which will be "firmly planted with the just soul as its pedestal ... justice and God's covenant are identical".[668] Further, Philo next links the concept of covenant with the transference of nature that has been seen in his meditations on God's immovability. Philo gives: "God gives ... the gifts ... but gives ... the recipients to themselves ... 'I will establish my covenant with thee' is the same as 'I will give myself to

[666] Philo, *Somn*.2.221-222.
[667] See Philo's writings on wisdom and Deut 1-11, above.
[668] Philo, *Somn*.2.223-224.

thee"'.[669] Philo then continues to meditate once more on immovability, and uses Deut 5:31 as he has before. Philo here, then, has used a type of *inclusio* to associate covenantal ideas with Deut 1-11 materials. Deut 8:15 and 5:31, used to describe wisdom and God's immovability, respectively, surround a description of covenant which is connected to this same overarching theme of immovability by way of the word "establish".

5.14. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Higher and Lower Law

Below, Philo considers justice, as is practiced within Israel, as part of his comments on Deuteronomy. Colson observes that Philo is thinking of Deut 1:17 when, in *Mut*.103-105, Philo describes Jethro's advice to Moses as contrary to the advice Moses finally delivers in Deut 1:17. Whereas Moses's advice is to "hear the small and the great alike", Philo claims that Jethro would have the judges decide with bias conforming to the worldly status of the litigants, and that "the great ones of the earth accept all (Jethro) says, and think that it is right to give great justice to the great and little justice to the little".[670] But Philo also says of Jethro that he

> values the human above the divine, custom above laws, profane above sacred, mortal above immortal, and in general seeming above being. And [Jethro] ventures to come self-bidden and take the position of an advisor and suggests to the sage that he should not teach the only thing worth learning, the ordinances of God and the law, *but the contracts which men make*

[669] Philo, *Somn*.2.224; Gen 9:11.
[670] *Mut*.104.

with each other, which as a rule produce dealings where the partners have no real partnership.[671]

Philo here makes a distinction between the "ordinances of God and the law" and "the contracts which men make with each other, which as a rule produce dealings where the partners have no real partnership". It should be noted that Philo is criticizing the transactional mindset present in most contractual agreements, which are performed solely for the benefit of the individual parties. Opposed to this he sets the ordinances of God and the law, which presumably he interprets as he has in the other portions of his work; as measures of piety and virtue, indicative of the one who fears and loves God. Whereas it is possible to interpret the covenantal passages in Deut 1-11 as an opportunity to exercise virtue and faith, it is also true that covenant may also be interpreted as an analog to men's contractual dealings, which here Philo condemns.[672] It should also be noted that, in this example, Philo interprets a situation that is normally indicative of a wisdom trope, that of rightful judges, completely in the context of law and covenant. As we have seen, this complex handling of themes and juxtaposition of ideas suggests again that Philo's primary concern is not the emphasis of these themes, but their recognition in passing en route to his greater goal, the use of allegorical exegesis to achieve his philosophical and theological ends.

---

[671] *Mut.*104 (emphasis mine).

[672] Geljon/Runia, *Cultivation*,138, mention the Jethro encounter in the context of Parmenides, who gives by way of Proclus, "It is necessary that you learn everything, Both the unshakeable heart of well-convincing truth/And the opinions of mortals, in which there is no true belief" (trans. Laks/Most: D5, 28-30, LCL 528) which according to Sextus Empiricus describes "the unmovable foundation of knowledge, and then ... everything that resides in opinion, because it is essentially uncertain" (trans. Laks/Most: R8, 114, LCL 528).

5.15. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Obedience and Grace

Yet Philo's view of the covenant is not only that of necessary obedience, but of grace. Philo continues to analyze Deut 8:11-18 in *Sacr*.55-57, making the same point that any increase of wealth or power must be supplemented by an awareness of one's previous weakness, and therefore the prosperity is due to God's power and intervention. But in this passage Philo examines the situation in greater detail, constructing three classes of individuals who have all failed to conform to Deut 8:11-18's exhortation towards humility. Philo counters the first two classes, those who grow prideful through neglect or forgetfulness and those who imagine themselves as having caused their good fortune, by citing two passages from Deut 8:11-18, Deut 8:12-14 and Deut 8:17-18a: "When thou hast eaten and art filled, and hast built fair houses ... and thy sheep and thy oxen are increased, and thy silver and gold and all that thou hast is multiplied, take heed lest thou be uplifted in thy heart and forget the Lord thy God"; also, "Say not, 'My strength ... hath gotten me all this power', but thou shalt keep ever in remembrance the Lord thy God who gave thee strength to get power".

Regarding the third class, Philo reserves the remainder of the quotation ("in order that he might *establish his covenant*"). Philo describes this third class as those who do not believe themselves powerful, but *worthy of having received* this power, which Philo refutes by viewing Deut 9:5 not only as an affirmation of Israel's inherent unfitness to enter the land, but that God would "establish the covenant which he swore to our fathers". But as Philo says plainly: "Now the covenant of God is an allegory of His gifts of grace, and it may not be that any of His gifts should be imperfect. Thus, all the bounty of the Uncreated must be perfect and complete. But

amongst all existing things the one that is complete is virtue and virtuous actions."[673] This is in accordance with the knowledge of God's essence seen earlier, which as observed must be given by God to the extent that it can be known. The perfection of gift-giving argues that the covenant is likewise perfect, and thus perhaps immune to human contamination. Geljon and Runia note this perfection in the context of both covenant and gifts.[674] Birnbaum writes that in *Sacr.*57 Philo modifies the Biblical understanding of covenant via allegorical means: "by explaining God's covenant with Israel's forefathers as a symbol of His grace, Philo changes the sense of the covenant as an agreement entailing mutual obligations between God and specific men, Israel's ancestors. Instead, according to this exegesis, God's covenant, grace, may be understood to extend to all creation."[675] Why Birnbaum extends the covenantal interpretation to "all creation" is unclear; perhaps a better observation is Philo's reminder that "Israel" is a more comprehensive entity than the host assembled at Moab, as technically originating with Jacob/Israel himself; further, *Place of Judaism* itself explores the concept of "Israel" as those who "see God", much more exhaustive than the Moabite audience but also not as inclusive as "all creation". The answer lies in Birnbaum's examination of Philo's allegorical technique; for Philo, Birnbaum asserts, the covenant allegorically represents God's unlimited graciousness.[676] However, it should be observed that the gift of the land to the Moabite audience also entails the removal of the Amorites/Canaanites from the land; seemingly, this unlimited graciousness does not extend to the Amorites/Canaanites. Israel did not possess the land, now Israel does; should Israel violate certain conditions, they will be removed as were the Amorites/Canaanites. This may be viewed as a type of dispossession without disruption of ownership. The land remains in the

[673] *Sacr*. 57. According to Birnbaum and Dillon this gift includes virtue, generally speaking (Birnbaum/Dillon, *Abraham*, 196, 287).
[674] Geljon/Runia, *Cultivation*, 152.
[675] Birnbaum, *Judaism*, 135.
[676] Birnbaum, *Judaism*, 135.

"possession" of the Israelites regardless of their actions; however, should they disobey, they may no longer *reside*, or dwell, in the land. This dispossession is a result of certain conditions linked to their performance but not their nature.[677]

5.16. Philo and Deut 1-11—Covenant: Mind and Senses

Philo's allegorical treatment of covenantal ideas becomes even more complex when it is used in conjunction with one of Philo's chief motifs, the struggle between the mind and the senses, which is in Philo's works an allegorical extension of Adam and Eve. In *Leg*.2.79-86, Philo alludes to the covenant of circumcision of which Moses, in Deut 10:16, reminds the Israelites. Here, Philo conceptualizes the human agent as director and coordinator of the faculties of mind and the senses. Either the mind may be subordinated to the senses, or both mind and senses may be turned to God. Philo refines this idea later in the same text, citing Deut 8:15 to illustrate the mind overwhelmed by the senses as the serpents of the wilderness which bite and distract. In contrast, to show the mind which exhibits mastery over the senses (and by extension, the material world), Philo cites the bronze serpent which Moses crafts in Num 21:8.[678] His use of Deut 4:39 ("is in the heaven above and on earth beneath, and still there is none but him,") in *Leg*.3.82 clarifies that the characterization of Melchizedek as "priest of the Most High" is not to suggest that there are other gods which are "not-so-High" but rather that God is above

[677] According to Termini, "covenantal nomism" is not applicable here as covenantalism only appears sporadically in Second Temple literature (?); see Termini, "Philo's Thought", 123 n. 82.

[678] Philo cites this Deuteronomy reference to create another contrast between the mind, or self-mastery, and the pleasure of the senses. He uses this reference in comparison with the episode of the bronze serpent (Num 21:8) "a serpent that expresses self-mastery". The serpent of Moses is constructed of bronze to show its inferiority to divinely gifted mastery (which would be gold) and also due to its material nature as opposed to spiritual (and superior) things.

all else, *including* mind; "all other greatness and all else that is free from matter".[679] This requirement, to subject both mind and senses/flesh/material reality also finds expression in *QG* 3.46, as Philo examines the circumcision required in Deut 10:16 and interprets it as demanding *two* circumcisions, one of the mind and one of the flesh; "male" representing the mind, and "flesh of your foreskin" representing the passions, material reality, and sensory perception. In *Spec*.1.305-306, Philo returns to the theme of circumcision and again interprets Deut 10:16 to affirm his original point that there is a circumcision of the mind, during which one must prune away the passions.[680]

Philo's understanding of the mind v. senses theme as related to the covenant of circumcision is developed in *Leg*.2.49-52, where he views this term in the language of "cleaving". Here, Philo allegorically interprets Gen 2:24 and employs Deut 10:9 to this end. Here, Philo describes the struggle between the mind and the senses. Philo's interpretation of Gen 2:24 as given in *Leg*.2.49-52 allegorizes the cleaving of the man and wife as the union of mind and senses; in other words, Mind, represented by the man, cleaving to Senses which are represented by the wife. This Philo holds as a sub-optimal arrangement, and argues instead that the mind should cleave to God. He adduces Deut 10:9 as evidence of this: "This man forsakes father and mother, his mind and material body, for the sake of having as his portion the one God, 'for the Lord himself is his portion' ".[681] The idea of cleaving is further explored in *Migr*.132, where Deut 10:20 is read as piety and faith serving as the glue that bonds men to God. Here, Philo gives:

---

[679] *Leg*.3.82.

[680] Philo's conception of the senses as subordinate to the mind - albeit the necessity of the senses - is also shown in Deuteronomic context within *Migr*. In *Migr*.47-49 Philo interprets the voice of God in Deut 4:12 as a voice which "was not that of verbs and nouns but of God, seen by the eye of the soul". Philo cites Deut 4:12 to prove that the Israelites *saw* "a Voice" and this "vocal" vision of the Israelites is a completely different phenomenon than normal voices.

[681] Deut 10:9; *Leg*.2.51.

Using still loftier language to express the irrepressible craving for moral excellence, he calls on them to *cleave* to Him. His words are: "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and Him shalt thou serve, and to Him shalt thou cleave". What then is the cementing substance? ... Piety, surely, and faith: for these virtues adjust and unite the intent of the heart to the incorruptible Being.[682]

Also, in *Spec*.1.344-345, Philo contrasts the life-giving effects of cleaving to God, as is detailed in Deut 4:4, with the allegedly essential and life-giving properties of the mind and the senses. So the covenant of circumcision, a covenant of separation between a human male and his physical anatomy, is connected via the theme of mind v. senses to "cleaving", a joining of man and woman, allegorically understood as Mind cleaving to Senses, but also the cleaving of Levi to God. This cleaving is covenantal, although this is not explicitly stated.

Philo will continue to explore the theme of mind v. senses elsewhere; as the governing allegorical expression, for Philo, of Adam and Eve, it is often addressed in his allegorical commentaries. The above example is perhaps the clearest engagement of this Philonic theme with covenant. Interestingly, this theme will not only intersect with covenant, but also with wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* concerns, although always subordinate to Philo's allegorical interests. Philo's examination of the intersection between mind v. senses, wisdom, and Deut 1-11 continues in *Spec*.1.13-20 and 299-304. Here, Philo uses Deuteronomy to expound God's created order, as well as God's presence; without God's active involvement, the aspirant is doomed from the outset. Philo ascribes value to both the sensory and mental worlds while simultaneously placing them within a schema that highlights their roles as functional components

[682] Deut 10:20; *Migr*.132.

of reality. Although he condemns the conception of planets as gods ("not authorities, but subordinates under one father of all")[683], he also finds evidence for an orderly Creator in the motions of the heavenly bodies, and asserts that it is right to perceive that God orders the created universe ("but those who do not descry the Charioteer mounted above attribute the causation of all the events in the universe to the team that draw the chariot as though they were sole agents").[684] Philo's emphasis, then, is on a world which is orderly and harmonious, in which all things reflect and obey the desires of the Creator. By giving the created world a place within this schema, Philo also creates an alternate arena in which the wishes of the Creator may be manifested. The actions of humanity, then, are not the exclusive determinants of right and wrong, good and evil, disciplined and undisciplined within the world. However, this is not really wisdom engagement, as man's interaction with this order is minimized and ultimately subject to God's gracious intervention. This graciousness is further elucidated in *Leg*.3.79-82, as Philo describes God's place in the struggle between mind and senses. Here, Philo discusses the Melchizedek episode in Gen 14:18 alongside Deut 4:39. This serves as a further example of both the mind and the senses cleaving to God, with Moabites and Ammonites allegorically representing the prioritization of the senses and the mind. Philo suggests here that the mind only acts rightly, and exerts proper dominion over the senses, when it turns to God rather than actively attempting to dominate the senses; likewise implying that it is God who provides order to both the mind and the senses.

Deuteronomy 5 tells a story of covenant in its first five verses. Moses announces the formation of a covenant, then begins to describe how Yahweh spoke to the Israelites "face to face" while Moses "stood between the LORD" and the Israelites. Philo likewise considers

[683] *Spec*.1.14.
[684] *Spec*.1.14.

covenant in *Her*., an extended meditation upon the Genesis 15 narrative in which Abram (Abraham) is promised a gift of uncountable descendants, falls into a trance, and participates in a ceremony involving the separation of animals into halves, then is the recipient of a land promise. The narrative concludes with Genesis 15:18, which states, "In that day the Lord made a covenant (*diathēkē*) with Abram, saying 'To your seed I will give this land from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates'". However, in Philo's exposition of Deut 5:5 in *Her*. 205-206, his interpretation of this phrase in its Genesis 15:18 ("On that day the Lord made a covenant (*diathēkē*) with Abram, saying, To your offspring I give this land ...") context is wholly centered around "the wisdom of God" rather than the inheritance of land:

Rightly then is the Sage declared to be the heir of the knowledge of the truths here mentioned. For "on that day", says Moses, "God made a covenant (*diathēkē*) with Abraham (Abram), saying, 'To thy seed will I give this land' (Gen. 15:18). What land does he mean, but that which was mentioned before to which he now refers, the land whose fruit is the sure and steadfast apprehension of the wisdom of God, by which through his dividing powers he separates all things and keeps untouched by evil those that are good, as it is meet that they should be kept for those who are born to life imperishable?[685]

"Wisdom" here, however, is referring to "dividing powers", a mention of the *logos* which derives from Hellenistic philosophy rather than the wisdom traditions of the Jewish scriptures despite its congruity with Proverbs 8-9. In *Her*.205-206, Deut 5:5 becomes an extended meditation on the *logos*, which for Philo is a mediator, incorporeal like the Potencies, but without

[685] *Her*.313-314.

their creative responsibilities.[686] As described in *Her.*, the Word is the "chief messenger, highest in age and honour" which "both pleads with the immortal as suppliant for afflicted mortality and acts as ambassador of the ruler to the subject".[687] Philo in fact attributes the words of Moses directly to the *logos* as given in Deut 5:5, "and I stood between the Lord and you". For Philo, this is a statement of ontological affirmation:

> that is neither uncreated as God, nor created as you, but midway between the two extremes, a surety to both sides; to the parent, pledging the creature that it should never altogether rebel against the rein and choose disorder rather than order; to the child, warranting his hopes that the merciful God will never forget his own work.[688]

This undoubtedly displays elements of covenant, such as the mention of surety and the understanding between creator and creation which the *logos* guarantees in its role as mediator. But unlike the Deuteronomic passage, Philo describes a covenantal arrangement between God and Israel, or possibly God and Moses, which has now become two covenants - one between the

---

[686] The Word will be attributed a creative role in *Sacr*.8, however. See Geljon/Runia, *Planting*, 105: "(Philo) portrays the transcendent *logos* as being on the border between the creature and the creator and separating them"; also Runia, *Philo/Timaeus*, 174; also Winston, 34. For Calabi, this mediatorial role of the *logos* is a result of its having been brought closer to God than in its typical role amongst the Powers; but also that the *logos* is actually the *sum* of the Powers and as such is greater than any one of them (Calabi, *God's Acting*, 14, 86). Daniélou notes that this passage demonstrates that the *logos* is inferior to God (Daniélou, *Philo*, 122). Goodenough comments on the manifestation of the *logos*, as "Cutter", in Phinehas's killing of the rebellious Israelite and Midianite woman, and that Phinehas is now an "everlasting priest"; for Goodenough, the *logos* is linked to the mediation of the *priesthood* (*Light*, 220).

[687] *Her*.205-206. According to Winston and Dillon, this passage is linked to a parallel reference in *Mos.*1.165-166; also to Sir. 24:4, I Baruch 3:29, *On the Origin of the World*, *CG* 2.5, 106.5-6, and Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge* 94-99; the connection is made by way of motifs of shining elements and clouds (Winston, *Contemplative*, 187). Goodenough emphasizes that the *logos* is a "Cutter" which separates as a creative act, distinct from the acts of mediation (Erwin R. Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962) 107; see also E. R. Goodenough, "A Neo-Pythagorean Source in Philo Judaeus," *YCS* 3 (1932): 115-164; also *Light*, 206). However, Wolfson notes that all acts of the *logos*, or any subsidiary Power, involve use of faculties which were bestowed upon the Powers by God (Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.221).

[688] *Her*.206.

logos and God on the creature's behalf, and one between the *logos* and the creature on God's behalf. Further, these agreements are really more like affirmations or promises, statements of reliability which, according to Philo, are efficacious when uttered by the *logos*. As Termini notes, this highlights the "dialectical tension" between ontological and epistemic concerns, as is aptly conveyed by the use of the descriptive term "archangel" within the Philonic passage.[689]

Philo's description of the *logos* here as lacking direct creative responsibility requires some nuance in light of his writings taken as a whole. Philo has different interpretive emphases in his early writings, such as *Her.* (the *Allegorical Commentary*) and his later works (*Exposition of the Law*). In these early works, the creative role of the *Logos* is minimized due to its proximity to the Godhead and Philo's governing impetus to show the remoteness of God, in what is perhaps the best example of "negative" theology; in the later works, the creative activity of the *logos* will be introduced in order to argue for the perceptibility of God in the world, a noted departure from Philo's earlier stance and related to his later adoption of, or possibly accommodation of, later Stoic thought.[690]

Finally, Philo explores covenantal ideas as they relate to Deut 1-11 in the context of Israel's relationships with other nations. We have seen this theme before, in Philo's treatment of *mûsar/paideia* themes. However, in that example the contrast was between Israel and their *defeat* at the hands of other nations. Here, in *Praem*.81-84 Philo explores the idea of Israel as *righteous* nation as described in Deut 4:6-7. However, Philo's characterization of this nation is distinct from, although related to, the Deuteronomic conception. A great nation, for Philo, is "a nation which has God to listen to its prayers inspired by true religion and to draw nigh when they

[689] Termini, "Philo's Thought", 99.
[690] See Niehoff, *Philo*, 209-224.

call upon him with a clean conscience".[691] Again, piety and personal holiness are the crucial elements here. Winston and Dillon compare this passage to *Det.*22-24, in which Philo observes that the "man" which interrogates Joseph in Gen. 37:15 is the conscience itself.[692] The Deuteronomic emphasis on obedience and covenant is not present; not that Philo would disavow the importance of obedience, but his focus is on the internalization of the legal demands.[693] This internalization may be also seen in Philo's interpretation of Deut 4:6 as given in *Migr*.53-56, in which Philo differentiates between the words "great" and "nation"; the former being a descriptive term of quality, the second a descriptive term of quantity.[694] In this passage, Israel is further differentiated as a nation that "sees God".[695] As Ellen Birnbaum notes, however, obedience is treated differently in these passages; in *Migr*.56-59, Philo "omits the Biblical emphasis on the nation's obedience to the commandments"; but in *Praem.* "he acknowledges the importance of the commandments but *generalizes the audience to whom the biblical message is addressed*".[696] This is further examined in *Migr*.59-60 with Deut 7:7, where Philo more clearly distinguishes between numerical largesse and an abundance of virtue: "Now the world and the wise man, the world-citizen, is filled full of good things many and great, but the remaining mass of men

---

[691] *Praem*. 84.
[692] Winston/Dillon, *Contemplative*, 202.
[693] The Greek *phronēsis* here reveals Philo's indebtedness to the Peripatetic school, as evinced in *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.7, 1141a8-21, Arius Didymus at Stobaeus *Ecl.*2.145.19-21, and Plutarch, *Moralia* 443e-f. This is situated in the Middle Platonic inheritance from Aristotle. See Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PCAS 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 368; see also Wolfson, *Philo*, 147, 212, 262.
[694] Philo here cites a grammatical inconsistency in the adjective "great" when combined with "multitude", and that the "greatness" does not refer to the numerical abundance of the Israelites but rather their nobility of character. However, see Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*, 139-140, for the idea that the Greek interrogative pronoun *poion* indicates priority given not to national/ethnic identity but to nobility of character. See also Termini, "Philo's Thought", 123.
[695] Taylor/Hay, *Contemplative*, 139; Birnbaum, *Judaism*, 50 n. 69.
[696] Birnbaum, *Judaism*, 146. Deut 4:6-7 features both elements of this analysis (obedience and the special identity of Israel). Martens clarifies the relationship between the two; "The best reason to follow the Mosaic law, according to Philo, is because one understands the purpose of the law, even loves the law, and realizes that the law dictates what is best according to our nature. The law should be in one's heart, not only upon one's lips ... Philo would rather have the law performed because it is good and just, not because observance is compelled". See Martens, *God/Law*, 104.

experiences evil things in greater number, but fewer good things; for in the medley and confusion of human life that which is fair and goodly is rare and scanty."[697] Philo continues: "For were a man to desire to distribute, as it were into nations, the crowd *contained in a single soul*, many disorderly companies would he find, commanded by pleasures or desires or griefs or fears or again by follies and wrongdoings, and the nearest kinfolk of these, but one only well-ordered, of which right reason is the captain."[698] The one preferable, the host of right reason, is thus compared to the numerical multitude of wrongdoing. Philo is allegorically comparing the "fewness" of Israel and the multitudes of other nations with the relative proportions of virtue and vice in general, and especially with the virtue and vice to be found in a single soul. Within the soul, as within the world, vice is common and multivaried, but virtue (which Philo equates with right reason) is rare. Philo is here distinguishing between the witness of the many, or perhaps the mob, and the witness of the few who are equipped with right reason, which context suggests should be equated with the righteous nation examined above, the nation of piety and true religion. The ultimate emphasis upon allegory, in this case on of Philo's loftiest, needs no reminder here; once again, textual themes from Deut 1-11 are overshadowed by Philo's more compelling interest in allegory.

5.17. Conclusion

Generally speaking, Philo prioritizes the spiritualization of his texts when engaging with Deut 1-11. He always does so indirectly, using Deut material as a secondary lemma. But this focus on spirituality can be seen consistently in his approach.

---

[697] *Migr*.59. Goodenough claims that the sage is given the seemingly impossible status of equality with "the primal man and God"; both are considered "citizens of the universe" (*Light*, 397); again, Termini, "Philo's Thought", 123.
[698] *Migr*.60.

When addressing wisdom, Philo is quick to warn against undue attachment to material wealth. He begins to combine themes of wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* when warning also against developing pride as a result of this wealth. Although material provision is an important wisdom theme of Deut 1-11, Philo consistently stresses the superiority of spiritual excellence, and describes the priesthood as an example of an excellent life in which the only possession is God. Virtue is another important possession which God provides. The possession of God is further examined as a faculty of the faithful, and the analogy of a painter is used for this, as well as temple furnishings which symbolize the spiritual life of the priesthood.

Philo also writes on the orderly world, another wisdom theme. Here, the depiction of Moses striking a rock becomes an occasion to make a list of created objects, which Philo treats not as a typical wisdom theme but in connection with Genesis. Again, the preference for spiritual concerns can be seen in Philo's treatment of wisdom themes. An exception to this rule is the examination of widows and orphans, which Philo does not subject to allegory but instead emphasizes as necessary. This same focus on spirituality continues when Philo exegetes passages dealing with rightful judging, which becomes an occasion to depict God as Judge, and the equality of all people as created by God.

Philo also engages with the "long life" theme by revealing his convictions concerning immortality. This is a development which he shares with otehr Second Temple authors and has been discussed elsewhere; for Philo, immortality is the survival of the soul after death, but a survival that is not automatic. Although it is unclear how this immortality of the soul is achieved, nevertheless, regarding his work with Deut 1-11 passages, this is Philo's conviction.

When writing about *mûsar/paideia* with respect to Deut 1-11, Philo often engages with the metaphor of the *kubernētēs*, a pilot or controller. He also writes extensively on chastisement,

but spiritualizes this as well, considering anthropomorphic representations of God as "chastisements" which are nonetheless designed to educate the less spiritually advanced. Famines are also a type of chastening, and this specific subtheme reveals Philo's complex treatment of the *mûsar/paideia* theme. The status of proselytes is also analyzed in terms of *mûsar/paideia*, differentiating between those who have been part of Israel for varying lengths of time. The fear that many experience when encountering God is also a type of *mûsar/paideia*. Finally, *mûsar/paideia* is used to illustrate the innate receptivity that certain individuals possess, as well as discourage the pride of educators, and to characterize Israel's interaction with other nations.

When Philo writes on covenant in the context of Deut 1-11, he does so with extreme flexibility. Two motifs, the stability of the rock and the struck rock, are location points for a complex interaction with covenant that becomes a meditation on the divine origin of the laws. Covenant is also used to explore the difference between divine and human laws. Philo then uses the covenant as an allegory for grace, which will lead him to explore the wisdom theme of land dominion, again showing the versatility of these themes in Philo's writing. Finally, Philo extensively connects covenant to the idea of mind v. senses, a key theme in his work, another area of thematic interplay as Philo considers the covenantal relationships between God and Israel.

Chapter 6. Josephus and Deut 1-11—Wisdom, *Mûsar/Paideia*, Covenant

Flavius Josephus is an essential source—in many cases, the only source—for the history of Judaea in the Second Temple period.[699] He is inarguably the greatest Jewish historian of the Second Temple period, and his work is unrivalled, both in its singularity and its exhaustiveness, in its provision of Jewish historical data.[700] While much of his work in *Antiquitates judaicae* (hereafter *A.J.*) is a revisitation of the Jewish scriptures, once Josephus begins his account of the Maccabean Simon Thassi he strikes out on his own and develops a historical record that, while dependent upon other sources as must be any history that is not an eyewitness account, stands on its own as the only surviving history of Judaea under Hellenistic and Roman rule.[701] On its own, that is, save one—Josephus's *Belli judaicum* (hereafter *B.J.*), his earlier and more detailed account of his military service as a Jewish general in which he narrates his ongoing conflicts with John of Gischala, his final defeat and capture at Jotapata, and the eventual downfall of Jerusalem at the hands of the Romans. If the works of any author in this period present an obvious opportunity to locate reinterpretations of Scripture, it would be the works of Josephus.

Unfortunately, the situation is not that straightforward. Josephus was not a disinterested observer, tabulating Jewish records with a detached, clinical eye. He was both the descendant of priests, of the course of Joarib, and the Hasmonaean dynasty through his mother. Yet he reports these facts in different sources, and his separation of this personal biographical information reveals the biases which inevitably color his writings. Josephus wishes to present the Jews as an

---

[699] Josephus's own source, Nicolaus of Damascus, exists only in fragments. See Harold W. Attridge, "Josephus and His Works", in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, CRINT 2.2, ed. Michael E. Stone (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 193. Unless otherwise noted, I will use the Loeb edition for texts and translations of Josephus (trans. H.St.J. Thackeray, London: Heinemann).

[700] Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (London: University of California Press, 1998), xiv.

[701] Josephus can be said to employ a large number of textual witnesses, including the Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, and even a Hebrew *Vorlage*, underlying the LXX, which varies from the Masoretic text-type. See Lincicum, *Paul*, 170-171.

ancient and blessed people, with a truly sacred priesthood. Yet he simultaneously wishes to show that the Roman conquest was rightful, insofar that as a result of internal strife, the Jews had forsaken their mandate to rule Judaea.[702] Even his name shows his loyalty to Rome; "Flavius", which he appended to his birth name, Joseph ben Mattathias, is a mark of deference to Vespasian, emperor of Rome and founder of the Flavian dynasty.[703] His writings, therefore, cannot be read without acknowledgement of these pressures to reshape events to suit his purposes.

This bias, however, gives Josephus's works far more literary value than one might expect. Ancient historians routinely arranged the events they retold not to provide a crystalline duplication of reality, but to answer certain historical questions which individuals in their times might have been expected to reasonably ask.[704] Josephus is no different in this respect, and provides an apologetic for the Jewish people. However, his additional biases encourage the modern reader to find instances of scriptural interpretation, as well as reiterated emphases and dramatic retellings, that demonstrate resonances with established scriptural passages.

In my survey of Second Temple interpretation of Deut 1-11, I include Josephus as his specific approach to historiography allows him to interact with biblical texts not merely as an editor, presenting the biblical works largely unchanged. Josephus, as a historian, should also be considered a biographer, and in this he bears the mark of his influential predecessor Dionysus of Halicarnassus. This influence may be especially noted in the related genres of encomium and panegyric, but also in the addition of philosophical, moralizing glosses. Josephus also provides

---

[702] *B.J.*2.140 gives the Essene vow to support authorities as "no ruler attains his office except by the will of God". Likewise, *B.J.*5.257: "it was the sedition that subdued the city, and the Romans the sedition ... and that all the tragedy ... may be properly ascribed to her own people, all the justice to the Romans. But let everyone follow his own opinion whither the facts may lead him".

[703] Gaalya Cornfeld, Benjamin Mazar, and Paul L. Maier, *Josephus: The Jewish War* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982), 6.

[704] One example is Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War*, which seeks to explain the causes behind the Athenian-Spartan conflict.

philosophical commentary throughout, often in the guise of explanations for "difficult" biblical passages. These explanations provide apologies for non-Jewish readers, a stated goal of Josephus. But they also serve as materials suitable for inclusion in a survey of interpretations. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these philosophical observations is Josephus's well-documented concern with divine providence. Josephus invokes this concept to explain how the eventual Roman conquest of Judaea is divinely mandated, and that it is now the Romans rather than the Jews that enjoy the blessings or favor of God.

Several salient characteristics of Deut 1-11 make this passage especially relevant as a point of intersection with Josephus's approach to historiography. Deut 1-11 is, simply put, a speech. It is spoken oratory delivered by Moses at the plains of Moab to the second generation of Israelites after the flight from Egypt. Within this speech, the qualities of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant are especially prominent, so much so that, arguably, there is no portion of the discourse that does not fit under one or more of these three headings. Josephus often places speeches in the mouths of his historical personages, in keeping with the practice of Hellenistic and Roman historians. In these speeches, Josephus embeds many of his philosophical observations.

In this chapter, I first examine Josephus's interpretation of Deut 1-11 as found in *A.J.* Unless otherwise noted, I will use the Loeb Classical Library translation. Then, I will analyze a selected portion of Josephus's *oeuvre*, to ascertain how wisdom concerns and *mûsar/paideia* are treated by Josephus. According to Harold W. Attridge, the twelve key speeches of *B.J.* provide a summary of Josephus's philosophical emphases.[705] Accordingly, I treat these speeches as something of a "confession" or "catechism" and examine how Josephus views two of the three

[705] Attridge, "Josephus", 194-195.

qualities under consideration—wisdom and *mûsar/paideia*—in these speeches, in light of the great speech of Deut 1-11.

I will then perform a similar analysis as is seen above with the twelve key speeches of *B.J.*, focusing now exclusively on covenant and using *A.J.*, while determining how Josephus's interpretation of covenant in *A.J.* interacts with covenantal concerns found in Deut 1-11. As I will discuss below, Josephus notably omits explicit mention of covenant in his works. While wisdom concerns and *mûsar/paideia* have clear analogues in the Hellenistic world, covenantalism in the Jewish scriptures almost always leads to a declaration of Jewish exclusivity, a concept which Josephus as a Jewish apologist was keen to avoid. Nonetheless, in his representation of the Jewish scriptures he cannot completely ignore covenant, and so within that work I will determine how his understanding of covenant is shaped by Deut 1-11, if at all.

6.1. Josephus: Intertexuality, Deut 1-11, and the Law in *C.Ap.*

Josephus also serves as an excellent example of ancient intertextuality. His works are not independent, but within *C.Ap.* he mentions *Ant*. as his first attempt to provide a satisfactory apology for the historical veracity and legitimacy of the Jewish nation.[706] As we will see, Barclay judges that Josephus does not arrange his work to the specifications of the rhetorical genres of his day. Nevertheless, throughout *C.Ap*., Josephus relies upon apparent argumentative strategies, not *prima facie* evidence. What are we to make of this seeming failure of presentation? Surely Josephus knew how to arrange his material in accordance with established

[706] *C.Ap.* 1.1. Some proofs of this are Josephus's tone, which avoid standard rhetorical forms that would fix this work within a genre but instead assume the voice of a weary contestant, as can also be observed in the emphasis of *hikanoos* in 1.2: see John M.G. Barclay, *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary*, BJP 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 4.

norms, if he considered this to be necessary to achieve his persuasive ends. The principle of broadly articulated intertextuality provides an answer. If we are to take Josephus in good faith (see below), we may assume that these arguments are convincing *to Josephus*, as they confirm the understanding of ancient Israel that he has obtained from his perusal of the sources he uses. Rather than impose an external rubric of factual accountability upon each text, Josephus, convinced that the Jewish scriptures are correct, finds all evidence that corroborates *any part* of the narrative presented in the Jewish scriptures as evidence that those narratives are *entirely* true. This logical leap is supported by Josephus's convictions concerning Jewish antiquity. Due to his convictions that the Jewish scriptures are inspired, they are not to be seriously questioned for accuracy. By showing any interaction between the Jews of antiquity and the other nations, Josephus provides evidence, albeit inconclusive, that the Jews really are as old as they claim to be. So, for Josephus, these Jewish scriptures need no defending.

Yet his failure to adequately provide support for his position, from the perspective of Greeks, Romans, and others who do not share his conviction that the Jewish scriptures are divinely inspired, is also explained by the broad concept of intertextuality.[707] The texts which Josephus believes to be inspired have created a web of meaning, meaning that resides within the reader. It is this web that Josephus really seeks to defend, which is why he sees no problem when the texts themselves do not, in the eyes of modern scholarship and probably many Greeks and Romans of his day, exactly align. This also explains Josephus's penchant in *C.Ap*. to assemble many witnesses, so much so that Eusebius would later criticize him for having "heaped

[707] It is this conviction which often causes Josephus to provide anecdotes which might even alienate his Greek and Roman readers, such as his criticisms of pagan liturgy and divination. See *C.Ap.*1.193, 200-204; Cicero, *Div.*1.105-108 (but cf. *Div*.2.76-83); Barclay, *Apion*, 92.

up" evidence.[708] The rich pluriformity of textual interaction, for Josephus, strengthens his non-critical view of the Jewish scriptures' historical narratives.

As is well known, however, Josephus does not evaluate his Jewish sources with the objectivity that a biblical scholar would like to see. In his paraphrases of these texts, he often omits key passages, most famously the incident of the golden calf as recorded in Exod 32. Occasionally Josephus comments on the discrepancy, as is seen in *Ant.*10,106-107 and 10.141.[709] Here we see evidence of textual interaction and reader-response that justifies the use of these tools, as conceived by modern scholarship, when considering ancient authors. Familiar with the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Josephus attempts to present them as they inform the decisions of King Zedekiah. According to Josephus, Zedekiah ignored these prophecies as they appeared to contradict each other. Yet Josephus also records that the eventual fate of Zedekiah reveals the accuracy of both prophecies; while as Jeremiah predicts, the blinded Zedekiah did not "see" the king of Babylon, in keeping with Ezekiel's prophecy Hezekiah's eyes do in fact "look" upon the eyes of the king of Babylon and the two meet "face to face". This textual pericope is, of course, not a literal reproduction of the Jewish scriptures, which make no mention of Zedekiah's motivations or his opinions regarding the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Given the very short period of time between the origination of these prophecies and Zedekiah's eventual capture, it is questionable whether or not Zedekiah would have had the opportunity to interact with Ezekiel's prophecies as Josephus asserts. No such interaction is recorded in 2 Kgs or 2 Chr. Nor is it certain, despite dreamlike depictions of scrolls in Ezekiel 1-2 and the command to "write the name" in Ezekiel 24, when it was that the prophecies were committed to writing. In short, Josephus has placed within his representation of history—a history which Josephus claims,

[708] Barclay, *Apion*,
[709] Barclay, *Apion*, 28.

in *C.Ap*., to be based solely upon the Jewish scriptures—a event which results not from simple transposition of textual data from his engagement with those texts and his creative attempt to supply those texts with additional history, all in keeping with his presupposition that these texts are providing an accurate history of the Jewish people.

There is a dimension of good faith that should be considered here. Does Josephus create his works in the desire to appease his Roman rulers, or does he genuinely consider the Jews to have been displaced by Rome in the eyes of divine favor? While this concern looms large in many of Josephus's works, most notably *B.J.*, *C.Ap.* is positioned so that the presence of this motivation cannot be reliably assessed from any angle. As Josephus himself notes in *B.J.*, to ennoble the Jewish people also elevates the status of the Romans for having defeated such a people. Nor is Rome criticized as having negative views towards the Jews in *C.Ap*., rather, it is the Greeks who are continually described as having formed wrongful views of the Jews. So the usual problems which attend to modern views of Josephus, i.e., his personal motivations given his political immersion within many of the events he narrates, are not applicable in the case of *C.Ap*. This is good news, as it permits the model of broad intertextuality to operate apart from any authorial loyalties Josephus may have possessed. The account of the history of the Jewish people that Josephus gives in *C.Ap*., for whatever reason, is *not* the history given in the Jewish scriptures. It is a composite that has formed within the mind of Josephus, who has supplied details necessary to give that composite the consistency it must display to be consciously considered a proper recasting of the Jewish scriptures—again, given the presupposition that these scriptures are accurate.

Josephus also inadvertently displays his commitment to this broad conception of intertextuality in his presentation of the work of Manetho. Manetho's account of the Hyksos

rulers of Egypt is plausible in its own right and, as Barclay notes, highly prized by Egyptologists. What is less certain is its connection to the story of the Hebrews in Egypt as is related in Genesis. Again, Barclay writes that the account of the Hyksos is not compatible with the Exodus story, and while Josephus may be satisfied with the etymology of "Hyksos" as meaning "captive" due to the proper breathing, the linguistic connection is not enough to satisfy modern readers. Nor does Josephus ever return to this material, as he promises he will. Josephus is more thorough when dealing with the Phoenician accounts, which provide a clear corroboration of the accounts of Solomonic rule found in 2 Kgs/2 Chr.

In *C.Ap.*, Josephus often engages with Deut 1-11. This is occasionally historical, as when by conflating the accounts of Deut 1-3 and Judges Josephus describes the entry of the Jews into Canaan, their massacre of the native people, and their plunder of temples and cities.[710] In Deut 10:11 the Jews are commanded to treat foreigners with compassion, and Josephus mentions this in his apology for the Jewish people.[711] Josephus also agrees with the Pharisees in his contention, within *C.Ap.*, that the resurrection of the dead is a Mosaic doctrine; in rabbinic commentary this is related to Deut 6:4.[712] Deut 6:4 is also used when, at *C.Ap.*2.166, Josephus mentions God as "the cause of all good things". Here, as in *A.J.*4.180, Josephus relies upon Deut 6:4 as a justification for God's role in universal goodness.[713]

But the majority of Josephus's use of Deut 1-11 in *C.Ap.* involves the use of the law. This includes Josephus's argument that it is the unique excellence of the Jewish people that has resulted in the excellence of the Jewish law.[714] This argument relies upon Deut 4:7, but it is worth mentioning that the greatness of the law originates not in the greatness of the people but

[710] Barclay, *Apion*, 162.
[711] Barclay, *Apion*, 290-291.
[712] m.Sanh.10.1; b.Sanh.90b-92a; Barclay, *Apion*, 296.
[713] Barclay, *Apion*, 263.
[714] Barclay, *Apion*, 164.

the greatness of God.[715] Josephus's presentation of the law in *C.Ap*. even follows the general scheme of Deut 1-11; first matters concerning God and the cult are discussed in 2.190-198, then family and fellowship in 2.199-208; finally, foreigners and enemies in 2.209-214.[716]

Josephus provides the Decalogue itself with a detailed treatment. As a response to Deut 5:8-9, Josephus avers that Moses forbade making *any* graven images, for use in worship or otherwise.[717] The benefits of honoring one's parents are emphasized in an exposition of Deut 5:16.[718] Josephus devotes a significant amount of space describing Sabbath observance. In *C.Ap.*1.22 he provides a lengthy excerpt from Agatharchides, who criticizes the Jews' observance of the sabbath to the detriment of daily provision and even the preservation of their own lives in wartime. Josephus's feelings on this matter are complex; on the one hand, he acknowledges the value of Maccabean resistance in *B.J.*1.146 but here in *C.Ap.* he remarks that the Jews' radical faith in God is a sign of their moral and spiritual excellence, not their weakness; after all, even the animals are allowed to rest on the Sabbath.[719] Apion himself is dismissed at *C.Ap.*2.2 and the false cognate relationship between the Egyptian *sabbo* and the Jewish *sabbaton* is elaborated; the Jewish word, according to Josephus, has no connection with the Egyptian word which means an inflammation of the groin.In *C.Ap.* Josephus also elaborates the virtue of private property, and the protection of it, by discoursing on the Decalogue's prohibition of theft.[720]

Josephus's remaining discussion of Deut 1-11 within *C.Ap.* concerns the teaching of the law, a *mûsar/paideia* issue. As we see in Josephus's discussion of Moses as educator in *C.Ap.*171-179; Moses employs *both* words and deeds, law and character. This is a Greek

[715] We will see this sentiment revisited in Josephus's admittedly odd arguments in *favor* of the Romans; Barclay, *Apion*, 164.
[716] Barclay, *Apion*, 243.
[717] Barclay, *Apion*, 210.
[718] Barclay, *Apion*, 97, 288.
[719] Barclay, *Apion*, 119.
[720] Barclay, *Apion*, 290, 294.

dichotomy found in Epictetus (4.7.6) and Lucian (*Tox*.9); however, it is not exactly equivalent to the Athenian emphasis on debate, as Jewish law is not determined by dialectic, nor should it be equated to the specifically military exercises in Sparta.[721] The law should be engraved on the soul, and children are expected to learn the law.[722] Finally, adding and removing from the law is forbidden as Josephus is quick to point out; one cannot observe this command if one is not well-educated in the law.[723]

6.2. Moses at Moab: Josephus's Recasting of Deuteronomy 1-11 in *A.J.*4.176-199

In *A.J.*4.176, Josephus identifies the place of Moses's address with Abile, or Abel Shittim, in modern times Khirbat al-Kafrayn.[724] By doing so he directly connects Moses's delivery of a speech with several events given in Numbers (the outermost position of the Israelites, Num 33:49; the prophecies of Balaam, Num 22-24; and the Israelites' sin with the Moabite women, Num 25:1) and Joshua (sending of scouts, Josh 2:1; resting place of Israel, Josh 3:1). By doing this, Josephus reinforces in detail his original purpose in writing *A.J.* His plan to create a rewritten history of the Jews, for informative and apologetic reasons, is augmented by his placement of Moses's address within the larger biblical narrative.

Generally speaking, Josephus's version of Moses's address takes the following shape: 1) Moses's impending death, which is mentioned briefly in Deut 4:22 but only fully engaged in Deut 31:2; 2) the happiness of the Israelites and their remembrance of Moses; 3) the possession

[721] Barclay, *Apion*, 267.
[722] Deut 6:6-7; 11:18-19; Barclay, *Apion*, 270, 287.
[723] Barclay, *Apion*, 31.
[724] H.St.J.Thackeray, *A.J.*4.176 (LCL242), 561.

of wealth and Moses's reliability and trustworthiness; 4) God as the source of good things, or providence; and 5) The law as virtue and the importance of obedience.

According to Louis Feldman (1926-2017), one of Josephus's main goals in *A.J.* is to present happiness as the reward for obeying God. This is explicitly given in the proem, found in 1.14 and 1.20. Happiness, or *eudaimonia*, occurs in several other passages within Moses's address as recorded in the *A.J.* (4.179, 4.186, 4.193) and also in Josephus's version of the *'Aqedah* narrative (1.223-224, 1.228, 1.234, 1.236).

Josephus presents Moses in a manner which fully comports with this understanding of happiness, *eudaimonia*, as the chief goal of a godly life that is characterized by obedience. In *A.J.*4.179, Moses claims:

> Come, therefore, let me suggest the way in which you may be happy and may bequeath to your children the eternal possession of good things, and thus let me depart from life. I am deserving of your trust because of my previous ambitious efforts on your behalf and because souls, when they come to the end, communicate with utter integrity.[725]

Feldman notes that, instead of complaining that the people oppress him, Moses self-reports as content as he approaches death and uncompromisingly benevolent (*A.J.*4.179). This is, again, in conformity with the tone of happiness which Josephus has imparted to this narrative and to the *Antiquities* as a whole.

Happiness, then, is the chief motivation of Moses's speech as presented by Josephus; Moses desires the people of Israel to be happy and wants to inform them how they may achieve

[725] All translations in this section from Louis Feldman, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, vol. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

this goal. According to Feldman, it is happiness that undergirds Moses's further exhortation to the Israelites, in which he promises them that that they will be blessed with securely possessed goods if they remain obedient (*A.J.*4.180-181).

Also present is the idea of providence, or *pronoia*, mentioned by Josephus in 4.185: "God, who has until now guided you, according to Whose will I also have been useful to you, will not limit His providence up to this point". According to Feldman, providence is a major element of Josephus's paraphrasing within the *Antiquities*. Feldman has noticed this particular trend within Josephus in the Balaam narrative in which *pronoia* becomes a decided *idee fixe*.[726] Attridge writes, "To express this divine governance of affairs, Josephus relies primarily on the Greek term *pronoia*, which, for the most part, replaces the more deterministic language of fate and destiny used prominently in the *War*".[727] Josephus also locates *pronoia* within certain prophetic texts, namely those of David, Elijah, Isaiah, and Jeremiah.[728]

However it should also be noted that providence or *pronoia*, as the care and provision of God for his people, necessarily interacts with covenantal concerns. As for so many other Hellenistic Jewish authors, discussing the special care that God gives to Israel demands a consideration of the covenantal concepts embedded in the Hebrew and Greek texts. But this covenant is explicitly exclusivist, and a Jewish author wishing to present the history of the Jews in the best possible light would be well advised to minimize or eliminate this covenantal emphasis. Attridge writes:

Josephus, following the obvious tendency of his scriptural sources, emphasizes the special position of Israel in the sight of God. To do this, he utilizes the special categories of

[726] Louis Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*, JSJSupp 58 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 136.
[727] Attridge, "Josephus", 218.
[728] Attridge, "Josephus", 223.

"ally" and "benefactor". However, the relationship designated by these terms is not seen to be based on a special agreement, disposition, or favor of the Deity. Josephus subordinates the relationship to more universally applicable and acceptable belief in the governance of the moral order by God. The history of the people is taken to be an example of how that moral governance operates. Whatever special position Israel enjoys is to be understood as a result of its special virtue.[729]

So for Josephus, the special covenantal relationship that Israel has with God becomes a generalized care that God has for the entire world. Any special benefit that Israel derives from God is due to special virtue which Israel displays, and as Josephus implies, any nation who attains to this virtue can expect the same benefit. It is not hard to see how this interpretation makes Judaism, and the Jewish people, more appealing to Gentiles.

Deuteronomy 4:19 provides another example of obedience as a prohibitive command that is especially problematic for non-Jewish readers of Deuteronomy: "And beware lest you raise your eyes to heaven, and when you see the sun and moon and stars, all the host of heaven; you be drawn away and bow down to them and serve them, things that יהוה your God has allotted to all the peoples under the whole heaven". This is not to say, however, that heaven and earth may not be invoked as covenantal witnesses, as is seen in Isa 1:2a, "Hear, O Heavens, and give ear, O earth; for יהוה has spoken", and Deuteronomy 32:1, "Give ear, O heavens, and I will speak, and let the earth hear the words of my mouth". Yet in *B.J.*4.462-464, Josephus presents the prophet Elisha as praying to heaven and earth in order to bring fruitful crops.[730] According to Schwartz,

[729] Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*, HTR Dissertation 7 (University of Montana: Scholars Press, 1976) 91.
[730] Tessel M. Jonquière, *Prayer in Josephus*, AGJU 70 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 214.

Josephus is following an alternate source text; however, it must be admitted that this presentation of Elisha is highly problematic for Judaism and much more in conformity with Greek and Roman religious ideals.[731] Further, Josephus completely omits the command found in Deut 4:19, which states that not only should the Jews not serve the host of heaven, implicitly insulting these deities and explicitly asserting יהוה 's priority over them, but that these inferior deities are the natural inheritance of the other, presumably inferior nations.[732] All this demonstrates why it is little surprise that Josephus omitted Deut 4:19 entirely, and made use of an opportunity, in his retelling of 2 Kgs 2:19-22, to promote Greek and Roman religious ideas.

Josephus also presents virtue (*arete*) and moderation (*sophrosune*) as a benefit of obedience. *A.J.*4.182 gives, "Great rewards of virtue lie before you who have acquired them for all your life. She is the most excellent of goods, and then she generously grants abundance of the others". In *A.J.*4.184 we see "I myself depart, rejoicing in your good things and entrusting you to the moderation of the laws and the orderliness of the constitution and to the virtues of the generals who will have forethought for your well-being". *A.J.*4.185 notes, " ... so long a time as you yourselves wish to have Him as your protector, while remaining in the habits of virtue, so long will you enjoy his forethought". Feldman writes that Josephus has added moderation here, and that the concept does not appear in the Septuagintal text of Deuteronomy. Moderation also emerges in *A.J.*4.189, and in fact amidst a radical re-imagining of Deuteronomy in which Moses is *not* angered by the Jews. This is hinted at in *A.J.*4.179, which also omits any mention of Moses's anger, but in *A.J.*4.189 Josephus no longer relies upon a subtle omission to make his point. Feldman will also note Josephus's emphasis of moderation in an addition to the Deborah

[731] S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaean Politics*, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition XVIII (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 33.
[732] There is rabbinical evidence of this: b.ʿAbod. Zar. 55a..

narrative, which Feldman compares to Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* 176-178, in which the chorus proclaims that wisdom comes only through suffering, and comments, "the prevailing lesson in so much of Greek tragedy is that one must learn moderation".[733] Also, in the Ehud narrative, Josephus is careful to include disorder and anarchy amongst Israel's crimes that warranted their oppression by Eglon. This recasts the struggle between Jews and non-Jews, a conflict that Josephus is always careful to avoid if possible, with an encomium for orderly, lawful living.[734]

Exemplarism is not an alien concept to Josephus, who will later present Gideon as a model of every virtue.[735] Moses is for Josephus the highest example of virtue, depicted in *C.Ap.* as the paragon of humanity in war and excellence in philosophy.[736] This is of course a distorted picture; Josephus displays Moses not with laser-like fidelity but in the best possible light.[737] Moses here is a *theios aner*, or wonderworking god-man, but through his copious philosophical gifts rather than his thaumaturgical prowess.[738]

It is little surprise that Josephus, seeking to present Moses's address in a way that would appeal to non-Jews from Greek, Roman, and other backgrounds, couched the benefits of obedience in language that appealed to readers educated in Hellenistic norms. Whereas the living, covenantal presence of the God of Israel presented several logistical problems toward this end, the easy applicability of virtue and moderation not only spoke directly to the Hellenistic reader, but comported with Josephus's general aim of making the text accessible to those outside Judaism.

Josephus will also elaborate the idea of rulership within his presentation of Deuteronomy 1-11. In *A.J.*4.176, Josephus writes that Moses "convened an assembly". The Greek used in this

[733] Feldman, *Studies*, 154.
[734] Feldman, *Studies*, 144-145.
[735] Feldman, *Studies*, 165.
[736] David Lenz Tiede, *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker* (SBL Dissertation Series 1: 1972), 208.
[737] Tiede, *Charismatic*, 215.
[738] Tiede, *Charismatic*, 240.

place, *ekklesian ... sunagagōn*, shows that Josephus wants to indicate the regular meeting of an established institution. Here, Josephus emphasizes the establishment of an orderly entity, although it is unclear at this point whether or not this fixed group is a meeting of priests, governing figures, or some combination of the two. This focus on assembly is continued in *A.J.*4.186:

> The high priest Eleazar and Iesous (Joshua), the council of elders, and the leading men of the tribes will propose to you the best counsels, by following which you will attain happiness. Listen to them without annoyance, knowing that all who know well how to be ruled also will know how to rule, once they have come to a position of authority.

However, Josephus also takes this occasion to defend his own priestly lineage. As has been seen, Moses regularly articulates the aristocratic-priestly rule as ideal.[739] This priesthood is "elected" by God, preserved as a type of aristocracy, and charged with the perpetual stewardship of the laws and society of Israel, unmediated by a lay ministry or rabbinic interpretation.[740]

6.3. Conclusion

As Josephus interprets Deuteronomy 1-11, he emphasizes concerns that would have been of importance to both Jews and non-Jews, such as virtues, orderly society, the preservation of laws, the presentation of heroic figures as moral exemplars, and a deity that rewards obedience

[739] Steve Mason, *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins*: *Methods and Categories* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009), 195.
[740] Tessa Rajak, "The *Against Apion* and the Continuities in Josephus's Political Thought" in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*, JSPSupp 32, ed. Steve Mason (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Series, 1998), 231-236.

with happiness while nonetheless providing for humanity as a whole. Specifically Jewish motifs, especially those that elevate Judaism at the expense of other nations such as covenant, are minimized or completely omitted. The same may be said for depictions of Jews as intolerant of other peoples; Josephus carefully recasts these accounts to show that other nations are always worthy opponents.

We may say, then, that Josephus's interpretation of Deuteronomy 1-11 is entirely in keeping with what we might expect. Josephus, for better or worse and for uncertain motives, cast his lot with the Romans and wrote his material within their imperial city. His works are intended not only to illustrate the ancient lineage and superior customs of the Jews, but to extol the virtues of Rome. He therefore rewrites biblical texts with an eye toward both aims.

6.4. Josephan Speeches—Wisdom and *Paideia* Through Deut 1-11

In *B.J.*, Josephus presents twelve speeches especially useful for understanding his governing themes.[741] Josephus himself presents three of these speeches, found in *B.J.*3.362-382, 5.363-419, and 6.96-110. The emperor Titus presents three of his own, at *B.J.*3.472-484, 6.34-53, and 6.328-350. The Sicarii leader Eleazar presents two speeches, at *B.J.*7.320-336 and 7.341-388. Finally, Agrippa II, high priests Ananus and Jesus, and Simon the Zealot each present one speech, at *B.J.*2.345-407, 4.162-192, 4.239-269, and 4.272-282, respectively. I first analyze each speech for wisdom and *paideia* motifs, then for Deuteronomic influence.

[741] Attridge, "Josephus", 194-195.

6.5. Josephus—*B.J.*3.362-382

Josephus gives this speech during the siege of Jotapata, hoping to dissuade his fellow combatants from not only committing suicide, but from killing him should he try to interfere. The topic of this speech is immortality and the value of life, concepts which are attested in Qohelet and Job, but have very little interaction with the disciplinary and educative nature of *mûsar/paideia*. Deut 1-11, however, says a great deal about death and war, and will be shown as depicting a stark contrast to Josephus's speech.

Josephus's argument is that sentiment also expressed in Acts 17:28 and attributed to Epimenides: "in him we live and move and have our being".[742] This soul "lives forever, is immortal: it is a portion of the Deity housed in our bodies".[743] Because this gift of life is so valuable and given by God, to casually discard it is an affront to God, and will result in the deceased residing in "the darker regions of the nether world".[744] Further, while there is honor in dying at the hands of one's enemies, this honor proceeds from one's valiant conduct in combat; to pre-emptively deliver a mortal blow to oneself awards one no merit and, Josephus argues, if one is ready to end one's life at the imminent threat of death, why bother with defensive combat in the first place?[745]

---

[742] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.10, LCL 184; also Clare K. Rothschild, *Paul in Athens: The Popular Religious Context of Acts 17*, WUNT 341 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); also review by Joshua W. Jipp, *Themelios* 40:3, https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/review/paul-in-athens-the-popular-religious-context-of-acts-17-clare-rothschild/.

[743] *B.J.*3.372. This translation and subsequent Josephus translations are from LCL unless otherwise noted.

[744] *B.J.*3.375. This attestation of survival after death supports the theory that Josephus adopted Pharisee teachings; but the nuance of the rhetoric seems unbelievable in the context of a military engagement. See Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 240; also Josephus, *C.Ap.*2.218.

[745] *B.J.*3.362-365. Note that Josephus does not explicitly connect immortality with valor, as will be seen in Titus's speech below at *B.J.*6.34-53. The majority of Jews taught a resurrection of the dead, as did all Pharisees; Greeks and Romans espoused immortality on the grounds of virtuous death in combat. See Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 404; *B.J.*2.119-161.

In Job, the protagonist displays a famous disdain for his own life, lamenting his existence and regretting that he continues to live in his present miserable condition.[746] He curses the day of his birth and openly wonders why he was not stillborn.[747] But his opponent Eliphaz the Temanite attributes this to Job's failure to abide by his own instruction, which is *mûsar* in the Hebrew but *noutheteō* in Greek. According to Eliphaz, Job has "instructed many", but now something has come to Job which is overpowering him despite his expertise in mature guidance. Eliphaz himself experiences these sorts of doubts, which he describes as the presence of an accusing spirit in Job 4:17-21.[748] He reminds Job that this present crisis is reproof, that Job should "despise not the chastening (*mûsar/paideia*) of the Almighty", and that Job will only see the grave "in ripe old age".[749] But Job responds that it is not death he fears, but a miserable life; he is, in fact, a "hireling", a "slave who longs for the shadow". With this Josephus would concur; it is better to die free than live a slave, but only if one dies at the hands of those who would enslave one.[750] For Qohelet, death is inevitable, and the answer is to live as well as one can in the time that is allotted.[751]

According to J. N. Simhoni, this speech provides a concise encapsulation of Josephus's most deeply held convictions, as well as justifying his abdication of the Jewish cause.[752] Whereas the Zealots' commitment to a Judaism on the verge of destruction necessitates, in their eyes, their own destruction as well, Josephus reveals his own dissociation with the aims of the Zealots and his new allegiance, if not explicitly here with the Romans, then at least at distance with the aims of the Zealots. By entertaining the idea of an immortal soul, Josephus substantially

---

[746] Job 3:1-26.
[747] Job 3:3-12.
[748] A spirit not unlike the Satan presented in the framing portions of Job (Job 1-3, 42:10-17).
[749] Job 5:17, 26.
[750] *B.J.*3.365.
[751] Qoh 2:16; 3:2, 20; 8:15.
[752] Cornfeld, *Josephus,* 240.

departs from not only the Deuteronomic narrative but the wisdom tradition. It is the divine value of this soul that makes suicide an especially impious crime. However, neither suicide nor the immortal soul is engaged within Deuteronomy nor the wisdom texts; while Job does indeed wish for death, nowhere does he suggest that he is willing to bring it about by his own hand. In Deut 1-11, one is hard pressed to conceive of an idea more antithetical to Moses's presentation than the idea of a pious Jewry forced into the consideration of suicide by more powerful enemies. Rather, pious Israel *will* succeed in war. The great reliability of this premise allows it to serve as the underlying argument behind Moses's exhortations to obedience.

6.6. Josephus—*B.J.*5.363-419

In this speech, Josephus is in Jerusalem during the siege of Titus, and encourages the Jews to surrender. In doing so, he follows a two-pronged argument, which it seems would not have been necessary had his first prong succeeded. Both of these arguments, while thematically connected to Deut 1-11, strangely distort the presentation of Moses in those chapters.

Josephus's first argument is perhaps the most radically opposed to Deut 1-11; one might surmise that, for this reason, it fails to convince the Jews.[753] Essentially espousing the principle of "might makes right", Josephus argues that one may determine God's favor upon the Romans due to their military success, or "fortune" (*tuchē*). Yet as an additional defense, he claims that the Romans, "though without a share in [the holy places], yet reverenced the holy places of their enemies".[754] The Jews, on the other hand, "were bent on [the holy places'] destruction".[755]

---

[753] *B.J.*5.375.
[754] *B.J.*5.363.
[755] *B.J.*5.364. For a critical view see Cornfeld who asserts that the Hasmoneans should not be described as "sinful" and that temple rites continued undisturbed: *Josephus*, 384.

Further, he adds that if the Romans win they will be merciful, for they are "naturally lenient in victory", for the reason that they would "put above vindictiveness considerations of expediency, which did not consist of having on their hands either a depopulated city or a devastated country".[756]

Josephus could not have crafted an argument so diametrically opposed to Deut 1-11 had he actively intended to do so. In Deut 1-11, while the Jews will indeed enjoy military success if they obey God, it is clear that this success is not an indication of their own righteousness. To say then, that all those who succeed in war are "favored" by God is excessive, as the disobedient Israelites are punished, in a sense, by the victory of the Amorites when Israel initially reaches the borders of the promised land. The ability of the Romans to honor God, yet not have a share in the holy places, is utterly foreign to Deuteronomy, which describes the surrounding nations in completely negative terms with no sentiment toward יהוה other than to subvert the worship due him by substituting their own gods and influencing the Israelites to do the same whenever possible. Only in the concluding portions of this initial argument does Josephus approach something resembling Deuteronomy, for in the pragmatic preservation of territory that characterizes Roman acquisition of political domain the Romans display the opposite approach to that which God demands of Israel; that in conquest, Israel show no mercy, utterly destroying the nations which they are to supplant.[757] Perhaps if Josephus were using the Romans as an illustration of *villainy*, he would be in keeping with the message of Deuteronomy; however, by presently casting the Romans as *heroes*, he again subverts Deuteronomy. None of this is taken on by the Jewish audience, and Josephus "during this exhortation", in a comical inversion of

[756] *B.J.*5.373.
[757] Deut 7:2.

Moses at Moab, "was derided by many from the ramparts, by many execrated, by some assailed with missiles".[758]

This complex view of the Romans in light of Deuteronomy will continue throughout Josephus's writings. Deut 1-11 does not present *any* nation as inherently moral, although God's love has been reserved for Israel in a special but undefined way. A moral nation instead is one which honors and obeys God. Deut 1-11 cannot be said to assert that Israel does this infallibly, because it includes the warning that Israel may fail to continue in proper devotion to God. Therefore, since it is possible for Israel to apostasize, they cannot be said to be perfectly faithful. What is presented to Israel is 1) a statement of special favor, or God's having loved them, likely inalienable, and 2) an *opportunity* to enter a land, destroy an especially wicked people who dwell there, and establish homes in perpetuity—*so long* as they continue to honor and obey God. Should they fail to do so, God warns, Israel will in turn be removed from the land, and another nation will drive them out as Israel drove out the Canaanites. This places the Romans in an unusual position in light of Deut 1-11. Since Josephus routinely the depicts Jews as having failed as moral exemplars and rulers, by showing the Romans as supplanting the Jews he is also creating a historical account that explains the defeat of the Jews as in accordance with Moses's warnings at Moab. At the same time, Josephus shows his respect for Moses and agreement with Moses's prophetic statement. Look, Josephus seems to be saying, Moses was right all along! He warned you that this would happen—you have failed in your moral duties and another nation, the Romans, is removing you. However, the Romans are not exactly the sort of nation that the Israelites at Moab might have envisioned. They practice a sort of religious tolerance unknown to the Israelites or Canaanites. Therefore, while not entirely within the bounds of Jewish "orthodoxy" in that the Romans do not even honor the Torah, as do the Samaritans, they

[758] *B.J.*5.375.

nevertheless respect the Jewish worship structures as did Cyrus. The Romans, then, serve as an additional testimony that Moses is reliable, and as such can be viewed positively—not of course as exemplars of Judaism but in fulfilling roles that God has promised, through Moses, *will* be fulfilled should the Jews fail in the roles assigned to *them*.

Bizarrely, Josephus continues with another argument, one which though seemingly impossible runs even more contrary to the spirit of Deut 1-11; that the Jews must never actively seek out defensive war, but rely upon God to save them. He first states that to "make war on the Romans with might and hand" will never succeed, and then reminds the Jews of Abraham in Egypt, the Hebrew escape from Egyptian captivity, the seizure of the ark by the Philistines, the destruction of 185,000 Assyrian troops, and finally the liberation from Babylonian captivity, all of which were accomplished without direct Jewish intervention.[759] However, in Deut 1:21, God commands Israel to take the land of the Amorites; it is by disobeying this direct command that much misfortune, thirty-eight years' worth to be precise, befalls Israel. The next question is, why is God not intervening now? Josephus responds with an accusation to the Jews, that they are being punished for "impiety" and "party strife among our forefathers".[760] Here we find evidence of Josephus's protean nature, as well as the difficulty of broadly generalizing his attitudes, for in *A.J.* he will avoid direct accusations of Jewish internecine squabbling, instead often seeking to displace blame on the Samaritans.[761]

---

[759] *B.J.*5.379-395. Josephus's inclusion of the Abrahamic narrative includes "pure hands" which suggests an awareness of *Genesis Apocryphon* 20:16-17, as well as the healing knowledge of Essenism as also attested in *B.J.*2.136, 159 and *A.J.*15.117. There is also influence from Wis 19:3-4, which attributes the Egyptian's wavering attitudes toward the Israelites' departure to "fate", supporting Josephus's governing theme of divine providence. For the above points, see Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 383.
[760] *B.J.*5.396.
[761] *A.J.*11.19-20.

6.7. Josephus—*B.J.*6.96-110

In this dramatic speech, Josephus is with Titus during the siege of Jerusalem. The Romans have invaded the city and are now at the fortress of Antonia, held by John of Gischala. Titus gives Josephus a message to deliver to John—that if John will surrender, the temple will be spared. In response, John claims that "he could never fear capture, since the city was God's".[762] At this, Josephus answers that the temple sacrifices having ceased since the seventeenth of Tammuz, 70 AD, how can John claim piety when he cannot even provide God with worship?[763] The Romans, in fact, strive to reinstate the temple sacrifices, making them in reality the pious ones. Further, king Jeconiah of Israel gladly surrendered to the Babylonians, rather than watch the temple be desecrated.[764]

Again, Josephus interprets all this to indicate God's present favor to the Romans. He also cites "the records of the ancient prophets and that oracle which threatens this poor city and is even now coming true? For they foretold that it would then be taken whensoever one should begin to slaughter his own countrymen".[765] This is, according to Thackeray, likely a reference to the fourth book of the Sibylline Oracles, written contemporaneously with *B.J.*[766] However, the fratricide began long ago, before the ascension of the Hasmonaean dynasty, with Joannes's murder of Jesus who had been spurred on to unduly assert himself by Bagoas. This speech reveals Josephus's respect and concern for the priesthood, but the astute reader cannot help but notice the discrepancy in the causative relationship Josephus presents. This is likely due to the

---

[762] *B.J.*6.98.
[763] Concrete evidence of other temple sacrifice cessation is found in *B.J.* 1.32-33, which records that Antiochus IV halted temple sacrifices for three years and six months; see also Dan 7:25; 9:27; 12:7, 11-12. 17th Tammuz is also the purported date of the golden calf offering at Sinai: Taʿan 4.6, Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 406.
[764] *B.J.*6.99-105.
[765] *B.J.*6.109-110.
[766] Josephus, *The Jewish War*, LCL 210, 406 footnote b.

exigencies of Josephus's life; as a ward of Titus, Josephus was motivated to present to future Emperor of Rome in the best light possible, seeking to justify his actions whenever possible. By attributing the fall of Jerusalem to the present impieties, Josephus accentuates Titus's blamelessness and minimizes the historical corruptions that, for over two hundred years, have plagued the Jerusalem priesthood. As its concern is with temple and priesthood, there is little intersection, within this speech, with wisdom or *paideia* concerns. Nor is Deut 1-11 relevant here, as those chapters do not address issues of the priesthood except only in passing, as Moses establishes priestly cities of refuge.[767] In this case we find the above apologetic for the Romans—an incentive to view them as congruent with Mosaic prophecy—in concert with Josephus's generally positive view of the Romans, as Josephus presents the Romans as Deuteronomically compatible while still more virtuous that a sole reading of Duet 1-11 might lead the reader to suspect.

6.8. Titus—*B.J.*3.472-484

In this speech, Titus exhorts his soldiers not to fear the Jews, for they are trained Roman soldiers while the Jews are a "mere rabble".[768] The Romans are better equipped, better trained, possessed of a better temperament, flushed with the inertia of conquest, and according to Titus, under the approval of God.[769] Josephus depicts Titus as honorable and pious, but this is not universally attested; other sources instead show Titus as a man concerned only with battle, womanizing, and extravagant living.[770] It should also be observed that, while less savory

[767] Deut 4:41-49.
[768] *B.J.*3.475.
[769] For the divine favor especially see *B.J.*3.484.
[770] See Attridge, "Josephus", 203; Suetonius, *Tit.*7.1; Dio Cassius, *Hist.*66.18, 1.

elements of that archetype are here suppressed, the only positive qualities that Josephus emphasizes here are military ones. Only Titus's claim to "valour, discipline, and a heroism which, though doubtless seen to perfection when favoured by fortune, in adversity also holds on to the last" awards him any claim to virtue, in this case the virtues of fortitude and temperance.[771]

Josephus here presents a view of divine benevolence which is tailored to the recipient to such an extent that it seemingly obscures any objective qualities which God may be said to possess. Whereas John of Gischala has been rebuked for his pugnacious commitment to war at any cost, Josephus praises this attitude in the Romans, claiming that it shows they are resolutely fighting with God's help. Jewish virtue, according to Josephus, is to passively await one's fate, hoping that God will intervene. Not so for the Romans, who conquer all lands they see and view their increasing success as a sign that God is blessing them. Josephus has here either created a disturbing double standard, under which God judges and views the Romans completely differently than the Jews, or else an unfalsifiable picture of deity that, once it is detected as unable to be meaningfully contradicted, fails to provide any substantial comfort or spiritual consolation.

None of this, it should also be noted, is in conformity with Deut 1-11, which above all emphasizes the ability and need for Israel to actively conquer the peoples around them, as well as live lives of piety and remembrance of God. They must inculcate their children with this way of life, a point repeatedly emphasized in Deut 1-11, and the other peoples who will lure their children away must be destroyed. Josephus has here, as have so many Second Temple authors, shown a willingness to contravene scriptural traditions when the immediate exigencies of his situation demand he do otherwise. However, the favored positiion of the Romans is not necessarily in opposition to Deut 1-11, as the success of the Romans, as a punitive nation, can

[771] *B.J.*3.479.

mean that God has ordained their actions in accordance with the promises delivered through Moses.

6.9. Titus—*B.J.*6.34-53

In this speech, the Romans, having destroyed an outer wall of the Jewish-held Antonia fortress, now face a second wall, the assault of which according to Josephus will inevitably result in the deaths of the first Roman soldiers to scale it.[772] This places Titus in the unenviable position of motivating his troops to undertake what is essentially a suicide mission. However, "believing that the ardour of troops is best roused by hope and encouraging words, and that exhortations and promises often induce forgetfulness of danger and sometimes even contempt of death", Titus prepares his men with a speech.[773] It should be noted that the influence of Deut 1-11 may be already observed, as in those chapters the Israelites, fresh from their conquests of Sihon and Og, now face an entire territory to be subjugated. But Josephus has Titus first philosophize aloud on the topic of risk, which is nowhere mentioned in Deut 1-11. According to Titus, risk is a prerequisite for any exhortation of great deeds; to give a stirring speech meant to inspire troops to undertake an endeavor *without* risk is "to cast a slur on the persons addressed, while it assuredly convicts him who delivers it of unmanliness (*anandrias*)".[774] Josephus here delivers a subtle and disturbing observation that, when considered alongside Deut 1-11, illustrates not only the radical divergence in Roman military perspective, but may even be a cautious criticism of Moses himself. For while many issues undergird Moses's speech in Deut 1-11, such as the Jewish proclivity to apostasy, their failure to remember God's provision for them,

[772] *B.J.*6.32.
[773] *B.J.*6.33.
[774] *B.J.*6.34.

and their inability to completely trust God and obey the orders they are given, the element of risk is nowhere to be seen. The Israelite experience is characterized by definite outcomes; if they obey God, they will succeed, but if they disobey, they will fail. Seen in this light, the preamble to Titus's speech criticizes the Israelites at Moab, for if they really are not at risk by promptly invading the promised land, as they failed to do earlier, they should be "expected to act of their own accord".[775] But the implications here for Moses are even graver, for his speech at Moab shows his "unmanliness", if Titus/Josephus is to be believed. *Anandrias* here is a serious slur, with consistent attributions in the literature to cowardice, weakness, and effeminacy.[776] In Philo, this term acquires additional connotations of moral degeneracy.[777] But the most interesting examples are found in the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Cassius Dio. Here, *anandrias* is used in military contexts that bear unmistakable resemblances to Titus's siege of Antonia. In Dionysius's *Ant. rom.* 9.57.6, the Aequians and Volscians have obtained a superior position to the Roman troops. Titus Quintius Capitolinus—another Titus—scolds his officers "for their want of courage (*anandrias*), reminding them of their former exploits, and showing them to what shame and danger they would be exposed in fleeing, he ended with an untruth, which more than anything else inspired his own men with confidence and the enemy with fear". Similarly, in Cassius Dio's *Roman History*, Antony is condemned for "lack of bravery in their failure to take Mutina, though they have been besieging it for so long a time".[778]

Titus then reminds the Romans that it is glorious to die in battle, another concept utterly foreign to the Mosaic ethos expressed in Deut 1-11, for it is clear that Israelite death is a result of disobedience; only death in old age, after having living a long and blessed life in the land given

---

[775] *B.J.*6.36.
[776] See Plutarch, *Lives* 6.34.2, 6.35.3; *Mor*.544.a2; Athenaeus, *Deipn.*12.514d, 12.514b; Polybius, *Hist.*30.18.5; Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.*16.1.1; 31.15.1.
[777] Philo, *Leg.*3.54 (*anandrias kai delias*); *Spec*.3.31 (*malakias kai anandrias*); 3.39; 4.224; *Virt*.6, 20, 25.
[778] Cassius Dio, 45.42.

as a result of obedience (but not inherent righteousness), is to be desired by Israel. Yet in 6.46-49, Titus will further elaborate on the idea of death in battle, while stating that "the worst I could wish is that they may die in peace of disease, soul and body alike condemned to the tomb ... souls released from the flesh by the sword on the battlefield are hospitably welcomed by ... the ether ...and placed among the stars ... while souls which pine away in bodies wasted by disease ... are obliterated in subterranean night and pass into profound oblivion". Nor is this warrior ethos to be found in the wisdom literature. But the soldiers have been prepared for this rhetoric by an examination of the Jewish drive for survival that alone enables their continued successes, however marginal, while Roman success results from God's favor.[779] While not Deuteronomic, there is a strong resonance with the Deuteronomistic history, specifically the conquest of Jericho, as Titus recalls "faction, famine, siege, *the fall of ramparts without impact of engines* (italics mine)—what can these things mean but that God is wroth with them and extending his aid to us?".[780]

Noteworthy also is the curious inversion that Titus gives to Jewish slavery, an institution which according to him persists and mitigates any dishonor that might follow their defeat. The Jews, Titus claims, "have learnt to be slaves", and any brave attack on their part which results in their death is most disgraceful as, since they are accustomed to servitude, by dying in this way they are wasting their lives.[781] Both slavery and martyrdom are strangely parodied, almost mocked, by Titus. Israel was delivered from Egyptian slavery at their weakest point, yet for Titus, the sight of Israel in slavery is a sign of God's disfavor, not, as Jewish history would indicate, a meaningless obstacle that has not stopped God's deliverance and may not prevent it again. Far from slavery as a natural condition for Jews, one to which they should accustom

[779] *B.J.*6.39.
[780] *B.J.*6.41.
[781] *B.J.*6.42.

themselves should they find themselves under its yoke, the rescue from slavery constitutes a prominent motif in Deut 1-11, for as the formulation of the Decalogue given there is clear, the Israelites are to honor the sabbath day and do no work therein because they were servants "in the land of Egypt, and יהוה your God brought you out thence with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm; therefore יהוה your God commanded you to keep the sabbath day".[782] And any Jewish willingness to die in battle must be, from Titus's point of view, a failure to accept their destinies as slaves, their deaths the result of the "sheer display of bravery". It seems that the vision of a warrior's death, which the Romans may anticipate, is withheld from similar heroism on the part of Jewish combatants.

This vision of death, however, does not preclude martyrdom, and eerily conforms to what we have witnessed earlier in Josephus's presentation of Titus. Josephus has through Titus reinforced his vision of passive Jewish piety, enabling to Jews to suffer and die nobly, but not to actively resist and die in combat. This reveals Josephus, again, as a shrewd political agent. By placarding the unfitness of Jewish resistance, Josephus subtly supports the Jewish virtue of martyrdom, as seen in 2 Maccabees. It is acceptable for Jews to die at the hands of their overpowering overlords, Josephus suggests, rather than violate those ancestral laws which they hold precious, and we can easily envision the Jews of his time in agreement. But to actively resist the overlords shifts the resistance from physical destruction with spiritual triumph to physical resistance and triumph, a political statement which would produce much more unease in the mind of the Romans.

[782] Deut 5:15.

6.10. Titus—*B.J.*6.328-350

In this speech, Titus delivers an unsettling inversion of the conditions which normally distinguish Jewish sacred victory. In *B.J.*6.330 he asks Simon and John, "Did you rely on numbers? ... On the fidelity of allies? .... On physical strength? ... On the solidity of your walls? ... On the determination of strength and the astuteness of your generals?".[783] Two of these qualities are addressed in Deut 1-11, but while Titus tries to expose the futility of these measures as a method of preservation against the Romans, Deut 1-11 reveals these qualities are ineffectual when relied upon as a substitute for God. The Jews should not rely on their numbers, according to Deut 7:7-9. Nor should they rely on their strength, according to Deut 7:17-24. The other three conditions are shown in the Jewish scriptures as either prohibitions or lessons in reverse. Reliance upon the stability of walls has already been mentioned in *B.J.*6.41, with an allusion to Jos 6:20. Regarding the fidelity of allies, Deut 1-11 warns against forming alliances with the surrounding nations, a prohibition which Israel historically interpreted to mean only those nations specifically mentioned as is attested by several scriptural passages.[784] Never is Israel encouraged by God to rely upon its own strength.

The inversion continues as Titus describes the Romans as the enablers of Jewish polity. It is because of the Romans, Titus claims, that the Jews inhabit the land where they now reside. It is because of the Romans that the Jews are ruled by their own kings, governed by their own laws, and even able to collect tithes and offerings for their own God.[785] In fact, according to Titus, these offerings are made with Roman money.[786] Here, the Romans are presented as a

---

[783] *B.J.*6.330-332.
[784] 1 Kgs 3:1; 2 Kgs 15:19, 16:7,
[785] *B.J.*6.333-336.
[786] See Matt 22:15-22.

surrogate god, arrogating to themselves the powers which according to Deut 1-11 belong only to God. Those powers are specifically inhabitation of the land and the laws of Israel, which are extensively treated in Deut 1-11.[787] But the most striking inverted reference is found in *B.J.*6.338-347, where Josephus seems to intentionally invert the tropes of Deut 1-11. In this passage, Titus claims that his father Vespasian "came into the country, not to punish you ... but to admonish you".[788] Josephus uses *noutheteō* here, which in Job is translated *mûsar*. Josephus here therefore invokes not only the sentiments of Deut 8:1-5 and 11:2, which recommends the Israelites view God's leading of them through the wilderness as *mûsar/paideia*, but *paideia* itself and its us within the wisdom text of Job. Yet it is not God who claims the authority to discipline Israel, but the Roman emperor Vespasian.

Further, this admonishment is delivered by way of a military conquest. Titus claims that had Vespasian wanted to destroy the Jews completely, he would have "hasten[ed] to the root of your strength and sacked [Jerusalem] forthwith; whereas he proceeded to ravage Galilee and the surrounding district, thus affording you time for repentance".[789] The same mitigated response may be seen in Deut 7:22, but this not a merciful gesture for the nations under attack; rather, it is purely for the assistance of Israel, so that they are not forced to contend with a suddenly barren wilderness, overrun with wild beasts. It should be noted here that, irrespective of the Romans' true role in God's design for the world, as revealed by Moses in Deut 1-11, *and* irrespective of Josephus's view of the Romans as participating in this design, the *Romans themselves* do not necessarily have the proper view of their own role as described in Deut 1-11. They may have, individually, wrongful attitudes of their own self-importance that certainly warrant criticism. It

[787] Deut 1:21; 4:5, 8. Other portions of the Deuteronomistic History address the remaining privileges; kingship is addressed in 1 Sam 8:1-22; establishment of worship in 2 Sam 7:1-29; 1 Kgs 8:1-11.
[788] *B.J.*6.338.
[789] *B.J.*6.339.

is in this respect that Josephus implicitly criticizes Titus. Yet this criticism is only meaningful in the eyes of pious Jews, allowing Josephus to save face; Titus himself would not have seen anything wrong with Josephus's statements.

6.11. Agrippa II—*B.J.*2.345-407

Agrippa II gives his speech at an especially fragile moment in Jewish history.[790] A Greek real estate purchase adjoining the temple is blocking access to a synagogue in Caesarea; the Jews complain to the owners, and even offer to purchase the adjoining land, but without response.[791] Some young Jews respond violently, to which the procurator, Florus, responds in kind.[792] Then the Greeks make a sacrifice of birds on the land within sight of the synagogue, and more violence from the Jews ensues, as well as the Caesarea Jews taking a copy of the Law and leaving for Narbata, another Jewish territory.[793] In response, Florus travels to Jerusalem and tries to extract extra funds from the temple, apparently holding the Jews in Jerusalem partially responsible for the acts in Caesarea.[794] At this point, there are no further violent actions from the Jews. Florus, on the other hand, begins a campaign of violent harassment, going so far as to crucify Jewish equestrians, an unprecedented move.[795] This eventually leads to mass violence as a group of Jews, verbally assaulting the Romans, are physically engaged in turn, and ultimately Jewish revolutionaries, likely Zealots or Sicarii, disrupt Roman communications near the

[790] This ornate speech, rich with artifice, presents a strong argument against the realist position presented earlier, as Agrippa did not even espouse the views presented in this address: not to mention the high level of rhetorical detail and control. The address more likely presents Josephus's knowledge once the war has been concluded. See Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 178.
[791] *B.J.*2.285-286.
[792] *B.J.*2.286.
[793] *B.J.*2.292.
[794] *B.J.*2.293-296.
[795] *B.J.*2.308.

Antonia fortress.[796] Finally, king Agrippa II addresses the crowd, hoping to defuse the hostilities, having no desire to see either any more organized opposition to Florus or any more Jewish bloodshed.

His speech, then, may be viewed as passing through two interpretive filters. First, his own, as a character in a story clearly motivated to convince the Jews not to do that which they reasonably have significant ground to do, namely, depose Florus. Secondly, Josephus himself certainly wants to present Rome in the best light possible, even in this early stage of authorship.[797] Many of these motivations occur in Florus's speech, but other elements are present which produce for the reader the same sense of disconcert we have seen in many other of the speeches Josephus presents.

We have seen many elements of Deut 1-11 subverted in these speeches; here Agrippa does so with a special emphasis on *mûsar/paideia*. As we have seen, Jewish youth were involved in the initial violence that led to Florus's involvement. Agrippa seizes this and designs his opening statement to exploit this opening, asserting that "the stimulus to war is for some of you mere youthfulness which lacks experience of its horrors".[798] Therefore, one of his chief aims is "to bring these misguided persons to reason and a better frame of mind, and to prevent virtuous citizens from reaping the consequences of the errors of a few".[799] Note the presupposition: Agrippa is tacitly underpinning his argument with the suggestion that the young Jews were wrong in their actions, a suggestion which remains assumed and is nowhere critically examined. By presenting the youth as "misguided" and addressing those who remain as

---

[796] *B.J.*2.325-328.
[797] At the very least, due to his patronage by Rome; but there are factual inconsistencies in this speech that suggest a more ironic interpretation and presents a Rome of pragmatism, rather than a messianism through surrogacy. See Steve Mason, *Judean War 2*, BJP 1B, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 268. It is also possible that Josephus includes these factual inconsistencies to present a tactical-rhetorical strategy which Agrippa uses to intimidate the Jews.
[798] *B.J.*346.
[799] *B.J.*2.346.

"virtuous", Agrippa draws upon the traditions of instruction found in Deut 6:1-2, 6-7, and 20-25. In these passages, Moses commands Israel to instruct their children in the statutes and commandments, as well as the history of their enslavement by Egypt and God's deliverance from that servitude. The tradition of passivity in the face of oppression, seen elsewhere in *B.J.*, emerges here also. Therefore, hoping that the Jews will remember Moses's command to teach the young, Agrippa seems to hope that in case they will do the same. Whether what he is commanding them to teach, however, should in fact be taught is not yet established.

As Agrippa's speech continues, it is clear that he either does not know the issues at hand or intentionally obfuscates them in order to prevent a convincing palliative.[800] Agrippa immediately presents the Jews their own situation, and characterizes it as a competition between freedom and justice. The Jews, Agrippa claims, are pursuing these claims simultaneously, when in reality they are mutually exclusive; to have just cause to claim one invalidates the other. If, for example, the Jews really believe they are wrongfully enslaved by the Romans, what does it matter if the Romans are just or unjust? Not even kind treatment from masters, Agrippa implies, justifies slavery. Similarly, if the Jews do in fact procure their freedom, they will have even little reason to demand justice from their former masters.[801]

What Agrippa does not elaborate here, however, is not only that slavery is itself a form of injustice, but also that justice might well demand that freed slaves receive due recompense, and—most importantly—that none of this incited the initial actions of the Jews, most especially the actions of the young Jews in criticism of whom Agrippa began his speech. It was the interference with Jewish synagogue practice that provoked the anger of the young Jews, first by

[800] As suggested in Mason, *Judean War 2*, 268.
[801] This presentation of an opponent's two-pronged argument as inherently contradictory is also observed in *C.Ap.* 1.219-2.286. See John M.G. Barclay, *Against Apion*, BJP 10, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2007), xix-xxi; Mason, *Judean War 2*, 271. In this case, competing and shifting motives often co-exist within colonized populations, with the desire for "freedom" often submerged in times of prosperity; again, see Mason, *Judean War 2*, 271.

impeding their access to the synagogue itself, then by committing a forbidden sacrifice within sight of the synagogue. By responding violently to this, the Jews are continuing a well-established tradition found within Deut 1-11. As seen many times before, when Israel offers to pay Sihon, king of Heshbon, in order that they may pass safely through his land, he does respond and prevents access to the promised land, with which Israel responds by violently destroying him and his people.[802]

Agrippa continues, arguing that the Jews should not make an appeal to the consciences of Florus and the Romans through active resistance, but through an attempt to provoke a compassionate response by way of passive acceptance of their fate.[803] This is, given the present circumstances, laughable; but it is also a nod to Titus, Josephus's current benefactor whom despite other ancient accounts to the contrary Josephus will depict as merciful and virtuous.[804] However, Agrippa next invokes the Roman administration itself as a mitigating circumstance that should inform the Jews' actions. Why, Agrippa asks, do you threaten war with Rome, with the emperor Nero, when your actual grievance is with Florus? The administration is the concrete apparatus, Agrippa suggests, that proves this dissociation of intent: "It is not by [the Roman ministers'] orders that an oppressive governor comes from them to us, and they cannot see in the west their officers in the east; it is not easy even promptly to hear yonder the news from these parts. How absurd it were ... to take arms against so mighty a power, which does not even know the nature of our complaints!".[805] Yet it is just this sort of administrative system that Moses enacts in Deut 1, claiming, "How can I bear alone the weight and burden of you and your strife? Choose wise, understanding, and experienced men, according to your tribes, and I will appoint

[802] Deut 2:26-37. It should be noted that the Jews in Caesarea, like Israel at Heshbon, offered to buy the adjoining land so as to ease their passage to the synagogue.
[803] *B.J.*2.351. Agrippa's use of the word *phileleutheros*, or "freedom-lover", is without nuance and as callous as can be imagined; see Mason, *Judean War 2*, 274.
[804] See above.
[805] *B.J.*2.352-354.

them as your heads", to which the Israelites answer, "The thing that you have spoken is good for us to do".[806] Yet Exod 18:14-27 presents a different account. Here, Moses is ruling the people alone, and growing visibly exhausted. Moses's father-in-law, Jethro, observes this and says: "What you are doing is not good ... the thing is too heavy for you; you are not able to perform it alone ... choose able men from all the people ... men who are trustworthy and hate a bribe ... and place such men over the people as rulers of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens".[807] The phrase "thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens" indicates an affinity between this Exodus passage and the Deuteronomic text which gives the same formula at 1:15. While it is impossible to say if the historical Agrippa interacted with these texts during his speech, it can be much more surely attested that Josephus, in his creation of *B.J.*, has Agrippa produce this criticism against administrative issues in connection with this shared narrative of Deut 1 and Exod 18.

Agrippa's next argument is since the Jews have already succumbed to servitude, it is now too late to oppose the Romans. This is also not in keeping with Deuteronomic teaching; Deut 5:15 reminds the reader that the Israelites were slaves in Egypt, brought out by God, and instructed to extend the privilege of the sabbath to their own servants/slaves as a memorial gesture. Already the inherent wrongness of slavery, seemingly presumed by Agrippa, is problematized; but also, it should be remembered that the Israelites were slaves in Egypt for many generations before their deliverance. To argue, then, that a statute of limitations applies to the Jews is strange and seemingly ignorant of the Jewish scriptures.

Finally, Agrippa ends his argument with a long litany of nations which have fallen under the Roman yoke. These include the mightiest nations in history: Greeks, Gauls, Egyptians, Scythians, Dacians, Spaniards, Britons, and Persians. The whole world is under the Roman

[806] Deut 1:12-14.
[807] Exod 18:17-21.

yoke, leaving no allies for the Jews, and therefore Rome must have the favor of God. If this is so, he implies, the Jews must not have this favor, and so any resistance against Rome is doomed to failure.[808] Josephus here expands upon the theme found in Deut 1-3, as well as Deut 7: if Israel disobeys God, they will lose all battles, but if they obey—promptly—they will win. However, relative military might is not part of the Deuteronomic considerations, whereas it plays an important role in Agrippa's reasoning. The ongoing and accruing inertia of Roman conquest, according to Agrippa, does not provide a mundane counter-argument against his claims of divine favor. Rather, the circumstances and victories of Rome should be viewed as not only providing material power, ensuring their future victories, but a continual sign of God's favor. Given Josephus's conviction in providence and the divine hand guiding the Romans, it is unsurprising that he places this speech in Agrippa's mouth and has him argue in this way.

6.12. Eleazar—*B.J.*7.320-388

Eleazar's speech has the same inversions seen in Titus's, but while Titus's speech inverts the role of God in the life of Israel, claiming that role for himself, Eleazar's speech inverts the character of God and interprets the current plight of Israel as if God were contrary to the divine character revealed in Deut 1-11 and elsewhere. Eleazar believes that death is a favor granted by God, and a "noble death" at that.[809] This statement alone opposes the sentiments of Deut 1-11, which provides that long life is one of the blessings received by Israel as a reward for obedience. This death, moreover, is a result of the enemies which now confront the Jews—the Romans—being too strong to defeat. However, in Deut 1-11 and elsewhere in the Jewish scriptures, God's

[808] See Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 184.
[809] *B.J.*2.326.

response to an enemy seemingly too powerful for Israel to defeat is not for the Israelites to prematurely end their lives, but to rescue them despite seemingly insurmountable odds. In Eleazar's defense, he accuses the Jews of being "instructors", *didaskoi*, in crime, casting the Jews in the role of wrongdoers. Nowhere in Deut 1-11 is the possibility of repentance addressed; in fact, God appears determined to "destroy them and blot out their name from under heaven" requiring Moses's intercession to obtain mercy for Israel.[810]

Had he followed this line of reasoning, he might have convinced his audience that there was indeed no hope, but when the assembled Israelites cannot bring themselves to commit suicide, Eleazar leaves scriptural argument aside and, from Greek philosophy, produces an argument built upon the idea of the soul's immortality.[811] With the phenomenon of sleep and dream as evidence, Eleazar tells the Jews that the soul, when in the body, is essentially dead, while it only truly lives and "is restored to its proper sphere, that it enjoys a blessed energy and a power untrammelled on every side, remaining, like God Himself, invisible to human eyes".[812] This division between body and soul is not to be found in Deut 1-11, where only life and death are possible outcomes for Israel. The survival of the disembodied soul is not seen until the later wisdom writings of Job and Eccesiastes.[813] Here, then, Eleazar's interaction with wisdom, and for that matter *mûsar/paideia* as "instructor", is used to mitigate Deut 1-11's dire promises of destruction. Rather than rely upon repentance formulas, Eleazar instead extrapolates from the wisdom tradition to offer hope of disembodied immortality. But his presentation of this immortality reveals that he is unwilling to fully exegete these wisdom texts, which speak of the

---

[810] Deut 9:14.
[811] See *B.J.*7.343, LCL 210, 601 footnote b (Thackeray).
[812] *B.J.*7.346.
[813] Job 19:23-27; Qoh 12:7. These are insufficient proofs, however, according to Cornfeld, who instead finds evidence in Ps 115:17: "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go into silence". In the Hellenistic, Tannaitic, and Talmudic periods, the immortality of the soul was assumed on the grounds of its inherent immateriality, and a Jew's task was to "protect the soul from losing its purity while in the material world", with Pharasaism insisting upon a final judgment at which point souls would receive justice. See Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 494.

soul's post-mortem existence in Sheol not as the apotheosis of glory which, inspired by the Greeks, he promises the assembled Jews, but instead a limbo not to be eagerly anticipated by anyone, as Ecclesiastes especially emphasizes and as we have seen above.

Eleazar next perhaps shows the tendencies which incriminated the Jews in the first place. To further convince the Jews to commit suicide, he describes the practices of Indians who "reluctantly endure the period of life ... but hasten to release their souls from their bodies".[814] This suicide is accomplished by means of immolation, and the Indians who end their lives in this way are accompanied by their loved ones. Yet Deut 1-11 is clear that Israel is not to imitate the ways of the surrounding nations, and this Indian practice somewhat resembles the immolation practices of the Canaanites. So the Israelite proclivity to apostasy and syncretism is seen even now in Eleazar, who justifies his advice on the grounds of foreign practices and beliefs. But in what is perhaps the most shocking statement of all, Eleazar says, "even had we from the first been schooled in the opposite doctrine and taught that man's highest blessing is life and that death is a calamity ... it is by God's will and necessity that we are to die".[815] This is exactly what Moses in Deut 1-11 teaches repeatedly: that obedience brings life and blessed prosperity, which disobedience brings cursing and destruction. It seems that Eleazar has failed to do that which Moses in Deut 1-11 constantly exhorts Israel to do: to remember the rules and statutes and to do them. Eleazar seems to have forgotten that the discourse at Moab even occurred.

It is possible, of course, that these are literary attributions which Josephus makes to reinforce his overriding theme that the Jews have lost God's blessing and that the Romans now supplant them in accordance with Deut 1-11. Just as he employed an inversion with heavy Christian overtones, drawing parallels between Titus and Christ to reinforce Rome as the new

---

[814] *B.J.*7.352.
[815] *B.J.*7.358.

"messiah", he now has Eleazar catastrophically blundering Deut 1-11 in a series of arguments for what is arguably one of the most monstrous crimes in Judaism, murder of the self.[816] This farce presents such an obvious inversion that Josephus's literary invention, if it is that (and it almost assuredly is) becomes dangerously close to the "fourth wall" of the reader's suspension of disbelief. Only in Deut 1-11's assurance of destruction for the wrongdoer does Eleazar properly interpret the passage. But the mercy and intercession found here and elsewhere, for example Exod 34, is nowhere to be seen.

6.13. Ananus—*B.J.*4.163-183

As the war with Rome continues, the Zealots within Jerusalem have seized control of the temple. So bold have they become that they select Phanni, one of their own, through the casting of lots. Phanni is a thoroughly unqualified man whom Josephus calls an *agroikios*, translated "clown" by Thackeray but better given as "rube" or "hick", an unlettered, unsophisticated hillbilly who "scarcely knew what the high priesthood meant".[817] His only claim to priestly eligibility is his mysterious inclusion within a priestly clan, in this case "Eniachin". Seeing this charlatan in priestly garb, attempting to minister in the sacred Jewish liturgies, is enough to incense the populace, and a legitimate priest, Ananus, addresses them.

What follows is a complex and highly nuanced intersection with not only *mûsar/paideia* but also Deut 1-11. According to Gaalya Cornfeld, it is "one of the finest orations in *War*, both in composition and content" that is meant to "channel the people's sense of freedom against the armed fist of the Zealots and to fan the religious feeling of the people and their devotion to the

[816] See Josephus's argument in *B.J.*3.362-382.
[817] See *B.J.*4.155-156, LCL 210 (Thackeray); also Montanari, *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, 21.

Temple against the Zealots who had seized it and made it their stronghold".[818] This complex speech builds upon many ideas we have seen earlier, most significantly the idea of a noble or heroic death. This concept frames his address, and he repeatedly extols the virtue of dying for a sacred cause rather than allowing oneself to face mortality through inertia and resigned passivity. Ananus first essentially declares himself a coward, stating that it would have been better for him "to have died [than to have seen] the house of God with such abominations and its unapproachable and hallowed places crowded with the feet of murderers!"[819] He further contrasts his current condition of life, in which he continues to wear the vestments of a priest, with a courageous demise "that would shed lustre on [his] old age".[820] Ananus will return to this theme briefly at the end of his speech, noting that if his audience decides to muster their collective courage and fight the Zealots, he will gladly die beside them. But again, such heroism has no place in Deut 1-11 which asserts, to the contrary, that while heroism has its place, the true virtue is obedience to God and to engage in battle at God's command. Without God's directive, no act of war can be successful, and death will ensue, a death not of glory but of shame at having disobeyed God. But Josephus also embeds a subtle criticism of the priesthood, carefully disguised so as to avoid overt castigation of the institution. For Josephus himself is of priestly descent. Like the "rube" Phanni, Josephus is descended from one of the priestly courses, albeit in Josephus's case the course of Joarib. Yet as we will soon see, for Ananas to defend his own priestly legitimacy while decrying the lineage of his opponents, on the ground that he chooses to criticize, is questionable and even absurd.

This criticism, which we will examine before looking at the underlying problems, is the idea of an "offered" priestly life. Ananus has just announced that he is ashamed of his life, and

[818] Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 269.
[819] *B.J.*4.163.
[820] *B.J.*4.164.

that it would have in fact been better had he not been alive at all. Yet this life, which he regrets in every way, he deems fit to offer to God. Had Ananus been a common Jew, this claim of having "offered" his life to God would be problematic, given that Jews are expected only to offer the best of themselves and their possessions to God. This is seen in interpretations of Genesis, citing Cain's failure to offer "firstfruits" or in his case the best of his flock, as grounds for God's rejection of his sacrifice. Ananus, however, has just stated that he views his present life as an inferior compromise and seems to sincerely believe that his life would be much improved were he to give it in battle against God's opponents. He is therefore implying that a life which he thinks unfit from a human perspective is somehow appropriate from God's perspective—and not any human life, but that of a priest, who are the self-attested professional specialists regarding what is and what is not fit to be offered to God. Further, he wants to separate himself from the Jews for whom he should be interceding: "alone will I go and, as in utter desolation, devote this single life of mine in the cause of God".[821]

There is an obvious explanation for these circumstances; Ananus would much rather be serving in the temple, but is prevented from doing so by the Zealots who have seized it. However, his real failure of priestly character is his compulsion to abandon the people for whose intercession he is responsible. This aversion to duty, he claims, is provoked by the people's passivity in the face of the Zealots' bold violence and impiety. This is reprehensible now, Ananus scolds, but the inevitable outcome of a lengthy period during which the people refused to intervene, "allowing those first recruits to combine, when they were yet but few, [swelling] their numbers by [their] silence, and by [their] inaction when they were arming drew those arms upon [themselves]".[822] This refusal to act, according to Ananus, has enabled the Zealots to assume

[821] *B.J.*4.164.
[822] *B.J.*4.166-167.

power incrementally, and Ananus describes this as *trophē*, or the "rearing" of a nursemaid.[823] This sort of passivity is also seen in the common, but slightly deficient, translation of Prov 22:6: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it". The Hebrew here gives "according to the mouth of his way", implying that allowing the child to become his own teacher will result in the child assuming a self-directed course of action, and presumably a poor one at that, from which the child will in later life be *unable* to depart. This sort of anti-*paideia* is exactly what Ananas observes in the Zealots and, assuming that it was the responsibility of the Jews to address these tendencies, the Jews through their inaction have enabled.

Again, Josephus presents to the reader a depiction of priesthood that is in strong opposition to Deut 1-11. In the Deuteronomic passage, Moses commands Israel to actively train their children in the knowledge and obedience of the statutes and ordinances. Nor does Moses show a desire to abandon Israel, even when, as given in Deut 9:13-14, God is preparing to destroy them: "I have seen this people and behold, it is a stubborn people; let me alone, that I may destroy them and blot out their name from under heaven; and I will make of you a nation mightier and greater than they". Nor is this perhaps an accidental reference, for in this section of Deuteronomy Moses is interceding not only for the people of Israel, but also Aaron the priest, who have acted together to make a golden calf.[824] Therefore, just as the events which are transpiring before Ananus, Moses intercedes for both people and a fallible priesthood—albeit, in Aaron's case, an inarguably legitimate one—while Ananus abandons them, or at least wishes to.

The Deuteronomic issue of slavery is also presented by Ananus, who reprimands the Jews for their cowardice. Much like Agrippa, Ananus argues that if the Jews are brave enough

[823] Montanari, *Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, 2158.
[824] The episode of the golden calf appears in *B.J.* but not in *A.J.*

to resist Roman slavery, there is no reason for them to fearfully cooperate with the dominating attacks of the Zealots. Again, like Agrippa, Ananus argues that if the Jews are at war with the Romans to protect their liberty, why are they willing so surrender these same liberties to the Zealots? Ananus has of course answered his own qestion earlier in his speech; the gradual and incremental encroachment of the Zealots, transgressing the rightful boundaries bit by bit, not only gave them increasing confidence to oppress the Jews even further—a type of anti-*paideia*—but also desensitized the Jews to the effects of a slowly intensifying suppression of their liberties. For this reason, Ananus perhaps implies, the Jews have failed to take quick and sufficient action against the Zealots, and now reap the penalties for their hesitation. They are barred from the temple, and he can no longer fulfill his rightful priestly function.

So Ananus suggests that it is the people, the Jews whom he addresses, are to blame not only for their own bondage but for his own inability to properly perform the rites of a priest. Again, we see important themes of Deut 1-11, introduced in a context that is relevant and important for Josephus. As we have repeatedly seen, the statement of the decalogue found in Deut 5 mandates the sabbath not only for Jews but their livestock and slaves/servants. Deuteronomy thus presents a complex view of slavery; while the institution is not condemned *per se*, the bondage of Israel in Egypt, for God is intolerable, due not to any express condemnation of slavery in Scripture but for the sake of the promise which God made to the Jewish forefathers and which God remembered as Israel cried out to him. It is therefore the special character of the people of Israel which prompts God to liberate them from Egypt, as is again found in Deut 1-11.[825]

But it is also the poor behavior of the people that brings not only their first failure in the wilderness, in which they constructed a golden calf, of which Moses reminds them in Deut 9,

[825] Deut 7:6.

and which Josephus treats cautiously and inconsistently in his own work, but also their failure to enter the promised land when they first reach its borders. Deut 1-11 consistently presents the *people* as the villain in the story, if there is to be one; the priesthood, while seemingly implicated in blame due to Aaron's complicity in the forming of the golden calf, is partially exonerated by both the emphasis upon the wrong doing of the people and the importance of Moses's intercession for Israel. For Josephus, then, there is a considerable benefit in this presentation of Ananus as a priest who, despite the charges of hypocrisy that could be levied against him, is in fact depicted much like Moses: solidly locating the blame for what has gone before not with Aaron, but with the people assembled before him. By allocating blame with the people, Josephus reinforces his narrative: an ambivalent and careful attitude toward the priesthood, combined with a constant assertion that God has shifted favor from the Jews to the Romans. After all, the priesthood has many times been subjected to scandals that could possibly disqualify it as an institution, from the blood shed by Joannes to the ascendancy of the Hasmoneans. Yet none of this is part of Ananus's speech, for reasons not only historically applicable—Ananus does not wish to incriminate himself—but also useful to Josephus's underlying aims.

6.14. Jesus—*B.J.*4.239-269; Simon the Idumaean, *B.J.*4.272-282

This speech shows Jesus, the second ranked priest (Ananus is first) addressing a massed horde of Idumaeans who have been summoned to Jerusalem by two eloquent Zealot ambassadors, each named Ananias. Alleging that Ananus and the priests want to surrender Jerusalem to Rome, they ask the Idumaeans for assistance, and so effective are the ambassadors that twenty thousand Idumaeans travel to Jerusalem, led by four generals: John, James son of

Sosas, Simon son of Thaceas, and Phineas son of Clusoth.[826] It falls to Jesus to somehow dissuade this army from besieging Jerusalem, an easy task seeing as how they will have the cooperation of the Zealots.

Jesus begins by first observing the mixed motives of the assembled army. These men, Jesus alleges, would not have come in such numbers even if the Jerusalem authorities had summoned them, requesting their help from a barbarian (*barbarous*) horde.[827] He therefore questions their true allegiances, and soon reveals his conviction that the Idumaeans do not consider themselves so much the ally of Jerusalem as the enemy of Rome, and taking advantage of the opportunity to inflict harm upon their enemy on behalf of the enemy of their enemy, or in other words Jerusalem, who may or may not be their "friend".[828] Yet Jesus argues this cannot be the case, for the following reason—it is far too late to broker any peace treaties, now, with Rome. Jerusalem's opportunity to cooperate with Rome has long passed. The adjoining territories have already been destroyed, and Jesus suggests that any advantage they might have obtained from a negotiation no longer exists. This argument shows an awareness of the tradition found in Deut 1-3, which is a historical narrative describing the unsuccessful first attempt of Israel to enter in to the promised land. God reveals the terms of a swift and complete occupation, namely, immediate attack; Israel, however, fails to comply, sends spies, and hesitates in fear. This causes them to lose their chance for occupation, and a protracted period of wilderness pilgrimage is the punishment. However, they immediately assume that if they now attempt to fulfill the terms of obedience, they will reap the originally promised reward. This is not the case and Israel is routed by the Amorites, "chased ... as bees ... and [beaten] down in Seir as far as

---

[826] *B.J.*4.226-232.
[827] *Barbaroi* here should be taken to mean "non-Greek speakers", not "non-Greeks"; the Romans of Josephus's day, and certainly Josephus himself, would not have considered anyone fluent in Greek to be a barbarian. See Steve Mason, *Judean War 4*, BJP 2A, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2022), 127.
[828] *B.J.*4.244-246.

Hormah".[829] Seir is, perhaps not uncoincidentally, the same territory as Edom.[830] Josephus, aware of these traditions, perhaps is alluding to Deuteronomy here to remind the reader of the historic truces between Israel and Seir, as an additional subtle criticism of the Idumaeans who have taken the side of the Zealots.[831]

Jesus's speech is followed by a brief rebuttal from Simon, who speaks on behalf of the incredulous Idumaeans. According to Simon, the Jews have no grounds to prevent the Idumaeans from entering the city, as the arms they bear are only for the purposes of ensuring the freedom of the Jews.[832] It was further the intention of the Idumaeans to *worship* there which, again, the Jews are preventing. Interestingly, this speech shows little affinity to Deut 1-11, but is highly reminiscent of the original complaint of the Samaritans in the Ezra-Nehemiah-Esdras cycle; that they have come to assist in building the temple, being faithful worshippers of God.

6.15. Josephus and Covenant—The Biblical Text Compared With *A.J.*

In *A.J.*, Josephus is engaging in what can be called "rewritten Bible". As with many other specimens of Second Temple Jewish writings, e.g., Pseudo-Philo's *LAB, Jubilees*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Josephus's goal is to represent the events of the Jewish scriptures in a new document. Josephus's precise underlying purposes behind the creation of *A.J.* remain debated within scholarship, but it can be unequivocally said that he excised virtually every mention of *diathēkē* from his own "rewritten Bible". This elimination of *diathēkē* is so complete that it actually simplifies the issue. Because covenant is so profoundly absent from all twenty books of

[829] Deut 1:44.
[830] Gen 36:20-21; Deut 2:4, 12; 2 Chr 20:22-23.
[831] This long preamble is another example of artificiality of speech and a sign of Josephus having composed this address, which was however the standard practice of other ancient historians (Thucydides, Polybius, Livy). See Cornfeld, *Josephus*, 276.
[832] *B.J.*4.275-277.

A.J., it allows us to view this omission of covenant as not linked to the specific interpretation of a given textual pericope, but as one of Josephus's many purposes for *A.J.* as a whole. This is, after all, a simpler explanation than attempting to posit many different explanations, as many as one for each pericope, for a phenomenon that really does not warrant such a convoluted hypothesis.[833]

As we examine Josephus's treatment of covenant within *A.J.*, we will see that his retellings may be classified under six subheadings. These subheadings are: rulership; human agreements; liturgical practice; obedience; inheritance of the land; and the ark of the covenant. Within each subheading, I present the examples in chronological order. What we will see, in general, is that Josephus's overwhelming motivation is political. Much of the covenantal language within the Hebrew Bible designates the Jews as a special people which will inherit a land that, at the time of Josephus's writing, is firmly under Roman control. These passages are omitted, as this is the last impression of the Jews that Josephus wishes to present to the Romans, recently victorious over the Jewish people. Occasionally a covenantal mention is made that does not have this ominous implication, such as Jewish alliances with foreign rulers and narratives which show the Jews *losing* their rights to the land through disobedience. These narratives are largely retained complete. But the word *diathēkē* is never used and is always replaced with, most commonly, *horkos*, *pisteis*, and sometimes *sunthēkē*. *Diathēkē* is a particularly, perhaps exclusively, Septuagintal word which, for those that knew the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, would link the idea of covenant directly to its Jewish origins and, in the Hebrew, its

---

[833] All English Bible translations, ESV, except for the phrase "the LORD" in that translation which I give as יהוה. The ESV uniformly translates "berith" as "covenant"; I have occasionally provided both but not always, as to do so would, in my opinion, be excessively tedious for the reader.

inescapable claims of Jewish exclusivity—something which Josephus was undoubtedly eager to avoid. As such, it makes no appearance in his corpus.

Before beginning, it would be helpful to provide a brief comment on Josephus's descriptions of Moses with respect to covenant. In Josephus, Moses twice uses the phrase *summachos kai boēthos*, "ally and helper".[834] We have investigated Harold W. Attridge's work on these terms with respect to *pronoia* or "providence" above. But Attridge also argues that, for Josephus, this phrase replaces the Hebrew idea of *bəriyṯ*.[835] Jonquière echoes this:

As Attridge has argued, the expression 'ally' and 'helper' might well represent a replacement of the doctrine of the covenant: Josephus avoided all talk of the covenant and seems to have wanted to replace this conception of the relationship between God and the people with the idea of God as ally and benefactor, so that help from God comes primarily in response to human need, rather than out of contractual obligation.[836]

However, as we will see, this phrase is perhaps more closely linked with Moses than the idea of the covenant. While it has obvious conceptual relevance to the issue of the covenant, when Josephus retells biblical narratives that mention covenant, he does not use the phrase *summachos kai boēthos*, but most notably *horkos* and *pistis*, "oath" and "fidelity". *Summachos kai boēthos*, then, is best viewed as a specific philological construct that, for Josephus, is designated as a feature of *Mosaic* narrative, not *covenantal* narrative.

[834] *A.J.*2.334; 3.302; see Jonquière, *Prayer*, 93.
[835] Attridge, *Interpretation*, 79-82.
[836] Jonquière, *Prayer*, 94.

6.16. Josephus and Covenant: In Context of Rulership

Of all biblical mentions of *bəriyṯ*, it is in the context of divinely imposed rulership that might have proved the most dangerous for Josephus. Were he to make a mistake in this regard and suggest that it was not the dominant Romans whose rulership enjoyed the favor of the gods, but the subjugated Jews, who had been granted divine mandate by a god who is himself more powerful than the Roman deities, he might have lost favor with the Romans. Already under Roman suspicion as a former Jewish general, Josephus was undoubtedly eager to avoid any such negative scrutiny. In both instances where Josephus confronts rulership and covenant, he subtly reworks the narrative to present a less threatening scenario that no longer presents a divine mandate for Jewish rule.

In 2 Sam 5:3, David has defeated Ish-Bosheth and secured control over Israel. In a pragmatic show of solidarity, "All the tribes of Israel came to David and said, 'Behold, we are your bone and flesh. In times past, when Saul was king over us, it was you who led out and brought in Israel. And יהוה said to you, 'You shall be shepherd of my people Israel, and you shall be prince over Israel'" (2 Sam 5:1-2). Here, David makes a covenant (*bəriyṯ*) with the assembled elders at Hebron, and David is anointed king of Israel for a second time.[837] But in *A.J.*7.53-54, there is no mention whatsoever of covenant, oath, pledge, or agreement. Instead, "there came to David at Hebron all the principal men of the Hebrew people, the captains of thousands and their leaders, and offered themselves to him while reminding him of the loyalty they had shown him while Saul was still alive, and the honor they had not ceased to pay him ... they also declared that he had been chosen king by God ..." (*A.J.*7.53). Here, Josephus does not

[837] See 1 Sam 16:13.

invoke covenant in its sense as a bilateral bargain or agreement. Rather, the assembled elders merely *recognize* a status which David possesses by right, a status in no way dependent upon their assent for its validity. By interpreting the passage in this way, Josephus subtly communicates the inherent fitness of rulers, in this case his newly adopted Roman patrons, and their right to rule regardless of the opinions and agreement of others.

2 Chr 22:9 describes the death of Ahaziah son of Ahab at the hands of Jehu, whom Elisha has anointed king of Israel. After this, Ahaziah's mother Athaliah destroys the rest of the royal family of Israel, so that she can rule uncontested (2 Kgs 11:1; 2 Chr 22:10). But Jehosheba, Ahaziah's sister, hides Joash, the son of Ahaziah and heir to the throne (2 Kgs 11:2; 2 Chr 22:11). To rescue Joash, Jehoida the high priest forms a conspiracy with captains of the guards and commanders (2 Kgs 11:4; 2 Chr 23:1). Both the Kings and Chronicles accounts describe this pact as a covenant (*bəriyṭ*). In *A.J.*9.143, Josephus writes that Jehoida (Jodas) "obtained oaths (*horkous*) by which he was assured that in future he would have nothing to fear from the conspirators". 2 Chr 23:3 continues to relate that the Levites assembled in Jerusalem and "made a covenant with the king in the house of God". This detail does not occur in Kings, and Josephus describes this process in *A.J.*9.145 as *pistin enorkon*, "sworn pledges". Once Joash is secure, the plot is exposed, and Athaliah is killed, 2 Chr 23:16 states: "And Jehoida made a covenant between himself and all the people and the king that they should be יהוה 's people". Likewise, 2 Kgs 11:17 gives: "And Jehoida made a covenant between יהוה and the king and people, that they should be יהוה 's people, and also between the king and the people". Josephus presents this last covenant as *exorkosen* "take an oath", in *A.J.*9.153. This alteration, as we have seen earlier,

likely originates in a motivation to present legitimate rule as independent from the desires of the people, conveniently establishing Josephus as an ally of the Romans.

So in both instances, Josephus modifies the narrative to create a much more innocuous version of the events presented in the Hebrew Bible. In 2 Sam 5:3, while David is indeed recognized as a rightful ruler, this rule is not given as having been instituted by יהוה. And in 2 Chr 22:9, the rightful rule of the king, organized by the elites, is not conditional upon the will of the people. Not only does this present the history of Jewish rulership in a non-threatening light, it also subtly justifies the newly assumed rule of the Romans, as any general principle which might be derived from Josephus's retelling could as easily apply to Romans as to Jews.

6.17. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Human Agreements

For Josephus, it is perhaps easiest to recast *bəriyṭ* when it occurs not as a divinely instituted bond between God and man, but, as it often does occur, as an agreement between two humans. All he needs to do in this instance is replace the term *bəriyṭ* not with *diathēkē*, which he avoids, but another term that conveys the idea of an agreement. He uses *horkos* and *pisteis* most often, but sometimes uses *sunthēkē* as well. When he does this, it is in the context of two leaders, one an Israelite or patriarch, the other a hostile Gentile.

Genesis 21:22-32 presents a covenant scenario from which, in *A.J.*207-212, the covenant concept is actually retained by Josephus. It is one of two examples in *A.J.* where the *bəriyṭ* is not omitted, and Josephus couples this singular presentation of *bəriyṭ* with a reworking of the Genesis narrative.[838] In the biblical story (Gen 20:1-18), Abimelech abducts Sarah from

[838] The other is 2 Chr 16:1 (see below).

Abraham who, to be fair, has informed everyone that Sarah is actually his sister. Abimelech then receives a dream message from God instructing him of his crime and that he is to return Sarah to Abraham. He does so but not before asking Abraham why he deceived everyone, to which Abraham answered that his fear motivated him to perpetrate the ruse. Abimelech gives Abraham livestock, servants, and silver, and by Gen 21:1 the matter seems to be resolved. It is not until Gen 21:22 that the issue of the *bəriyṭ* emerges. Here, we find Abraham and Abimelech swearing an oath of right dealings: "Now therefore swear (*sheva*) to me here by God that you will not deal falsely with me or with my descendants or with my posterity, but as I have dealt kindly with you, so you will deal with me and with the land where you have sojourned.' And Abraham said, 'I will swear'" (Gen 21:22-24). Then when Abimelech's servants acquire Abraham's well and Abraham seeks restitution from Abimelech, Abimelech pleads ignorance of the whole affair (Gen 21:25-26). It is at this point that a covenant is made, specifically, "So Abraham took sheep and oxen and gave them to Abimelech, and the two men made a covenant (*bəriyṭ*)". But Abraham then sets seven ewe lambs aside, and when Abimelech enquires why he has done this, Abraham answers that the gift of the lambs are a witness that he has in fact dug the well Beersheba (well of the oath). Verse 31 gives this etymology for Beersheba, then verse 32 notes that a covenant (*bəriyṭ*) was made at Beersheba. However, the biblical text does not fully elaborate what is the exact relationship between the two agreements that Abraham and Abimelech make, the oath (*sheva*) and the covenant (*bəriyṭ*).

But in *A.J.*1.207-212, Josephus presents a modified version of the narrative. In Josephus's account, the covenant at the well that is indeed a covenant, *suntithentai*, is conflated with the oath, *horkios*. Both these agreements are made as a result of the misunderstanding concerning Sarah's marital status: "So Abimelech assigned to him (Abraham) land and riches and

they covenanted (*suntithentai*) to deal honestly with each other, swearing an oath (*poioumenoi ton orkon*) over a well which they call Bersubai, that is to say, 'well of the oath'" (*A.J.*1.212). The incident of Abimelech's servants wrongfully appropriating the well for themselves is not mentioned.

The next biblical passage that concerns covenant is Genesis 31, although it requires Gen 30:25-43 as a preamble. In Gen 31:44, Laban proposes a deal: "Come now, let us make a covenant (*bəriyṯ*), you and I. And let it be a witness between you and me". The terms of this covenant, it transpires, are that Jacob will not "oppress (Laban's) daughters, or ... take wives besides (Laban's) daughters" (Gen 31:50), or harm Laban, while Laban for his part must not harm Jacob: "This heap is a witness, and the pillar is a witness, that I will not pass over this heap to you, and you will not pass over this heap and this pillar to me, to do harm" (Gen 31:52). This covenantal agreement is immediately precipitated by the incident of the household gods which Rachel stole (Gen 31:34), but this is merely the catalyst that ignites a history of ill-will between Jacob and Laban, beginning with Jacob's request for wages (Gen 30:31-32), Jacob's use of a type of sympathetic magic to produce the sorts of sheep that constitute his wages, as agreed upon by Jacob and Laban (Gen 30:33, 37-39), the bitterness of Laban's sons (Gen 31:1), and Jacob's unannounced departure of Laban's home, explicitly delineated as "trickery" (*gagav lev*, stealing the heart). Yet this covenant does not address the underlying hostilities between Jacob and Laban, nor does it resolve the undiscovered matter of the household gods; it is merely a cease-fire that ensures a peaceful future rather than mandating reparations for past wrongs. However, in *A.J.*, the entire narrative is radically reshaped. In *A.J.*1.320, the story of the black and white sheep is shifted out of chronological order and given as a narrative aside, interspersed among the larger narrative concerning Laban's grievance with Jacob. The element of sympathetic magic is

also removed. Instead, Laban merely promises various colors of sheep to Jacob, then reneges on his commitment by delaying to surrender the sheep for an entire year (*A.J.*1.321). This delay does not appear in the biblical text. Josephus thus begins his narrative not with the affair of the sheep, but with Jacob's desire to depart from Laban, which in the biblical text occurs at Gen 31:3 and is a direct command from God. When Jacob and his family leave and Rachel steals the household idols of her father, Josephus writes that Rachel "had indeed been taught by Jacob to despise such worship, but her motive was that, in case they were pursued and overtaken by her father, she might have recourse to them to obtain pardon" (*A.J.*1.311). Thackeray attributes this explanation to a Midrash, and cites *Pirke Eliezer* 36 (Friedlander): "Rachel stole them, so that they should not tell Laban that Jacob had fled, and not only that, but also to remove idolatrous worship from her father's house". Thackeray further mentions Zech 10:2 and that these household gods, or *teraphim*, are used for divination.[839] Further, in Josephus's account Laban has a dream in which God encourages him to make a *spondas*, or treaty sealed with a drink offering, with Jacob, and not to continue hostilities with him.[840] In the biblical account, God merely instructs Laban to refrain from speaking to Jacob, a command which Laban defies two short verses later (Gen 31:24-26). Josephus then provides an expansion of the airing of grievances between Jacob and Laban (*A.J.*1.315-322), followed by a final agreement to avoid future conflict, which Josephus gives as an *horkos*, or oath (*A.J.*1.323).

As we have seen, the Hebrew narrative explicitly mentions that the covenant, *bəriyṭ*, is to serve as a "witness" between Jacob and Laban. The ideas of *martus*, "witness" and covenant are closely interconnected; E. T. Mullen, Jr., writes: "The application of the role of 'witness' to members of the divine realm is especially relevant to the biblical metaphor of covenant ... treaty

[839] H.St.J. Thackeray, LCL 242, 150-151.
[840] *LSJ* 39478; Thackeray translates this "covenant".

forms ... invoke extensive lists of deities or elements of the natural world ... who serve as witnesses to and guarantors of the treaty agreement".[841] However, in the Hebrew Bible, these lists are not present but rather "deified elements of the natural world or other objects are invoked as 'witness' to an agreement or contract".[842] Since the Hebrew Bible here presents a version of covenantal practice that substantially departs from other ancient Near Eastern examples, it is unclear why Josephus omitted the idea, as it involves neither alien deities, which would have offended Jews, nor an exclusive model of covenant, which would have alienated Greeks and Romans. Further, Josephus is comfortable with presenting agreements between men as covenant, as is seen in *A.J.*1.212.

In 1 Sam 18:3, we are told in the Hebrew text that almost immediately upon David's slaying of Goliath, "the soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul" (1 Sam 18:1) and that "Jonathan made a covenant (*bəriyṯ*) with David, because he loved him as his own soul" (1 Sam 18:3). But this event is completely omitted by Josephus, who passes directly from David's slaying of Goliath to the women's praise of his numerically extravagant exploits, i.e., tens of thousands slain (*A.J.*6.192-193).[843]

In 1 Sam 20:8, Jonathan asks David to "deal kindly" with him, because he has "brought (his) servant into a covenant of יהוה ". Jonathan tells David this presumably to authenticate the conversational strategy he has designed to pry Saul's genuine sentiments from him (1 Sam 20:5-7). In Josephus this narrative is retold, but when the portion of the text that corresponds to the Hebrew is reached, we find, "And thou shalt inform me of thy father's state of mind in token of thy pity and of that friendship for which thou hast seen *fit to receive pledges* from me and to

[841] E.T. Mullen, Jr., "Witness", *DDD* 905-906. See also Jonquière, *Prayer*, 114.
[842] Mullen, "Witness", 906.
[843] See footnote d by Thackeray and Marcus, LCL 281, 263, and Christopher Begg, *Judean Antiquities 5-7*, BJP 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 152.

grant me the like myself, though thou art the master, and I thy servant" (*A.J.*6.228). Here Josephus implements the idea of pledge exchange, found elsewhere in Josephus's writings and familiar to Josephus's Greek and Roman readers. But he also uses *sunthēkōn*, "covenant", to describe the agreement that David has with Jonathan, conflating the two Hebrew mentions of *bəriyṭ* (1 Sam 20:8, 20:16). The interaction is also described by the term *epomosas* "oathtaking", and *labōn pisteis*, "taking pledges". This is the same covenantal phrase that we have seen used to describe the well-covenant in Gen 21:25-26, and as with that covenant described an agreement made between men. However, in the case of David and Jonathan, God is invoked as a witness to the covenant.

In 1 Sam 23:18, David and Jonathan once again arrange a *bəriyṭ*: "And (Jonathan) said to (David), 'Do not fear, for the hand of Saul my father shall not find you. You shall be king over Israel, and I shall be next to you. Saul my father also knows this'. And the two of them made a covenant (*bəriyṭ*) before יהוה " (1 Sam 23:17-18b). In *A.J.*6.276, this is represented by *orkous tēs eis apanta ton bion pros allēlous eunoias kai pisteōs* "oaths of life-long, mutual affection and fidelity", and *sunkeimena*, "covenant". God is invoked here as a witness—*theon martura kalesas*—but the covenant itself is once again depicted as an arrangement between men, subsuming oaths and pledges.

In 2 Samuel 3:12, Abner, commander of the armies of the Saulide dynasty and now under the control of Ish-Bosheth, is embroiled in a concubine dispute with Ish-Bosheth. Enraged by Ish-Bosheth's accusations, Abner contacts David and proposes a covenant (*bəriyṭ*), to which David agrees, with the understanding that Abner will return David's wife Michal: "Make your covenant (*bəriyṭ*) with me, and behold, my hand shall be with you to bring over all Israel to you. And he (David) said, 'Good; I will make a covenant with you'" (2 Sam 3: 12b-13a). In *A.J.*7.23-

25, Josephus translates this *bəriyṭ* in terms of *orkous te kai pisteis* (oaths and fidelity) and once again *sunthēkōn* , "agreement":

Then he sent to David at Hebron and asked for a sworn pledge that he would own him as a comrade and friend when once he had persuaded the people to revolt from Saul's son and caused David to be king of the whole country. When David ... accepted these terms ... he asked Abenner to furnish a first proof of carrying out their agreement" (*A.J.*7.24-25).[844]

Again, this is a mortal covenant between men, and as such Josephus expresses this in appropriate language for a Greek and Roman audience. Further, in this agreement God is not invoked as witness as he was in 1 Sam 23:18.

In 2 Chr 16:1 (1 Kgs 15:19), Asa suggests a treaty between himself and Ben-hadad, the king of Syria. Chronicles and Kings record this passage virtually identically: "There is (Kgs: Let there be) a covenant between me and you, as there was between my father and your father ... Go, break your covenant with Baasha king of Israel, that he may withdraw from me". In *A.J.*8.304-305, Josephus uses *summachein*/*summachian* (to make alliance) to convey the idea of covenant: "Asanos ... sent envoys to the king of Damascus with gold and silver, requesting him to become his ally (*summachein*) ... This king gladly accepted the large sum of money and formed an alliance (*summachian*) with him". Ben-hadad returns in 1 Kgs 20 which details an ongoing conflict between this Syrian king and Ahab, king of Israel. In an account unrecorded in Chronicles, Ben-hadad unsuccessfully besieges Samaria then is thoroughly defeated in the subsequent battle of Aphek. In the process of surrender, during which Ben-hadad dons the

[844] Thackeray and Marcus, LCL 281, 371, footnote h, attribute Josephus's translation to the Targumic rendition of 2 Sam 3:12a, "To whom does the land belong?" as "Let us swear by Him who made the earth".

sackcloth and ropes of a penitent and tells Ahab, "The cities that my father took from your father I will restore, and you may establish bazaars for yourself in Damascus, as my father did in Samaria" (1 Kgs 20:34), Ahab agrees to Ben-hadad's terms and according to 1 Kgs 20:34, "he made a covenant with him and let him go". This is one of the few instances where Josephus preserves the idea of covenant, writing that Ahab and Ben-hadad made *orkon kai sunthekon*, "oaths and covenants".

So we see that Josephus primarily favors *horkos* and *pisteis* when rewriting covenantal sections that, in the Hebrew Bible, involve the agreements between two humans. In two examples (Gen 21 and 2 Chr 16) Josephus uses *sunthēkē* to describe the covenant, which in both of these instances is made between an Israelite or patriarch and a Gentile commander. Perhaps, in these circumstances, Josephus wished to depict the Jews as willing to make, and honor, agreements with foreign rulers, as this attitude would have been well received by the Roman rulers of the Jewish territory.

6.18. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Liturgical Practice

Many covenantal passages in the Hebrew Bible feature the institution or ratification of the *bəriyṯ* in connection with liturgical ceremonies. In the source material, these ceremonies are symbolic markers that represent the covenant itself, and are explicitly delineated as such. Josephus, predictably, changes or removes these covenantal references, but does not always remove the liturgical ceremonies. Instead, he provides other reasons for these ceremonies to occur. Sometimes these reasons are present within the text, and Josephus needs only to shift the emphasis of the ceremony while removing the covenantal reference. Other times, he creates a

new reason for the ceremony that may be plausibly believed within the context of the given narrative. However, on one occasion (Exod 24-34) he removes much of the liturgical trappings that surround the covenant, along with the covenantal reference itself, due to the dramatically supernatural nature of the account. On another, an exotic cultic element, salt, is removed along with the covenantal references which accompany it.

Within the biblical flood narrative, covenant is mentioned at the conclusion of the flood. As he attains a position of safety, Noah offers a sacrifice, to which God responds with a promise of a merciful future:

> Then Noah built an altar to יהוה and took some of every clean animal and some of every clean bird and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And when יהוה smelled the pleasing aroma, יהוה said in his heart, 'I will never again curse the ground because of man, for the intention of man's heart is evil from his youth. Neither will I ever again strike down every living creature as I have done' (Gen 8:20-21).

Noah also prays in *A.J.*1.96-98 that God would:

> inflict no more such calamity as would bring the whole race of living creatures into danger of destruction, but, having now punished the wicked, to spare those who for their rectitude had survived and been judged fit to escape the peril ... He therefore entreated him graciously to accept his sacrifice and to be moved no more to such wrath against the earth, so

that they might assiduously devote themselves to its cultivation, erect cities, live in happiness ... and attain to a ripe old age and a length of days like that of the men of yore.

According to Josephus, then, it is Noah not God which initiates the covenant instituted after the flood.[845] God is merciful because Noah prays for it: "several times Josephus writes that God made all promises because of Noah: he wants to fulfill Noah's prayer, because he loves Noah for his righteousness".[846] In Gen 9:9-13, God continues by instituting a *bəriyṭ*:

> Behold, I establish my covenant with you and your offspring after you, and with every living creature that is with you, the birds, the livestock, and every beast of the earth with you ... I establish my covenant with you that never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of the flood, and never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth ... This is the sign of the covenant ... I have set my bow in the clouds, and it shall be the sign of the covenant between me and the earth.

Bəriyṭ occurs no fewer than seven times in Gen 9:9-17 (verses 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17). But in *A.J.*101-103, the source material is abridged to remove all mention of covenant. Instead, Josephus gives: "Howbeit from henceforth I will cease to exact punishment for crimes with such wrathful indignation; I will cease above all *at thy petition* [italics mine]. And if ever I send tempests of exceeding fury, fear ye not the violence of the rainfall; for never more shall the water overwhelm the earth ... Moreover I will manifest the truce that ye shall have by displaying my bow".

---

[845] Jonquière, *Prayer*, 226.
[846] Jonquière, *Prayer*, 227.

In Genesis 17, *bəriyṭ* is once again mentioned, this time as the mandatory circumcision ritual. Throughout Gen 17: 1-21, *bəriyṭ* is repeated with the same insistency that characterizes its presence in the biblical flood narrative. No less than thirteen mentions of *bəriyṭ* are made in the passage (verses 2, 4, 7(x2), 9, 10, 11, 13 (x2), 14, 19, 21). This covenant is a covenant of land: "And I will give to you and to your offspring after you the land of your sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God" (Gen 17:8). As a marker of this covenant, "Every male among you shall be circumcised. You shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskins, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you" (Gen 17:10b-11). But in *A.J.*1.191-193, Josephus alters the passage. While the essential narrative details are retained, Josephus adds an explicit reason for the circumcision ceremony: "Furthermore, to the intent that his posterity should be kept from mixing with others, God charged him to have them circumcised and to perform the rite on the eighth day after birth" (*A.J.*1.192). He also omits any mention of covenant.

Further, Josephus omits the mention of *bəriyṭ* in Exod 24:7-8. These mentions, specifically the "book of the covenant (*bəriyṭ*)" (Exod 24:7) and the "blood of the covenant" (Exod 24:8) are part of a larger ritual narrative beginning in Exod 24:4. Here, Moses constructs an altar and twelve pillars, collects the blood of sacrifices, reads aloud from the "book of the covenant", throws half of the blood on the altar and the other half on the people, then declares that blood to be "blood of the covenant that יהוה has made with you in accordance with all these words" (presumably from the book of the covenant, Exod 24:4-8). But in *A.J.*, this episode is skipped entirely, as is the account of the elders seeing God (Exod 24:9-18) and God's spoken commands regarding the tabernacle (Exod 25-34). Instead, Josephus passes directly from Exod 24:3-31:11, the giving of the rules which is detailed in *A.J.*3.101, passing over Exod 31:12-18

which gives Sabbath regulations, the episode of the golden calf (Exod 32-33), and the reinstitution of the new tablets (Exod 34), to Exodus 35:5 which describes the people of Israel bringing their contributions (*A.J.*3.102). Part of this omission, the reinstitution of the tablets, contains several more references to *bəriyṭ*: Exod 34:10 ("Behold, I am making a covenant"); Exod 34:12 ("Take care, lest you make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land"); Exod 34:15 ("lest you make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land"); Exod 34:27 ("with these words I have made a covenant with you and with Israel"); and Exod 34:28 ("And he wrote on the tablets the words of the covenant"). It is not difficult to see the explicitly cultic and supernatural content of these omissions, suggesting that Josephus's concerns to present an acceptable history of the Jewish people prompted him to remove such content.

In Lev 2:13 we are told that the grain offerings must be seasoned with *melach bəriyṭ*, the "salt of the covenant". In *A.J.*3.227, Josephus writes that priests who slaughter sacrifices must "drench with the blood the circuit of the altar and then, after cleansing them, dismember them, sprinkle them with salt, and lay them upon the altar, already laden with wood and alight". Thackeray notes that "the regulation of Lev. ii. 13, though there confined to the 'meal offering,' was taken to apply to all sacrifices" (LCL 242, 425, footnote i). However, nowhere else does Josephus mention the use of salt in sacrifice, and *bəriyṭ* is not mentioned at all. In Leviticus 24:8, Aaron is commanded to perpetually arrange frankincense, loaves, and lamps with oil on the golden table within the tent of meeting (Lev 24:1-8) "every Sabbath day ... it is from the people of Israel as a covenant (*bəriyṭ*) forever" (Lev 24:8). But in *A.J.*3.255-257, the same operations are described with no mention of *bəriyṭ*.

In 2 Chr 13:1, Abijah begins his reign over Judah. In 2 Chr 13:4 he announces from Mount Zemariam, "Hear me, O Jeroboam and all Israel! Ought you not to know that the יהוה

God of Israel gave kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt?" (2 Chr 13:4b-5). This is not present in 1 Kgs 15:1-7, a short summary of Abijah's life that incidentally directs the reader to "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" (1 Kgs 15:7). In *A.J.*8.276, this covenantal element is entirely absent, as Josephus gives instead, "That God has granted the sovereignty to David and his descendants for all time, not even you are unaware".

In the above examples, Josephus generally retains the liturgical covenantal ceremony while removing the explicit covenantal reference. This is usually accomplished by attributing the ceremony to other reasons within the narrative, but sometimes by creating a new reason, as in the case of Gen 17. In Exod 24-34, the entire sequence is removed as it is extremely supernatural; Josephus likely thought this passage would lend his history too much or a mythological character. Also removed are references to "covenants of salt".

6.19. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Obedience

In the Hebrew Bible, many instances of *bəriyṭ* highlight the importance of obedience. While it is true that the *bəriyṭ* often conveys a dimension of inevitability acting as a bond between God and Israel, nonetheless some level of observable compliance, be it the obedience of Deuteronomic theology or the seemingly symbolic acceptance conveyed by the circumcision ceremony of Gen 17, is present with *bəriyṭ*. But for Josephus, the covenant provides an unacceptable incentive, or possibly a kind of spiritual assistance, to obedience. It is also an incentive with a particularly ethnic allegiance—it is the Jews, and none other, who are the beneficiaries of the covenant. Josephus therefore transforms covenantal language into terms of

pure obedience. *Everyone* can obey God, and if they do all the benefits are theirs to reap regardless of their country or people of origin. Josephus does, however, preserve the spiritual content of the covenant in the types of obedience he describes. He often depicts prayer and piety as elements of obedience just as vital as physical, tangible acts.

We might initially think that a topic such as obedience would afford Josephus the opportunity to expound the subject of principled behavior, free from mundane and political concerns. This, however, appears not to be the case. Josephus carefully mitigates his treatment of covenant within the context of obedience to reflect his ongoing political motivations. When obedience seemingly could result in the Jews gaining a degree of political power that could be construed by Greeks and Romans as politically overweening, Josephus greatly alters or completely omits the passage in question, divesting the Jews of the narrative of any potency. But when obedience has purely divine consequences, apart from political considerations, Josephus preserves the narrative, substituting virtues and terms more familiar to Greek and Roman audiences, while still removing explicit covenantal references.

The very first mention of covenant within the biblical text occurs at Gen 6:18: "But I will establish my covenant with you, and you shall come into the ark, you, your sons, your wife, and your sons' wives with you". As might be expected, covenant is *bəriyṯ* in the Hebrew. In *A.J.*1.75-79, however, Josephus gives: "God loved Noah for his righteousness, but, as for those men, He condemned them not alone for their wickedness, but resolved to destroy all mankind ... Thus were they all obliterated, while Noah alone was saved ... He constructed an ark ... Thus was Noah saved with his family". There is no mention, in Josephus, of a covenant of any kind. It is instead the righteousness of Noah that motivates God to provide rescue, as Tessel M. Jonquière notes: "In and around God's speech in *Antiquitates*, which parallels the content of the covenant as

given in the Bible, it is stressed several times that, because of Noah, God promised not to punish the people anymore and to hear his prayer. Josephus underlines this when he writes that God made these promises to Noah "because he loves the man for his righteousness" (*A. J.*1.99).[847]

In Exodus 2:24, covenant is once again mentioned. The verse gives, "And God heard their (the people of Israel, v. 23) groaning, and God remembered his covenant (*bəriyṯ*) with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob". This verse describes God's response to the outcry of the people of Israel, distraught over their abuse at the hands of the Egyptians, and occurs at an advanced stage within the Moses narrative. In the biblical text, when this verse is provided, Moses has already been born, been set in a river basket, been rescued, grown to manhood, rescued a fellow Israelite by killing his oppressor, fled Egypt once the incident becomes public, and married the daughter of a Midianite (Exod 2:1-22). But in Josephus's account, the saga of Moses begins with Amram, Moses's father, the "man from the house of Levi" mentioned in Exod 2:1 but not named in the biblical text until Exod 6:20. It is Amram, not the people of Israel, who "(has) recourse to prayer to God, beseeching him to take some pity at length on men who had in no wise transgressed in their worship of him, and to grant them deliverance from the tribulations of the present time and from the prospect of the extermination of their race" (*A.J.*211-212). God responds with "compassion on him and, moved by his supplication, appeared to him in his sleep, exhorted him not to despair of the future, and told him that he had their piety in remembrance and would ever give them its due recompense, even as he had already granted their forefathers to grow from a few souls into so great a multitude" (*A.J.*1.212). Here, *bəriyṯ* is replaced with a form of interaction between Amram and God that is much less foreign to the Hellenistic reader. Instead of a unilaterally instituted *bəriyṯ*, solely due to God's pleasure, what God remembers is the "piety" of the Israelites, and the result of this remembrance is "due recompense".

[847] Jonquière, *Prayer*, 58.

Lev 26 is a lengthy monologue given by God to Moses that is highly reminiscent of prominent issues within Deuteronomy. Prohibitions on idolatry (Lev 26:1), importance of Sabbath observance and the sanctuary (Lev 26:2), and the importance of obedience to protect the Israelites' residence within the land and good fortune therein, especially regarding victory over enemies (Lev 26:3-45) are the sole concerns of this chapter. Yet part of the result of obedience, as given in this chapter, is God honoring the covenant (*bəriyṯ*) that he has made with Israel as given in Lev 26:9 ("I will turn to you and make you fruitful and multiply you and will confirm my covenant with you"), 26:15 ("if you spurn my statutes, and if your soul abhors my rules, so that you will not do all my commandments, but break my covenant"), 26:25 ("And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall execute vengeance for the covenant"), 26:42 ("then I will remember my covenant with Jacob, and I will remember my covenant with Isaac and my covenant with Abraham, and I will remember the land"), 26:44 ("neither will I abhor them so as to destroy them utterly and break my covenant with them, for I am יהוה their God"), and 26:45 ("But I will for their sake remember the covenant with their forefathers"). Josephus does not include this passage within his summary of Leviticus found in *A.J.*3.188-286.

In Num 25:6-15, we are given the story of Zimri and Cozbi, an Israelite man and Midianite woman, who are engaged in unlawful sexual congress. Furious over this defiance of the law, an Israelite named Phineas "took a spear in his hand and went after the man of Israel into the chamber and pierced both of them, the man of Israel and the woman through her belly" (Num 25:7b-8). Because he is zealous for the ways of God, Phineas is rewarded with a "covenant (*bəriyṯ*) of peace, and it shall be to him and to his descendants after him the covenant (*bəriyṯ*) of a perpetual priesthood, because he was jealous for his God and made atonement for the people of Israel" (Num 25:12b-13). But in *A.J.*4.150-159, there is no mention of this

covenant of peace. Rather, Phineas (Phinees) is described in a kind of bas-relief, by way of the young men who in their virtue (*aretēs*) and love of honor (*philokalein*) slay all those found in the same compromising circumstances as Zimri and Cozbi. Phineas, then, becomes a paragon of manly virtue, and his everlasting priestly covenant is nowhere mentioned. Josephus, himself a priest, in all likelihood minimized this connection so as to downplay the claims of rival priesthoods.

In Judges 2:1, the Israelites are warned by an angel that if they fail to destroy the inhabitants of the land, these peoples will corrupt them. In 2:1, the angel of יהוה speaks: "I brought you up from Egypt and brought you into the land that I swore to give to your fathers. I said, 'I will never break my covenant (*bəriyṭ*) with you, and you shall make no covenant (*bəriyṭ*) with the inhabitants of this land; you shall break down their altars'" (Judg 2:1b-2a). After the historical summary given in Judg 2:6-19, we are told, "So the anger of יהוה was kindled against Israel, and he said, 'Because this people have transgressed my covenant (*bəriyṭ*) that I commanded their fathers and have not obeyed my voice, I will no longer drive out before them any of the nations that Joshua left when he died" (Judg 2:20b-21). But in Josephus's account, we are merely told that God warned the Israelites "by oracle" and that the Israelites, having grown used to soft living, failed to heed this warning (*A.J.*5.133-135). *Bəriyṭ* is, predictably, nowhere mentioned in Josephus's version of the events.

1 Kgs 11 narrates Solomon's dalliances with foreign women and their seductive influence upon him, leading him to build high places for other gods. In 1 Kgs 11:11, יהוה tells Solomon, "Since this has been your practice and you have not kept my covenant and my statutes that I have commanded you, I will surely tear the kingdom from you and give it to your servant". This

passage is not echoed in 2 Chronicles, and Josephus presents this warning not directly fromיהוה , but "a prophet sent by God, who told him that his unlawful acts had not escaped Him, and threatened that ... while in his lifetime he should not be deprived of his kingdom since the Deity had promised his father David to make him his successor, on his death He would cause this to befall Solomon's son" (*A.J.*8.197). The word here translated "promise", *hupescheto,* carries the rough sense of being finalized from above, and while it carries the certainty of covenant it is not *bəriyṭ* in the strictest sense.

2 Chr 15 gives a lengthy account of the intercession between Azariah the son of Oded, bearer of the Spirit of God, and Asa king of Judah. "יהוה is with you while you are with him. If you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you forsake him, he will forsake you", Azariah tells Asa (2 Chr 15:2). Moved by Azariah's words, Asa "took courage and put away the detestable idols from all the land of Judah and Benjamin" (2 Chr 15:8). Asa also assembled Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Simeon, a host that included deserters from Israel, "and they entered into a covenant to seek יהוה , the God of their fathers, with all their heart and soul" (2 Chr 15:12). 1 Kgs 15 abridges this account, noting only Asa's removal of idols, cult prostitutes, and his mother Maacah from the queenship. Josephus, in *A.J.*8.297, merely notes that Azarios (sic) advises Asanos (sic) and his army:

> to be virtuous while they still had time, and not ungraciously refuse to accept the benevolence of God ... the king and the people ... rejoiced ... all together and each privately took thought for what was right. The king also sent men throughout the country to watch over the enforcement of the laws.

Virtue (*agathois*), or better "goodness", and benevolence (*eumenias*) are encouraged, but there is no mention of a *bəriyṭ*.

After the reign of Jehoshaphat, his eldest son Jehoram ascends to the throne of Judah, but then kills his brothers, presumably from fears of succession disputes (2 Chr 21:4). Jehoram marries Ahab's daughter and does what is "evil in the sight of יהוה . But יהוה (does not) destroy the house of David, because of the covenant that he had made with David, and since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his sons forever" (2 Chr 21:6b-7). The Kings account, 2 Kgs 8:19, does not mention covenant, only the promise of the lamp. *A.J.*9.96, while in Marcus's translation gives, "But God because of his covenant with David did not wish to utterly destroy his line", has in the Greek *kai ho men theos dia tēn pros Davidēn homologian ouk ebouleto toutou to genos exaphanisai*, with *homologian* translated "covenant" but really closer to "grant" or "concession".[848]

The Israelites do not suffer alone from the depredations of Assyria; Judah, too, falls under the aggressive expansion of the Assyrian empire, and King Hezekiah is forced to contend with his hostile neighbors to the east. According to 2 Chr 29:2 and 2 Kgs 18:3, Hezekiah "did what was right in the eyes of יהוה , according to all that David his father had done". 2 Chr 29:10 tells that Hezekiah announces to the assembled priests and Levites: "Now it is in my heart to make a covenant with יהוה , the god of Israel, in order that his fierce anger may turn away from us". In *A.J.*9.261 this is retold as follows: "You are not ignorant that it is on account of my father, who transgressed against the religion and worship of God, that you have experienced many great misfortunes, having been corrupted in mind by him and persuaded to bow down to those beings

[848] *LSJ* 39947.

which he himself admitted as gods. But now ... I urge you to put it out of your minds ... and to purify yourselves from your former pollutions". Covenant is nowhere mentioned in this recasting of Hezekiah's speech.

Although Jerusalem survives, Hezekiah's descendants Manasseh and Amon fail to maintain his standard of fidelity. It is not until Josiah assumes the throne that piety re-enters the heart of a king of Judah. Josiah successfully, and at long last, rids the lands of hostile artifacts and worship shrines: "the high places, the Asherim, and the carved and the metal images ... the altars of the Baals" (2 Chr 34:3-4). He then begins to repair and renew the temple which had fallen into disrepair, and the "Book of the Covenant" is discovered (2 Chr 34:30, 2 Kgs 23:2). At this point 2 Chr 31-32 gives:

> And the king stood in his place and made a covenant before יהוה , to walk after יהוה
>
> and to keep his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes, with all his heart and all his soul, to perform the words of the covenant that were written in this book. Then he made all who were present in Jerusalem and in Benjamin join in it. And the inhabitants of Jerusalem did according to the covenant of God, the God of their fathers.

Similarly, 2 Kgs 23:3:

> And the king stood by the pillar and made a covenant beforeיהוה , to walk after יהוה and
>
> to keep his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes, with all his heart and all his soul, to perform the words of the covenant that were written in this book. And all the people joined in the covenant.

In the eighteenth year of his reign, Josiah keeps a Passover and commands all to do likewise: "Keep the Passover to יהוה your God, as it is written in this Book of the Covenant" (2 Kgs 23:21). In *A.J.*10.58 this "Book of the Covenant" becomes *hieroi biblioi*, "sacred books". Further, in *A.J.*10.63-64, the personal and corporate covenant renewal is given as follows: "(Josiah) compelled them to take an oath and a pledge (*horkous kai pisteis*) that they would truly worship God and keep the laws of Moses. And they eagerly assented and undertook to do what the king urged upon them".

In the majority of the examples (Gen 6, Exod, 2, Num 25, 2 Chr 15, 2 Chr 29, 2 Chr 31-32), Josephus omits covenantal language and presents the covenantal narrative as an exercise in piety and/or virtue, rewarded by God. This new type of scenario appealed to the Greek and Roman reader, showing the Jews as participating within a system of deeds and rewards that Greeks and Romans already endorsed. In the remainder of the examples, Josephus curates the narratives to avoid conveying that Jews were given political power and retain that power by means of covenantal obedience. Lev 26, which demonstrates this very idea, is completely omitted. In Judg 2 and 1 Kgs 11, we see the Jews *losing* power by means of *disobedience*. Although one can easily infer what is, from certainly a first-century Roman perspective, the troubling political inverse of the situation, *prima facie* the Jews are shown here as powerless and Josephus allows the narrative to stand as is, except of course for explicit covenantal references. And in 2 Chr 21, Josephus carefully alters the narrative show that, while the royal line remains, its claim to power does not.

6.20. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of Inheritance of the Land

Any reader of the Hebrew Bible cannot fail to note the interconnection between *bəriyṭ* and God's promise of the land. In Gen 6-9, the Bible's first mention of *bəriyṭ* is, in a sense, land-oriented; here, the land has been effectively removed from the remnant of humanity, and God's *bəriyṭ* with Noah is given to ensure the land will never again be removed from humanity in that manner (i.e., inundation). Gen 15 continues this theme, as Abraham is promised the land of Canaan via a divinely instituted covenant. Yet Josephus once again removes all references to covenant. According to Betsy Halpern Amaru, Josephus does so to emphasize not a specific territory allotted to a specific people, but rather an always expanding increase of the Jewish population: a growing, even colonizing, diaspora more in keeping with a particularly Hellenistic variety of "manifest destiny". She writes:

> Josephus replaces the classical messianic eschatology with his own vision of future blessings: a glorious people whose eternal existence is assured by divine blessing and promise; a people who have a motherland, but whose population is so great that they overflow into every island and continent. It is ... a reflection of the Hellenistic world—a motherland ... with an extensive eternal diaspora which might even be seen as colonial in character.[849]

In Gen 15, *bəriyṭ* appears as God grants Abram (Abraham) knowledge of the future. Gen 15: 13-16 gives:

---

[849] Betsy Halpern-Amaru, "Land Theology in Josephus' 'Jewish Antiquities'", *JQR* 71:4 (1981): 228.

> Know for certain that your offspring will be sojourners in a land that is not theirs and will be servants there, and they will be afflicted for four hundred years. But I will bring judgment on the nation that they serve, and afterward they shall come out with great possessions. As for you, you shall go to your fathers in peace; you shall be buried in a good old age. And they shall come back here in the fourth generation, for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet complete.

The "smoking fire pot and flaming torch" passes through the sacrifice of Gen 15:9-10, and in verse 18 we learn that "On that day God made a covenant (*bəriyṭ*) with Abram saying, 'To your offspring I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates'". Yet in *A.J.*1.183-185, we find this passage has been abridged. Instead, "there came a voice divine, announcing that his posterity would for four hundred years find evil neighbors in Egypt, but that after affliction among them they would overcome their foes, vanquish the Canaanites in battle, and take possession of their land and cities" (*A.J.*1.185). Josephus has provided specific place-names in accordance with his historical knowledge, but has also omitted any reference to *bəriyṭ*.

The next mention of covenant in the biblical text, Exodus 6:4-5, is omitted entirely from Josephus's history of Moses in *A.J.* In Exodus 6, God self-identifies with the Tetragrammaton יהוה , establishes his connection with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob while also informing Moses that those ancestors did not know God's name as יהוה , and then tells Moses that he "established my covenant with them to give them the land of Canaan, the land in which they lived as sojourners. Moreover, I have heard the groaning of the people of Israel whom the Egyptians hold as slaves, and I have remembered my covenant" (Exod 6:4-5). As we have seen, Josephus does not attribute this "groaning" to the people of Israel, but reinterprets it as a prayer from Amram, father

of Moses.[850] In Josephus's account, we find the biblical description of Moses and Aaron's meeting in Exod 4:27 presented in *A.J.*1.279. Josephus then describes Moses's meeting with Pharoah, as given in Exod 5:1-3, in *A.J.*1.281-283. However, the episode of the Israelite's increased labor found in Exod 5:4-23 is omitted, as well as the aforementioned Exod 6:4-5 and the genealogy found in Exod 6:14-26. Instead, in *A.J.*1.284 Josephus immediately takes up the narrative of the rival magicians beginning in Exod 7:7.

Then we find a narrative passage, within the biblical text, that prominently features *bəriyṭ* interspersed with an angelic escort that accompanies the Israelites through the land they are to conquer. The angel will go before the Israelites as they destroy their enemies, but they must not "bow down to their gods nor serve them, nor do as they do" but instead must "utterly overthrow them and break their pillars in pieces" (Exod 23:24). Strategically and at a measured rate, God will drive out Israel's enemies before them, setting their border as was promised in Genesis "from the Red Sea to the sea of the Philistines, and from the wilderness to the Euphrates" (Exod 23:31), but Israel must "make no covenant (*bəriyṭ*) with them and with their gods" (Exod 23:32). The *bəriyṭ* described here is not the typical *bəriyṭ* which characterizes the connection between Israel and God; instead it applies to agreements made between humans (human-human) and foreign gods (human-foreign god). Yet Josephus omits this *bəriyṭ*, presumably including this passage in the laws which follow the giving of the Decalogue, as *A.J.*3.94 states: "And he both established these laws and in after times indicated how they should act in circumstances. Of these ordinances I shall make mention in due time; the major portion of the laws, however, I reserve for another work, intending to make them the subject of a special treatise".

---

[850] Jonquière also observes the omission of covenant here, and adds that in Pseudo-Philo (*LAB* 9:1-16) Amram admonishes the Hebrews and *emphasizes* the covenant which, for Amram, is the prime reason to disobey Pharoah. Jonquière also notes that the entire dream structure is ignored in Gnuse's work. See Jonquière, *Prayer*, 81; see also R. K. Gnuse, *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus: A Traditio-Historical Analysis*, AGJU 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

Covenant in the context of land occupancy, predictably, is a major theme of the exilic narratives found within Kings, Ezra and Nehemiah, and as Josephus recasts these portions of the Hebrew Bible he maintains his established interpretive strategies. As early as the destruction of the northern kingdom and the dispersion of its people, Josephus revisits the theme of land occupancy and the lack thereof as a consequence of covenantal disregard. 2 Kgs 17:6 tells that "in the ninth year of Hoshea, the king of Assyria captured Samaria, and he carried the Israelites away to Assyria and placed them in Halah, and on the Habor, the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes". This is duplicated in 2 Kgs 18:11 and happened, according to the author of Kings, because Israel "despised (God's) statutes and his covenant that he made with their fathers and the warnings that he gave them" (2 Kgs 17:15, 18:12). This is repeated in 2 Kgs 17:35-36: "יהוה made a covenant with them and commanded them, 'You shall not fear other gods ... but you shall fear יהוה '". In *A.J.*9.281, Josephus retells the account: "To such an end, then, did the Israelites come because they violated the laws and disregarded the prophets who foretold that this misfortune would overtake them if they did not cease from their impious actions". The covenant is nowhere mentioned.

In Ezra 9:1, officials inform Ezra that "the people of Israel and the priests and the Levites have not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands ... for they have taken some of their daughters to be wives for themselves and for their sons" (Ezra 9:1-2). At this, Ezra confesses to God: "For we have forsaken your commandments, which you commanded by your servants the prophets, saying ... do not give your daughters to their sons ... that you may be strong and eat the good of the land and leave it for an inheritance to your children forever" (Ezra 9:10-12). Then Shecaniah the son of Jehiel speaks: "We have broken faith with our God and have married foreign women ... Therefore let us make a covenant with our God to put away all these wives and

their children" (Ezra 10:2-3). In *A.J.*11.149-150, Josephus has Shecaniah (Achonios) request that Ezra make "the chiefs of the priests, Levites and Israelites swear to send away their wives and children in accordance with the counsel of Achonios. And, as soon as he had received their oaths ... he hastened ... to the chamber of Joannes ... and there spent all of that day". The act of swearing (*omosai*) and oaths (*horkous*) appear, but covenant does not.

In Nehemiah 1, Hanani tells Nehemiah the story of Jerusalem "in the month of Chislev, in the twentieth year ... concerning the Jews who escaped, who had survived the exile" (Nehemiah 1:1-2). Hanani tells Nehemiah "The remnant there ... is in great trouble and shame. The wall of Jerusalem is broken down, and its gates are destroyed by fire" (Neh 1:3). Nehemiah responds with weeping, mourning, fasting, and a prayer of confession and repentance that begins, "O יהוה God of heaven, the great and awesome God who keeps covenant and steadfast love with those who love him and keep his commandments" (Neh 1:5). In *A.J.*11.162, Josephus greatly abridges this prayer: "How long, O Lord, wilt thou look away while our nation suffers these things, having thus become the prey and spoil of all?". Much is omitted here, including a brief historical survey of Jewish national sin and also covenant. In Neh 9:8, the Levites, Jeshua, Kadmiel, Bani, Hashabneiah, Sherebiah, Hodiah, Shebaniah, and Pethahiah pray together: "Stand up and bless יהוה your God from everlasting to everlasting ... You areיהוה , the God who chose Abram ... and made with him the covenant to give to his offspring the land of the Canaanite, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Perizzite, the Jebusite, and the Girgashite" (Neh 9:5-8). This prayer also provides a historical summary which emphasizes Deuteronomic theology, and begins its concluding portion, "Now, therefore, our God, the great, mighty, and the awesome God, who keeps covenant and steadfast love, let not all the hardship seem little to you that has come upon us" (Neh 9:32). Finally, they announce, "Because of all of this we make a firm

covenant in writing; on the sealed document are the names of our princes, our Levites, and our priests" (Neh 9:38). These prayers are completely omitted in Josephus, who in *A.J.*11.168-183 merely details the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Also omitted is Neh 13:29, "Remember them, O my God, because they have desecrated the priesthood and the covenant of the priesthood and the Levites".

Therefore, throughout Josephus's examination of covenant and the land, we find that he has removed and claim that Jews have been given divine and inalienable prerogative to control any specific territory. True, Israel is promised that it will grow in number and flourish, but in passages that specifically mention *bəriyṭ*, the key element is the occupation of the land, from the Nile to the Euphrates. This is undoubtedly problematic for Josephus, who wishes to present Judaism in a non-threatening light to the Romans which now control the formerly Hasmonean and Herodian territory of Judea. By refusing to include the positive land claims which the Bible's use of *bəriyṭ* asserts, Josephus creates an account of biblical events that will not present opposition to the new masters of the region.

6.21. Josephus and Covenant—In Context of the Ark of the Covenant

Elias Bickerman (1897 O.S.-1981) writes that, during Josephus's early life, "the holy of Holies ... was empty and dark: the Ark of the Covenant, lost when the Temple of Solomon was burned by Nebuchadnezzar, had never been returned to Jerusalem".[851] In Josephus's thirty-third year, the holy of Holies, with the rest of the Temple, would be destroyed, adding insult to the injury of the long-lost ark of the covenant. Covenant, in the Hebrew text, invariably signifies a divine dispensation or decree of sorts. As Bickerman further elaborates,

[851] Bickerman, *Jews*, 134.

Berit (covenant) bound the Chosen People to the God of the Patriarchs ... *Berit* does not mean "agreement". The Hebrew word refers to the particular relationship that obtained between a lord and his client, whereby the former grants his protection to the latter unilaterally. *Diathēkē*, on the other hand, originally signified 'promise' or 'pledge', and then in legal usage, the unilateral disposition of property, hence "testament".[852]

Given that the presence of a *bəriyṭ* symbolized permanence and a presumably unchanging divine will, it is unsurprising that the loss of a sacred relic that physically embodied this permanence would have embarrassed Josephus. If an opponent sought to discredit Judaism, the loss of the ark would have been an excellent piece of evidence that God had indeed abandoned the Jews. In his writings, then, Josephus solves this problem by removing cultic descriptors that modify the ark in the Hebrew text. The "ark of the covenant of יהוה " typically becomes "the ark" or "the ark of God". Further, in the ark's initial military usage and final appearances within the biblical history, it is often omitted entirely, presumably to avoid the likely inference that God has specifically set apart the Israelite conquest of the land and the monarchy of David and Solomon.

Numbers 10:1-10 details the creation of two silver trumpets, to be used as signals and as alarms, while 10:11-36 describes the ordering of the tribal camps as the Israelites set out from the wilderness of Sinai. According to Num 10:33, "So they set out from the mount of יהוה three days' journey. And the ark of the covenant (*bəriyṭ*) of יהוה went before the three days' journey, to seek out a resting place for them". But in the corresponding passage *A.J.*3.291-294, there is no

[852] Bickerman, *Jews*, 115.

mention whatsoever of the ark, and likewise no mention of the *bəriyṭ* of יהוה . In Numbers 14:44, the Israelites advance to attack the Amalekites and Canaanites, even though they are still forbidden to do so due to their earlier hesitancy (Num 14:21-25, 42). Num 14:44 gives: "But they presumed to go up to the heights of the hill country, although neither the ark of the covenant (*bəriyṭ*) of יהוה nor Moses departed out of the camp". But in *A.J.*4.1-9, no mention is made of the ark or the *bəriyṭ* of יהוה , just as in Num 10:33.

Just as in Numbers 10, the ark of the covenant (*ʾărôn bəriyṭ*, Josh 3:3) goes before Israel on their way to Gilgal and Jericho (Josh 5:9; 6:1). On this occasion, however, it is sent forth by Joshua, not Moses. The phrase "ark of the covenant" (*ʾărôn bəriyṭ*) occurs in Joshua 3 with the same covenantal insistence we have seen in earlier passages, e.g. Gen 9, 17. Joshua 3:3 gives: "As soon as you see the ark of the covenant of יהוה your God being carried by the Levitical priests, then you shall set out from your place and follow it". Similarly, 3:6 has two mentions: "'Take up the ark of the covenant and pass on before the people.' So they took up the ark of the covenant and went on before the people". 3:8 has: "And as for you, command the priests who bear the ark of the covenant ...". In 3:11 we see: "Behold, the ark of the covenant of the Lord of all the earth is passing before you into the Jordan". 3:14 continues: "So when the people set out from their tents to pass over the Jordan with the priests bearing the ark of the covenant before the people ...". Finally, 3:17 gives: "Now the priests bearing the ark of the covenant of יהוה stood firmly on dry ground until all the nation finished passing over the Jordan". In the Hebrew text, the priests' transportation of the ark in the midst of the Jordan is concomitant with a miraculous recession of the waters (Josh 3:16), allowing the priests and all Israel to traverse dry ground as they carry the *aron bəriyṭ* (3:17). Once all the Israelites have crossed the Jordan riverbed, Joshua

selects twelve men, one from each tribe, to place twelve stones on the dry ground where the priests are standing before the waters once more flow freely. These stones are to be a sign to future generations that "the waters of the Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of יהוה" (Josh 4:7). The stones are placed "in the midst of the Jordan, in the place where the feet of the priests bearing the ark of the covenant had stood" (Josh 4:9). Once the stones are fixed in position, the priests carry the ark the rest of the way across the Jordan and the waters run again: "And when the priests bearing the ark of the covenant of יהוה came up from the midst of the Jordan, and the soles' of the priests' feet were lifted up on dry ground, the waters of the Jordan returned to their place and overflowed all its banks, as before" (Josh 4:18).

Josephus likewise relates that Joshua, the priests, and the Israelites crossed the Jordan en route to Jericho. But in Josephus, Joshua "proceeded to transport the army with the whole multitude in the following fashion. At the head went the priests bearing the ark, next the Levites carrying the tabernacle ... and after the Levites ... the whole throng, with the children and women in the center" (*A.J.*5.17). This is the only mention of the ark, and covenant is nowhere mentioned.

In 1 Samuel 4:3, the author writes that, after a disastrous battle with the Philistines, the elders of Israel demand, "Why has יהוה defeated us today before the Philistines? Let us bring the ark of the covenant (*bəriyṭ*) of יהוה here from Shiloh, that it may come among us and save us from the power of our enemies". So "the ark of the covenant of יהוה of hosts" is brought to Ebenezer, along with Hophni and Phineas who are "there with the ark of the covenant (*bəriyṭ*) of God" (1 Sam 4:4). As this same "ark of the covenant of יהוה " is brought into the presence of the

Israelites at Ebenezer, "all Israel gave a mighty shout, so that the earth resounded" (1 Sam 4:5). But in *A.J.*5.353-357, the ark is merely described as the "ark of God" or just "the ark". There is, in Josephus's account, no mention of covenant.

In 2 Sam 15:24, David is fleeing Jerusalem after Absalom sways the loyalties of the men of Israel (2 Sam 15:6, 13, 14). As David and his household cross the brook Kidron, "all the land wept aloud as all the people passed by ... and all the people passed on toward the wilderness. And Abiathar came up, and behold, Zadok came also with all the Levites, bearing the ark of the covenant (*bəriyṭ*) of God. And they set down the ark of God until the people had all passed out of the city" (2 Sam 15:23-24). While the account is duplicated in *A.J.*7.199-200, Josephus does not describe the ark as covenantal.

1 Chronicles 15:25 describes the transfer of the "ark of the covenant of יהוה " into "the tent that David had pitched for it" (1 Chr 16:1) from the house of Obed-edom, where it had been deposited due to Uzzah's disastrous mishandling (1 Chr 13:10). According to 1 Chr 15:26, "because God helped the Levites who were carrying the ark of the covenant of יהוה , they sacrificed seven bulls and seven rams". Further, "all Israel brought up the ark of the covenant of יהוה with shouting ... and made loud music ... as the ark of the covenant of יהוה came to the city of David" (1 Chr 15:28-29). The corresponding passage in 2 Sam 10-16 does not mention *bəriyṭ*, and neither does Josephus in *A.J.*7.80-84, in which the ark is described starkly without reference to covenant or its belonging to יהוה . 1 Chr 16 continues this narrative detailing the liturgical procedures once the ark arrives in the tent, and verse 6 tells us that "Benaian and Jahaziel the priests were to blow trumpets regularly before the ark of the covenant of God". In 2 Sam 6:17-

19, the corresponding passage does not mention *bəriyṭ*; again, neither does Josephus in *A.J.*7.85-86.

In 1 Chr 16:15, David includes a mention of *bəriyṭ* in his lengthy praise poem (Psalm 105). Verse 15-17 gives: "Remember his covenant (*bəriyṭ*) forever ... the covenant that he made with Abraham, his sworn promise to Isaac, which he confirmed to Jacob as a statute, to Israel as an everlasting covenant". This praise, and the liturgical information which follows (1 Chr 16:37-43) is omitted from the corresponding account in 2 Sam 6, and Josephus proceeds directly from *A.J.*7.89 to 7.90 without mentioning it either. 1 Chr 16:37 explicitly relates that David left Asaph and his brothers, whom David appointed to sing this psalm, "there before the ark of the covenant of יהוה to minister regularly before the ark as each day required". As Josephus passes over this account, he begins to relate the narrative in which David, desirous to construct a house for the ark, is told by the prophet Nathan that it will be his son who builds this house. This narrative begins in 1 Chr 17:1: "Now when David lived in his house, David said to Nathan the prophet, 'Behold, I dwell in a house of cedar, but the ark of the covenant (*bəriyṭ*) of יהוה is under a tent'". This covenantal reference does not occur in *A.J.*7.90-91, nor does it occur in 2 Sam 7:2-3.

In 1 Chr 22:10, David confirms that his son Solomon will build the house dedicated to God. He then instructs the leaders of Israel to assist Solomon, telling them to "arise and build the sanctuary of יהוה God, so that the ark of the covenant of יהוה and the holy vessels of God may be brought into a house built for the name of יהוה " (1 Chr 22:19). This passage is not duplicated in 2 Samuel, and *A.J.*7.337-342 does not mention covenant. After these leaders have been assembled and duly listed, David tells them, "I had it in my heart to build a house of rest for

the ark of the covenant of יהוה and for the footstool of our God, and I made preparations for building" (1 Chr 28:2). 1 Chr 28:18 reinforces this idea: " ... his plan for the golden chariot of the cherubim that spread their wings and covered the ark of the covenant of יהוה ". Again, this passage is omitted from 2 Samuel, and in *A.J.*7.341 we only find that David "further exhorted the chiefs of the people to assist his son in the building, and without fear of any evil, to devote themselves wholly to the worship of God, saying that as a reward for this they would enjoy peace and order, with which God repays pious and just men". Once again, *bəriyṭ* is transformed into language more comprehensible—and potentially inclusive—for the Greek and Roman reader.

In 1 Kgs 3:15, there is a remarkable exception to the Hebrew text's tendency to include covenantal reference in the Chronicles material but omit those references in the corresponding sections of Samuel/Kings. Here, Solomon has prayed for "an understanding mind to govern ... that I may discern between good and evil, for who is able to govern this your great people?" (1 Kgs 3:9).[853] God responds: "Because you ... have not asked for yourself long life or riches ... I give you a wise and discerning mind ... also what you have not asked, both riches and honor ... and if you will walk in my ways ... then I will lengthen your life" (1 Kgs 3:11-14). Solomon then "stood before the ark of the covenant of יהוה , and offered up burnt offerings and peace offerings, and made a feast for all his servants" (1 Kgs 3:15). The corresponding passage in 2 Chr 1:7-13 makes no mention of the covenant, or for that matter the ark, merely noting after God answers Solomon that "Solomon came from the high place at Gibeon, from before the tent of meeting, to Jerusalem" (2 Chr 1:13). Josephus also omits covenant here, writing in the corresponding passage: "When Solomon heard these words of God he at once leaped from his

[853] This prayer also carries connotations of universality and conditionality in Josephus, while removing the idea of a specific agreement between Israel and God; see Paul Spilsbury, *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible*, TSAJ 69 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 154.

bed and did obeisance to him; then he returned to Jerusalem and, after offering great sacrifices before the tabernacle, feasted all his household" (*A.J.* 8.25).

Solomon then begins building this house for יהוה "in Jerusalem, on Mount Moriah, where יהוה had appeared to David his father, at the place that David had appointed, on the threshing floor of Oman the Jebusite" (2 Chr 3:1). While this house is under construction, we are told in 1 Kgs 6:19: "The inner sanctuary he prepared in the innermost part of the house, to set there the ark of the covenant of יהוה ". Once this house is finished, Solomon "assemble(s) the elders of Israel and the heads of the tribes ... to bring up the ark of the covenant of יהוה out of the city of David, which is Zion" (2 Chr 5:2, 1 Kgs 8:1). After many sacrifices, "the priests brought the ark of the covenant of יהוה to its place" (2 Chr 5:7). The ark contains "nothing ... except the two tablets that Moses put there at Horeb, where יהוה made a covenant with the people of Israel" (2 Chr 5:10, 1 Kgs 8:9). Solomon confirms this in his address to the assembly of Israel found in 2 Chr 6:11 and 1 Kgs 8:21: "And there I have set the ark, in which is the covenant of יהוה that he made with the people of Israel". That יהוה will in fact honor this *bəriyṭ* Solomon makes explicit in 2 Chr 6:14 and 1 Kgs 8:23: "O יהוה , God of Israel, there is no God like you, in heaven or on earth, keeping covenant and showing steadfast love to your servants who walk before you with all their heart".[854] Supernatural fire then descends, consuming the offerings, and after a seven-day feast God appears to Solomon, telling him : "I will establish your royal throne, as I

[854] See Jonquière, *Prayer*, 166.

covenanted (*kārāṭ*, the idiomatic verb used with *bəriyṭ*) with David your father, saying, 'You shall not lack a man to rule Israel'" (2 Chr 7:18).[855]

Josephus duplicates this entire sequence in *A.J.*8.61-129. He follows the same order of events as the Hebrew text, detailing the preparations for the temple, construction of the temple itself, employment of Hiram (Huram-abi), prayer of Solomon, supernatural acceptance of offerings, feats, and Solomon's final vision of God. However, in Josephus's account the location of the temple at Mount Moriah (2 Chr 3:1) is omitted, as is any mention of covenant. Given the number of times covenant appears in the narrative sequence, this is all the more striking. Further, Josephus even represents the universality of Solomon's prayer:

And this help I ask of Thee not alone for the Hebrews ... but also if any come even from the ends of the earth or from wherever it may be and turn to Thee, imploring to receive some kindness, do Thou hearken and give it them. For so would all men know ... that we are not inhumane by nature nor unfriendly to those who are not of our country, but wish that all men equally should receive aid from Thee and enjoy Thy blessings (*A.J.*8.116).

This is in response to 2 Chr 6:32-33 and 1 Kgs 8:41-44: "Likewise, when a foreigner, who is not of your people Israel, comes from a far country ... when he comes and prays toward this house, hear from heaven your dwelling place and do according to all for which the foreigner calls to you, in order that all the peoples of the earth may know your name and fear you". So, given the clear bestowal of God's favor to all, a discussion of covenant here would find its

[855] 1 Kgs 9:5 does not mention covenant: "Then I will establish your royal throne over Israel forever, as I *promised* David your father, saying, 'You shall not lack a man on the throne of Israel'".

counterbalance in Solomon's inclusion of all peoples. Yet Josephus, once again, removes all reference to a special *bəriyṭ* between God and Israel.

Therefore, we find three categories of covenantal ark narrative within the Hebrew Bible. The first category involves the successful military use of the ark. These narratives Josephus severely abridges, presumably to remove any suggestion that the ark is a powerful weapon. The second category involves purely liturgical use of the ark, or *failed* military activity; these narratives Josephus leaves largely untouched. The third category involves the institution of the ark as a fixture within the Davidic/Solomonic monarchy. Here, the ark narratives are also heavily abridged, presumably to discourage readers from drawing the conclusion that the ark empowers the eternal dominion of David and Solomon's dynasty over the territory presently under Roman control. The ark is a potent symbol and artifact for the Jewish reader; its presence both enervates and energizes. As a token of God's favor, when it goes before Israel with God's permission, victory is assured, but when it is abused, failure follows. Perhaps Josephus's chief fear was that, should he present the ark as a rallying token, Jewish extremists might take inspiration from his account and use the ark found within *A.J.* to spur themselves on to revolt. Yet if he presented the account as given in the Hebrew Bible, a very reasonable conclusion, for any reader, would be that the Jews had lost God's favor long ago, as seen in the theft of the ark and the empty holy of Holies. Josephus, then, took the safe route, often omitted the ark entirely, and omitted all reference to the *bəriyṭ* that gave it its power.

6.22. Conclusion

When considering covenant and rulership, Josephus might have easily endangered his life, making incautious claims about Jewish rights to rule that would have directly challenged the sovereign control of the Romans. Far too clever to commit such a rudimentary mistake, Josephus retells these narratives by suggesting a general fitness to rule that is not dependent upon the covenantal recognition of יהוה . This indirectly supports the Romans, as any statement concerning rulership that might be taken from Josephus's retellings would as easily pertain to them as to the Jews.

As Josephus rewrites scriptural passages that discuss agreements between humans, he primarily uses *horkos* and *pisteis*, with an occasional mention of *sunthēkē*. This shows the Jews making non-divine, friendly agreements with foreign rulers, a depiction of them that would gain them a great deal of favor with the Roman ruling elite.

Josephus also must consider liturgical ceremonies in his rewriting of Hebrew covenantal passages. Here he often finds new reasons for the ceremony to take place; in one instance, piety, in another, naturalistic utility. In one instance he removes an entire passage due to its highly supernatural character, as well as "covenants of salt", possibly seen as too odd and question-provoking to include.

There is an almost ever-present connection between *bəriyṭ* and obedience. In many of the narrative pericopes in the Hebrew account, this is the main issue under consideration, and Josephus must deal with this problem as he retells these narratives. His strategy is to present *bəriyṭ* as a potential for reward following piety, not as an automatic bestowal of blessings upon a chosen people. The narratives also explicitly connect political power to obedience in several

cases. When dealing with these examples, Josephus strongly edits narratives that show the Jews gaining power as a result of the *bəriyṭ*. If the Jews lose power, however, Josephus is not so cautious and often presents these narratives relatively unchanged.

The same general logic applies to narratives involving *bəriyṭ* and a promised territory. This is another area of danger for Josephus, who wished to avoid any suggestion that the Jews remained the rightful rulers of the newly acquired Roman territory of Judea. So when the Hebrew makes a positive land claim, Josephus completely omits the reference. If the Jews lose land, however, Josephus is quick to point this out and present the land as no longer under rightful Jewish control, a pleasing conclusion for the Romans.

Finally, the ark of the covenant overlaps with other areas, largely possession of the land but also rulership. It is a divine symbol as well as a symbol of Israelite military victory, but in certain ark narratives its presence means defeat, not victory, for the Jews. Josephus treats these narratives exactly as we might expect. When the presence of the ark is connected with failure for the Jews, Josephus is not reluctant to demonstrate this. If on the other hand the ark shows Jewish conquest, power, or right to rule, Josephus heavily abridges or omits these references entirely so as to remove the offending elements.

Chapter 7. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—Wisdom, Covenant, and *Mûsar/Paideia*

7.1. Introduction

Thus far I have proposed three lenses through which to view Deut 1-11: that of wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia*. I suggested these lenses due to their representation of that passage's material. However, those lenses apply to the Qumran community in a special way. Deuteronomy appears to have been an important text at Qumran; if a religious community did in fact live there and the numbers of textual copies show the relative importance of those texts to the community, Deuteronomy must have ranked very high indeed.[856] Although many specific details of life at Qumran—or for that matter, whether or not anyone lived at Qumran in the first place—remain unclear, much can be said *if* there really was a community at Qumran that implemented the rules and practices found there. That community and its participants—often called in scholarship "sectarians"—might be thought of as the Israelites at Moab in microcosm, many hundreds of years later.[857]

---

[856] Counting fragments, there are 28 extant copies of Deuteronomy at Qumran, ranking it second place among biblical manuscripts at Qumran, exceeded only by Psalms. See Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, 2nd ed (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 467-519; Ariel Feldman, "Deuteronomy in the Texts from the Judean Desert", in *The Oxford Handbook of Deuteronomy*, ed. Doc C. Benjamin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2025), 365 (citing Julie A. Duncan), and 366 (citing Sidnie White Crawford). See also Lincicum, *Paul*, 79.

[857] For background see Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, 3rd ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); K.H. Rengstorff, *Hirbet Qumran and the Problem of the Dead Sea Cave Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 1963); Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1998); John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*: *The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010); *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013). The Qumran inhabitants have been labeled Essenes, *Yahad*, Enochic Jews, Damascus Covenanters, Dead Sea sectarians, etc., as convenient placeholders to serve hypotheses about those who lived at the Qumran site. See Jonathan D. H. Norton, "Composite Quotations in the Damascus Document", in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Greco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*, LTNS 525, eds. Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn (Oxford: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016).

Like those Israelites, the sectarians believed that God had provided them with principles which governed an ideal and orderly life. However, the sectarians were heir to the ideas, developed over many generations, which held that these principles governed not only a type of orderly human life but the universe itself. These principles, often considered "wisdom", were not mere abstractions for the Qumran sectarians, who left behind documents describing an austere lifestyle that, if practiced, would provide all the benefits of wisdom while minimizing more practical situations found, for example, in Proverbs. The Qumran way of life required commitment and personal dedication, as well as involvement with a "Teacher of Righteousness" who functioned as a community leader and overseer. This suggests that *mûsar/paideia,* the idea of development and enculturation through consistent and often uncomfortably rigorous training, was not merely restricted to a period of youthful education for the Qumran community. Rather, the entire life of a Qumran sectarian was spent in *mûsar/paideia,* under the instruction of the "Teacher of Righteousness".[858] And the change in life and entrance into the Qumran community was governed by covenant, as new aspirants to the community gave formalized vows to attain the status of initiates and undertook new responsibilities of obedience, as well as the concomitant penalties for disobedience. As does Josephus, the Qumran materials emphasize obedience as a feature of covenant.

That being said, the origins of the Qumran documents, the role of those documents in the lives of those who lived there, the identities of those inhabitants, and the exact function of the Qumran site are ongoing matters of debate in scholarship. These documents existed at Qumran as biblical manuscripts, *tefillin*, *mezuzot*, excerpts, and nonbiblical compositions.[859] Many fragments of Deuteronomy have been found, as well as works that are difficult to classify as

---

[858] See E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 348-350.
[859] Feldman, "Deuteronomy", 65 (citing Julie A. Duncan).

biblical manuscripts or rewritten Bible.[860] The general stability of the Deuteronomic text is observed at Qumran with the exception of Deut 32:8 and 32:42.[861] According to Jodi Magness, "no scrolls were discovered in the settlement at Qumran. Instead, all of the scrolls come from the caves surrounding the site".[862] At the current state of affairs it seems as equally plausible that a small community of religious dissenters, dissatisfied with the condition of the priesthood which at that time controlled the Jerusalem Temple, lived at Qumran in seclusion to worship and study in semi-hermetic seclusion, as that the scrolls represent a secreted library, placed in the caves for safekeeping, while the nearby structure was occupied by an ongoing series of inhabitants, always small in number, who did not necessarily demonstrate a particular bent toward the ascetic life.[863] Magness argues that the proximity of the scrolls to the inhabited area strongly suggests that the two are linked; however, she admits the gap of several hundred years between them. Subsequent generations that inhabit an ancient place of habitation often lose awareness of the material remains that preceded them; otherwise, very few finds would be made in inhabited regions. Therefore I find her strong conclusion of linked sites somewhat tenuous. Magness does make a compelling argument for a careful consideration of Qumran as serving a purpose other than mere residence, and instead some sort of religious or monastic function; while the site displays a significant level of water challens and cisterns, there are no individual bathtubs or bathing

---

[860] Feldman, "Deuteronomy", 367.

[861] The variant reading of Deut 32:8 in LXX (*sons of God*) and MT/SP (*sons of Israel*) is attested at Qumran, as wel as 32:42 in LXX (*Praise, O heavens, his people, worship him all sons of God*) and MT (*Praise, O nations, his people*). Detailed listings may be found in *Textual History of the Bible Online*, eds. Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov (Leiden: Brill, 2026). See Feldman, "Deuteronomy", 370.

[862] Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002), 43.

[863] See Michael O. Wise, "The Origins of the Teacher's Movement", in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2011), 92-122. Drawing sweeping conclusions, social or theological, from the Qumran materials is hazardous; here I chiefly show that the interpretive changes did occur, without speculating with which group, if any, and at which period the ideas which these documents indicate were held by which inhabiting group, if any. Again, the existence of the varying interpretations themselves is the goal.

facilities, only large pools.[864] Although analogues with the Christian sacrament of the Lord's Supper are invalid as no specifically Christian elements can be located within the Qumran complex, there were structures for large groups to eat together that suggest a kind of monasticism, as well as methods of removing animal bones that suggest a sacral view of the meal.[865] The spatial organization of the site also suggests some level of cultic involvement.[866]

Deuteronomy 1-11 is referenced several times within the Qumran corpus. Below, I will describe these Deuteronomic references, dealing first with quotations and borrowings then more substantial reworkings of the Deuteronomic text. I will then examine the Qumran treatments of wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia,* and how these Deuteronomic citations interact with those ideas. What we will find is that despite their respect for Deut 1-11, the special life circumstances of the Qumran sectarians—so far as we can determine from the Qumran materials, all assumptions in place—often modified their interpretation of Deut 1-11 in accordance with the unique features of ascetic and possibly a radically military life.

In the following, I will use the text names given in Florentino García Martínez's *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. Translations, however, will unless otherwise noted be taken from Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook's *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*.[867] In the examples given below, bracketed text indicates conjectural material supplied by the cited authors. Bracketed text will never give my own conjectural material. Ellipses, however, indicate my own omissions of material given, again, by the cited authors, which may be either conjectural brackets or translated texts.

---

[864] Magness, *Archaeology*, 99. This chronoloical factor is later mentioned in Magness's analysis of Qumran toilet practices; see *ibid.* 108-109.
[865] Magness, *Archaeology*, 116-126.
[866] Magness, *Archaeology*, 128-129.
[867] London: HarperCollinsPublishers, 1996 (afterward referenced as *WAC*).

In general, I have used both the Tigchelaar/Martinez and Wise/Abegg/Cook editions. This is by no means the end of the story, however. Julie Hughes provides a helpful example, showing that the Qumran texts currently exist within a state of scholarly flux, and that additional input and decisions are likely needed before definitive arrangements of these manuscripts can be determined, if at all. The example here, the *Hodayot* ($1QH^a$), while arranged by Sukenik in 1955, was further examined by, independently, Puech and Struegemann, who proposed different orderings for the columns of the manuscripts. These findings have been adopted by most recent scholarly editions, including the two editions I have used herein.

As Hughes writes, physical considerations are important when attempting to analyze texts, especially when the objects of one's search are allusions. In the case of the *Hodayot*, the reconstruction of Puech and Struegemann lends support for the authorial findings by Jeremias, Becker, and Kuhn at Heidelberg in 1963-1966. The material circumstances of the text support the unified physical location of the manuscript with other texts believed to have been written by the "Teacher of Righteousness". This preliminary work conducted in Hughes's own project shows the interconnectivity of materiality and textual interpretation. The Qumran materials, while highly disputed in many areas of provenance, did not arrive in the locations in which they were found by the actions of natural processes. They were deposited by human hands, likely very many over a long period of time. While this does not yield much definite information, it nonetheless confirms the methodological presuppositions that must follow any study of ancient literature. The texts must be considered in their general contexts of generating and interpreting creators and audiences, especially if that textual study is to address larger issues of allusion, echo, and other literary concerns that rely upon Kristevan intertexuality. While we have argued throughout that reasonable boundaries must be placed on these studies for the purpose of

manageability, scholars can and do run the risk of confusing these necessary bounds for the repudiation of Kristevan intertextuality itself (e.g. Hays). As Hughes's study of the *Hodayot* indicates, to do so is to undermine the methodological foundations which makes such studies possible in the first place. There is really no reason to discuss these allusions and echoes if they were never likely experienced by the initial audiences. One might as well discuss the proverbial tree in the forest which falls where it cannot be heard.

In Schiffman's words, a wise methodology carefully avoids making hasty conclusions regarding who exactly lived at Qumran at what time, or which group was responsible for the creation of the texts found there. It is more reasonable to expand the conclusions drawn to more responsibly fit the knowns, rather than make unwarranted assumptions that claim to have discovered the dogmas and beliefs of the Qumran community. The most valuable insight to be drawn from the Qumran finds, perhaps, is that the pluralities of conviction and practice at which many earlier scholars had hinted are reinforced in the Qumran materials. This conclusion, in fact, is even more reasonable when taken not from a purely methodological point of view—given that we simply do not know much, and cannot determine much, about the Qumran community/communities, and so have very little upon which to ground our textual conclusions—but also in light of that textual evidence itself, which provides for pluralities not only when the Qumran materials are considered alongside other Second Temple texts, but in comparison with each other.

This pluriformity can be seen in the accounts of Philo and Josephus, as well as the New Testament, when compared with rabbinic materials.[868] These sources suggest at least a twofold division in Second Temple practice and were confirmed by scholarly activity, largely Solomon

[868] Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Second Temple Jewish Law in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *Law, Literature, and Society in Legal Texts from Qumran: Papers from the Ninth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Leuven 2016*, STDJ 128, ed. Jutta Jokiranta and Molly Zahn (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 2-3.

Schechter, Louis Ginzberg, and Jacob Neusner. They provided evidence that encouraged a view of rabbinic literature as a development of Judaism following the destruction of the temple and preceded by a variety of practices among Sadducees, Pharisees, Samaritans, and others. Further, the very terms of the discussion prove limiting and encourage inaccurate understandings of how the Qumran materials should be viewed in light of the Second Temple period generally speaking. These texts are called as such due to their provenance, just as "Apocryphal" literature was preserved by the Latin church and "pseudepigraphal" texts were similarly preserved by the Eastern church. Yet these labels offer no indication what genre might best describe these texts, and actually might be construed as suggesting that the texts which fall under these labels share additional similarities—which could not be further from the truth.

The variety of Sabbath laws found in Second Temple sources, including the Qumran materials, provides an excellent example of this. A broad range of additional legislation, over and beyond what is given in the Jewish scriptures, can be found in these sources. These sources can be grouped into the strict camp (priestly), a more lenient camp (Pharisees), and a liberal camp (Jesus and his disciples). Although once considered the source of a proto-Christian movement, the Qumran materials have revealed a gnerally stricter approach as is illustrated by the rules forbidding rescuing an animal, under any circumstances, on the Sabbath.[869] Note that this approach does not consider any particular strand of Second Temple Judaism to be rabbinic or even proto-rabbinic. Rather, it observes and describes the materials without seeking to assume that one camp or another is the direct descendant of rabbinic Judaism or, for that matter, Christianity.

The Qumran materials have also increased our understanding of the Jewish purity laws. Originally thought to have been established by the biblical witness, which admittedly provides

[869] Schiffman, "Second Temple", 10-12.

much more extensive regulations concerning purity than the Sabbath, the early purity regulations were thought to have later developed into the more detailed laws found in the rabbinic materials. This view has now changed, and a diversity of purity regulations are recognized in the Second Temple period rough grouped under a priestly system and a Pharasaical system.[870] The *am-ha'aretz* and poorer Jews may have dispensed with these regulations altogether in favor of a more abstract, ethical approach, as is seen in the New Testament.

These examples demonstrate the importance of adopting an intertextual approach when reading Qumran materials in light of Second Temple Judaism as a whole. While the principle of allusion or "echo" is not as relevant here, what the Qumran texts have shown is that previous models presume a restricted and strictly chronological development when variance is noticed. For this to be true, it must also be true that, at any given time, there is unanimity in practice. This is in keeping with older models that presumed a largely unchanging rabbinic Judaism that originated early in the Second Temple period, if not earlier. But by contrast, the Qumran materials reveal synchronic disparity in practice. At any given time, in the Second Temple period, there were several "Judaisms" in play. Further, these variants were not discretely separated, but often shared as many similarities as dissimilarities. This also rules out the possibility of a plurality of Judaisms which, separated at some time, proceeded to develop without cross-pollination. Instead, what we find is a complex picture of Judaism, broadly speaking, definable by general trends and practices with regional and sectarian variants of doctrine. Given such a milieu, to insist upon anything other than a broadly intertextual approach would be foolhardy if not naive. While the Qumran texts present a mysterious group of authors and audiences, regarding which scholars do not agree, what *can* be said is that these texts show variety in dialogue. There is complex interaction with Hellenistic ideas, the Jewish scriptures,

[870] Schiffman, "Second Temple", 13-15.

and a spectrum of doctrinal ideas. While no one religious position can be definitely assigned to a community residing at Qumran, if one lived there at all, the complex diversity of thought can and must be acknowledged.

7.2. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—General

In the earliest period of Qumran research, the similarity of the scrolls' script to the text of Deut 6:4 motivated scholarly interest and investment.[871] The Qumran sectarians greatly valued Deut, as can be seen from the many textual examples of that book found among the Qumran manuscripts. Only the book of Psalms is better attested among the scriptural writings found at Qumran.[872] Yet even more compelling evidence is the degree to which the Qumran sectarians interacted with Deut in their own writings. These writings, according to Michael Segal, qualify as "rewritten Bible" as they do not retell the events of the Bible in their own words, but merely restructure the biblical text, restricting their own contribution to points of emphasis and thematic reinforcement made by way of textual restructuring and juxtaposition.[873]

This restructuring may be seen in 4QReworked Pentateuch[a]. Here, Deut may be found interwoven with Exodus in fragments 6, 7, and 8. In fragment 6, the text begins with a statement of Exod 20:19-21, but not exactly in conformity with either Masoretic or LXX text-types.[874] 4Q158 gives: ...[n]ot let [God] speak to u[s] ... [and t]o put the fear ...".[875] A text found in Deut 5:28-29 follows: "And יהוה ... to Moses, s[aying] ... they had such a mind as this, to fear ...".

---

[871] John J. Collins, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013), 15-17.
[872] See above: also Lincicum, *Paul*, 79.
[873] See, e.g., Josephus in *A.J.* and *B.J.* whose works, according to Segal, do not qualify as "rewritten Bible". See also *WAC*, 199.
[874] See BHS and Rahlfs-Hanhart.
[875] 4Q158, frag. 6, ll 2-3; *WAC* attribute many of the evident expansions, as well as conjectural material which they supply, to the Samaritan Pentateuch (*WAC*, 201).

These texts, Exod 20:19-21 and Deut 5:28-29, share thematic continuities. Both texts describe Moses's interaction both with God and with Israel, in a narrative sequence that details the spoken commentary that accompanies the giving of the law, a covenantal theme. Therefore, this Qumran text shows the importance of both texts for the Qumran community. The author(s) valued the narrative information found both in Exod and in Deut, and apparently sought to create a "harmonization" that would conveniently present the history of Moses, God, and Israel at Sinai.[876] However, in this case, the juxtaposition of Exod and Deut provides little more than the acknowledgement of both texts.

Many other examples of interaction with Deut at Qumran, however, provide enough information that substantial conclusions may be drawn. One of these cases may be seen in fragments 7-8 of 4Q158. In this case, the textual arrangement suggests the presence of a faction that, much like 1 Maccabees, opposes supernaturalism and espouses militarism. The text begins: "(Honor) your [father] and your mother ... false witness ... You shall not covet ... wife".[877] The Decalogue held obvious importance for the sectarians, and the text found in this fragment resembles the relevant portions of the "ten words" as given in both Exod 20:12-17 and Deut 5:16-21. The text then continues, giving: "And יהוה said to Moses, "Go say to them, Return to ... and the ordinances that you shall teach them, so that they may do them in the land that ...". This textual portion frames a pericope found in Deut 5:30-31.[878] It is followed by Exod 20:22-26, which prohibits gold and silver idols, altars made of hewn stones, and the use of steps to ascend the altar.[879] Interestingly, the textual compilation created by the sectarians suggests several

[876] This has obvious utility for liturgical contexts, and Lincium observes as much; Lincicum, *Paul*, 82.
[877] *WAC*, 202.
[878] Deut 5:30-31: "Go and say to them, 'Return to your tents.' But you, stand here by me, and I will tell you all the commandment and the statutes and the ordinances which you shall teach them, that they may do them in the land which I give them to possess". Philo provides extensive commentary on this passage.
[879] See also 4Q271 frag.1 col.2 ll.8-10 regarding Deut 7:25 (*WAC*, 64).

priorities. If we examine the portion of Exodus omitted by the creator of this Qumran fragment, we will find the episode of the frightening mountain, replete with thunder, lightning, smoke, and the blast of a trumpet. This is followed, in Exod 20:19, by the express reluctance of the people to be addressed by God along with their desire for Moses to communicate with God on their behalf and serve as an intermediary agent. Yet Exod 20:19, as we have seen, is attested in the same document. Therefore it cannot be said, from 4Q158, that the author or authors of this material opposed this narrative or thought it unworthy of inclusion. What can be said, however, is while the author(s) willingly interpolated passages detailing the reluctance of Israel to interact with God in their specimens of "rewritten Bible", there is no sign of their willingness to incorporate the overt supernaturalism which is given in the narrative of the smoking fiery mountain and terrible trumpet.

Much of what we know, or surmise, concerning the Qumran sectarians prepares us for this discovery. The sectarians, while opposing the inherent efficacy of sacrifice without a right attitude of the heart, also promoted the importance of liturgical activity.[880] This can be seen in their concern for proper calendrical records and the accurate observance of festivals. A scriptural passage that shows Israel's need for intercession, therefore, would have been of great use to them. Further, while it is also surmised that the sectarians had strong links to the Sadducees, the exact relationship between the sectarians and the Jerusalem temple is as yet not fully understood, with many scholars attesting that the high priest Alexander Jannaeus is the

[880] Despite differences in their willingness to attribute Essenism to Qumran, largely based on methodology of evidence (Taylor's position is closer to F.M. Cross in attesting that a failure to attribute Essenism to the Qumran sectarians assumes that Qumran existed wholly apart from the Essene community, described in unique detail in antiquity, while Goodman assigns greater value to the pregnant lacunae in the records), Joan Taylor and Martin Goodman agree that the Qumran sectarians did not repudiate the Temple. See Joan Taylor, "Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes: A Case Study of the Use of Classical Sources in Discussions of the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis", *SPhA* 19 (2009): 1-28; Martin Goodman, "Religious Variety and the Temple in the Late Second Temple Period", *JJS* 60.2 (2009): 202-213; Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, "Current Issues in Dead Sea Scrolls Research", in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011): 1-18. See also Sanders, *Judaism*, 342.

"Wicked Priest" and so designated for having wrongfully taken the high priesthood to himself. This is, however, disputed; and portraying Moses as an intercessor rather than Aaron has obvious advantage for any community which espouses an "unorthodox" view of the Jerusalem priesthood. It is also true that a de-emphasis on supernaturalism may be seen in 1 Maccabees, a text which relates the narrative of yet another group of Jewish separatists. Many Qumran materials suggest additional affinities between Qumran community/communities and the Maccabean rebels, of which perhaps the most visible is a willingness to embrace militarism in the pursuit of holy obedience.[881]

However, unqualified praise for Moses is not universally attested among the Qumran materials. Deuteronomic interaction in the Qumran corpus may also be seen in 4Q175 (4QTestimonia). This text, titled "4QTestimonia" by John Allegro under the assumption that it represented a series of passages collected for easy reference during debate, presents Deut 5:28-29, then appends four additional scriptural passages.[882] Two of these passages are from Deuteronomy (Deut 18:18-19, 33:8-11), one is from Numbers (Num 24:15-17) and the last from Joshua (Josh 6:26).[883] What, by presenting this collection of passages, did the author(s) intend to

---

[881] E.g. 1QM, 4Q491-496, 4Q285, 11Q14; according to Driver and Roth, this militarism indicates the presence of a Zealot faction at Qumran. See G.R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965); Cecil Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959); Collins, *Biography*, 41-42.

[882] The "testimonia" theory, however, should be questioned. See *WAC*, 229. According to Knibb, this is a document from the first-century AD, although no rationale is given. See Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Hellenistic and Jewish World 200 BC to 200 AD (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 263.

[883] *WAC* suggests this juxtaposition of Deut 5:28-29 and Deut 18:18-19 indicate the possibility of a "rewritten Bible", and that in terms which satisfy Segal's definition. While this is true, the passages which *WAC* selects as noteworthy are from the same biblical book, which can mislead the reader into thinking that this makes them *more* likely to constitute a "rewritten Bible". All the passages presented by the document are, in fact, possibly part of the same "rewritten Bible", illustrating the conjectural nature of this observation which should be taken into consideration by the reader. See *WAC*, 230. For more on "rewritten Bible", generally, see Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008); Molly Zahn, "Rewritten Scriptures" in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Timothy Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010): 323-336; Steven D. Fraade, "The Temple Scroll as Rewritten Bible: When Genres Bend" in *Hā-ʾîsh Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*, STDJ 122, ed. George J. Brooke (Leiden: Brill, 2018):136-154.

convey? The Numbers passage gives Balaam's messianic prophecy: "a star shall come out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel: it shall crush the borderlands of Moab, and the territory of all the Shethites". The inclusion of Deut 33:8-11 provides the strongest clues to the social and religious provenance of this document. Here, we find the Qumran author(s) presenting the Blessing of Levi, pronounced by Moses in Deut 33. While the author has previously included a passage from Deut 1-11, Deut 33 presents a view of the incident at Massah/Meribah more in keeping with Ps 81:7 than Deut 6:16.[884] The Psalmist presents the testing as successful, and the Qumran author extends this success to Levi and his descendants. Further, the blessing continues with ominous language: "who said of his father and mother, 'I know them not': he ignored his kin, and did not acknowledge his children. For he observed Your word and kept your covenant".[885] This references two incidents: the matter of the golden calf given in Exod 32:27, and the zeal of Phinehas in Num 25:7-13.[886] In both of these incidents, the Levites slew all who failed to obey the terms of the covenant, including their families if needed. However, neither Moses nor Aaron entered the promised land with the other Israelites for failing to "render Yahweh holy among the people" as is given in Num 20:12.[887]

The above leads us to several conclusions. First, it is clear that the Qumran author maintained a critical distance from Deuteronomic material. We cannot speak of Deut 1-11 as a "canon within a canon" for the Qumran author, as he was willing to demote readings from Deut 6 in favor of Ps 81. Second, it is clear that, unlike Josephus in *A.J.*, the Qumran author was willing to engage with the matter of the golden calf and the disobedience of Israel, as well as the fidelity of Levi and his descendants. Third, it is clear that the Qumran author acknowledges the failures

---

[884] Richard D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, OTL (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 389.
[885] 4Q175 col.1 ll.15-17.
[886] Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 324; Peter C. Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), 395-396.
[887] Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 926. This passage, for Feldman, suggests the cleromantic lights of the Urim and Thummim; see Feldman, "Deuteronomy", 378.

of Moses and Aaron through his inclusion of the Meribah/Maasah incident. Again, this shows a willingness to incorporate competing biblical accounts with the Deuteronomic material, showing as much, if not more, involvement with Psalm 81 and Numbers 20 as with Deut 1-11.

This all shows a critical engagement with the figure of Moses on the part of the Qumran author for which the term "messianism", while a traditional label, proves insufficiently precise to capture the nuances of the Qumran author's textual concatenation. The initial portion of the document, quoting Deut 5:28-29, shows the importance of the Israelites' obedience to God and the necessity of keeping the commandments. Deut 18:18-19 is next presented; Moses is then depicted as a mouthpiece of God, who speaks for God and who is to be obeyed. However, note that Moses is not named in this passage, and "like you" could mean "similar to you", in that as Moses is to be obeyed, so is the prophet to come. But this does not comment on Moses's inherent fitness to lead, or that Moses inherently should be the leader of Israel. In fact, as we have seen, the Qumran author suggests that this is not the case, via his inclusion of the Blessing of Levi and its implications concerning Massah/Meribah, as well as the exclusion of Moses and Aaron from the land. Levi is commended by the Qumran author, however, as are the actions of the Levites.

Nor does the Numbers passage refer to Moses, as the figure there is an opponent of Moab who will "crush the borderlands of Moab, and the territory of all the Shethites". Moses did not attack Moab, but instead ordered the Israelites to peacefully traverse Moabite territory.[888] According to Wise/Abegg/Cook, this is likely Alexander Jannaeus, responsible for numerous military incursions on surrounding territories which culminated in a civil war with Rome.[889] However, the final passage, blending Josh 6:26 with 4Q379 frag. 22 (Psalms of Joshua), alludes

[888] Deut 2:9.
[889] *WAC*, 230. See also 4Q448, often interpreted by scholarship as supportive of Alexander Jannaeus but not unanimously so; John J. Collins, *Biography*, 26.

to the curse of Joshua which forbids the rebuilding of Jericho at the cost of the rebuilder's sons. The Qumran author of 4Q379 foretells a "cursed man, one belonging to Belial ... a fow[ler's n]et to his people and a source of ruin for all his neighbors. Then shall arise [so]ns [after him] ... They shall rebuild this city ... They shall work blasphemy in the land". While it is true that Alexander Jannaeus did in fact attack his neighbors, there is no record of his rebuilding of Jericho. That dubious honor belongs to Bacchides, mentioned in 1 Maccabees, *A.J.*, and *B.J.*[890]

What we see, then, from 4Q175, is a strong respect for the authority of Moses, but also a willingness to acknowledge the flaws of not only Moses's life but Aaron's as well. This leads the reader to the conclusion that what the author of 4Q175 is really praising is the *prophetic office* of Moses, which will be inherited by the Levitical priesthood. This priesthood, then should be respected, and this places the views expressed by the author of 4Q175 in the general trends observed within other Qumran documents. This author also appears to allude to the Greek general Bacchides, who established a fortification at Jericho. If correct, this places the document's origination no earlier than the Maccabean revolt; if the document is *later*, it could well be criticizing the Hellenistic rulers while tacitly praising the Hasmoneans, including Alexander Jannaeus. The reference to Phinehas certainly would confirm this, as this is the means by which the author of 1 Maccabees confirms the legitimacy of the Hasmonean priesthood. This document, then, arises from a perspective not in opposition to Alexander Jannaeus, but one sympathetic to the goals and long-standing rule of the Hasmoneans. 4Q175 suggests, then, a perspective that honors the institution of the priesthood while affirming the Hasmonean dynasty. However, the positive view of Moses in the first case suggests the presence

[890] At *B.J.*1.35, Josephus identifies the "king's official" of 1 Macc 2:25 as Bacchides, but he corrects this in *A.J.*12.270 to Apelles. Nor is the Bacchides in question mentioned in 2 Macc 8:30-31 as the companion-in-arms of Timotheus. It is instead the Bacchides mentioned in 1 Macc 9:50 who "built strong cities in Judea: *the fortress in Jericho*, and Emmaus ... with high walls and gates and bars". See Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 233; Goldstein, *2 Maccabees*, 339; Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 179.

of a faction which, while supportive of the Hasmoneans, also prioritized the role of Moses in liturgical activity, setting it apart from the Aaronid/Zadokite disputes which characterize usual disagreements over the Hasmonean priesthood and which may be seen in the second case. These perspectives reveal a diversity among the Qumran materials, which, according to Collins, shows the pluriformity of sectarian groups at Qumran.[891]

To sum up, the Qumran materials show not only a large number of copies of Deut, but the willingness of Qumran author(s) to interact with Deut by juxtaposing Deut material with other Jewish scriptures. Occasionally, these textual combinations provide little insight other than confirming the importance of Deut to the Qumran author(s). However, in other cases these combinations provide substantial insights into the political and religious convictions present among the author(s). In one case, an omission of supernaturalism alongside an approval of militarism, as well as an emphasis on the person of Moses, suggests affinities between the Qumran author(s) and the author of 1 Maccabees. However, another case shows a willingness to prioritize a Ps reading over Deut, as well as a presentation of material that is critical of Moses. There are also hints of a deliverer who is not Moses, as well as an oppressor who is very likely the Greek general Bacchides. This also suggests a sentiment in alignment with 1 Maccabees, but one which is critical of an unqualified regard for Moses. Here, then, we have evidence, in the first case, of a position that supports the Hasmoneans, but also favors a Mosaic priesthood. The second case offers a more unqualified approval for the Hasmoneans, including the priesthood, and these cases show a diversity of convictions among the Qumran materials.

[891] Collins, *Biography*, 27-28.

7.3. Excursus—Snow and Ice

Here, I present an unusual example of Qumran interaction with Deut 1-11, one that does not fit neatly within the standard scheme as it synthesizes all three themes. The Qumran materials here present wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant themes—Deut 1-11 in microcosm—alongside a type of religious xenophobia that is unique among the Second Temple writings surveyed here. In 4Q434-439 (4QBless, O my Soul[a]) the Deuteronomic reference is centrally placed amidst a complex web of scriptural references, most prominently Isaiah. There are other themes present; wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia* are presented with exact sequentiality in 4Q436 frag.1 col.1 ll.1-8. But the needy, weak, meek and orphaned are especially mentioned, as well as a comforted mother, healing of the blind and deaf, and fiery wrath.[892] 4QBless, O my Soul[a] also harshly judges the Gentiles, noting the phenomenon of "the Gentiles unto destruction and the nations will be exterminated" (frag.1 col.1 ll.1-2). This sentiment is shared with the Temple Scroll, which envisages no place for the Gentiles in its ideal future temple. However, it is at odds with Isaiah, which describes the nations as future worshippers of God.[893]

This xenophobic sentiment, merged with an inversion of land dominion, possibly continues with 4Q473 (4QThe Two Ways), a tiny fragment, yet which perhaps moreso than any other of the Qumran materials captures the spirit of Deut 1-11. Here, the necessity of choice is presented just as in Deut 11:26-28: a blessing and a curse is before Israel. Obedience will produce blessing; but Deut 11:26-28 provides an extensive litany of curses which, it should be added, are subdued in their supernaturalism but no less devastating for that and include illness,

[892] Frag.1 col. 1 ll.1-6: see Isa 40:1, 66:12-16; col.2 l.3: see Isa 35:5-6; col.2 ll.1-3: see Isa. 29:19; ll.1-6: Isa 42:2-4, 66:12-16.
[893] Isa 2:2; 42:2, 4, 6, 10; 56:6-8; 60:3, 8-10.

defeat and subjugation by enemies, agricultural blight, and finally the humiliation of cannibalism in a siege. In 4Q473, however, the cursing formula is greatly abridged, mentioning mildew which is present in the Deuteronomy passage but also snow, ice and hail, which is nowhere to be found in Deuteronomy. The presence of snow is exceedingly rare in the Hebrew scriptures, and in the Torah and historical sections it occurs only as a method of describing a variety of leprosy and in an account of Benaiah son of Jehoiada who slew a lion on a snowy day.[894] The other occurrences are to be found in the wisdom texts, Isaiah, Lamentations, and Daniel.[895] Hail is found almost entirely in the Exodus plague narrative, and ice or "mist" is rarest of all.[896] All three are found only in Psalm 148:8 which likely served as the inspiration for this document. In this Psalm, the elements of snow and ice are found in a "wisdom list" which delineates the division of created reality. As snow and ice are rare for Israel, one may argue that the emphasis on these foreign materials in this Qumran text suggests exile, the inversion of land dominion, among Gentiles, suffering the hardships of the Gentile countries.

7.4. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—Wisdom

Occasionally in the Qumran materials, wisdom concepts are presented in contexts that, while showing the presence of biblical wisdom, do not further comment on its nature or qualities. This may be seen in commentary passages such as 4Q161 (4QIsaiah Pesher[a]) which quotes Isaiah 11:1-5 at frag. 8-10 ll.15-21. Here, "wisdom and insight" are included as part of the quotation, but not elaborated upon in the interpretation which follows. Rather, 4Q161 here

[894] Exod 4:6; Num 12:10; 2 Sam 23:20; 1 Chr 11:22
[895] Job 6:16; 9:30; 24:19; 37:6; 38:22; Ps 51:7; 68:14; 147:16; 148:8; Isa 1:8; 55:10; Jer 18:14; Lam 4:7 Dan 7:9.
[896] Exod 9-10; also Job 38:22, Ps 78:47-48; 105:32; 148:8; Isa 28:2, 17; 32:19; Hag 2:17. For ice or "mist" see Gen 2:6; Job 36:27; Ps 148:8; Isa 44:22; Jer 10:13; 51:16; Hos 13:3.

broadly interprets the messianic implications of the passage, placing the Branch of David in an apocalyptic setting.[897] Wisdom therefore, while present, is not given additional meaning. Further, in 4Q364 (4QReworked Pentateuch[b]) frag.21a-k, Deut 1:17 is quoted with a short commentary phrase following the text. Wise, Abegg, and Cook surmise that this short phrase refers to bribery, and clarifies Deut 1:17 by adding that the judge, who should not be "partial in judgment" but should "hear the small and the great alike" should practically implement this advice by refusing to accept bribes.[898] We have previously seen the concern for bribery shown by Ben Sira as a practical wisdom concern. Here, if Wise, Abegg, and Cook are correct, the Qumran community held the practice of bribery in similarly low regard, and link their disdain to a text found in Deut 1-11. Scriptural sentiments are therefore confirmed by the Qumran materials, but additional insights or opinions are not provided.[899]

The wisdom theme of wise rulership is engaged as 1Q22 (1QWords of Moses) presents Moses's speeches at Moab in a highly fragmentary manner. The historical information is skipped, and a passage that restates Deut 1:3 moves directly to a summary of Deut 4:25-28. This passage, however, adds violations of festival laws to the prohibitions of idolatry which appear in the Deuteronomy source material.[900] 1Q22 then leaps to the end of Deuteronomy, depicting Moses as describing the eventual disobedience and defeat of Israel within the land, before interweaving Deut 6:10-11 with 27:9-19.[901] Finally, as a type of *inclusio*, the Qumran author

---

[897] Also 1QM (1QWar Scroll) col.16 ll.11-14, where "mysteries" does not signify biblical wisdom but the determination of who will die and survive in war. See Matthew Goff, *4QInstruction*, Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World 2 (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 14-16.
[898] Deut 1:17; *WAC* gives: "Do not take [a bribe]". See *WAC*, 326. See also 1QHymns col. 6 ll. 19-22; here, bribery is shunned as it encourages a sectarian to accept someone who has been removed from the *Yahad*.
[899] 4Q364 (4QReworked Pentateuch[b]) cites Deut 1:17's requirement for judicial impartiality, while adding a prohibition of bribery. This text also shares similarities with Jubilees, in this case shown in an addition describing Rebecca's concern for Jacob.
[900] *WAC*, 173.
[901] *WAC*, 173.

presents Deut 1:9-18 and 11:17, joining the passages delineating the appointment of elders with the necessity of Israel's obedience.[902]

The wisdom theme of material blessings can be found as 4Q378-379 (Psalms of Joshua[a-b]) cites Deut 8:7-9 at frag.11 ll.1-7. Here, the theme of the good land is invoked: "flowing streams ... wheat and barley ... honey. Surely it is a land of milk and honey". This passage may once again serve to encourage the people of Israel not to be fearful as they cross the Jordan and go into the promised land; as the former generation was reluctant under Moses, so may this generation lose its nerve under Joshua's leadership. 4QPsalms of Joshua[a], as noted above, is cited by 4QTestimonia, which includes Joshua's curse in a series of messianic prophecies.[903] Together, these texts suggest that the author viewed Joshua as one among several messiahs. The function of Deut 8:7-9 here is to assist in what appears to be the ultimate goal of 4QPsalms of Joshua[a]: to duplicate the rhetorical structure found in Deut 1-11 and present Joshua as a true successor to Moses. This is demonstrated by the allusion to Num 24, in which Balaam delivers a messianic prophecy (quoted also in 4QTestimonia). Yet this prophecy is delivered as Balaam looks upon the plain of Moab, where Moses is delivering his own address as narrated in Deut 1-11. Allusions to Balaam's prophecy, then, for the astute reader also allude to Deut 1-11.[904] More evidence for this may be seen in 4QPsalms of Joshua[a] frag.6 col.1 ll.4-7, which suggests intercessory prayer on Joshua's part (although possibly Moses's prayer as well), 4QPsalms of

---

[902] *WAC*, 174. Lincicum reads this as the presentation of a "pesudo-Deuteronomy", imitative of Moses's speech. See Lincicum, *Paul*, 80.

[903] 4Q175 (4QTestimonia) presents the necessity of obedience to Moses, presented in Deut 5:28-29, before quoting Deut 18:18-19 which predicts the arrival of another Moses-like prophet. The document then attaches the predictions of military and priestly messiahs, found in Num 24:15-17 and Deut 33:8-11, then closes with the curse upon the rebuilder of Jericho found in Josh 6:26 and its interpretation found within 4QPsalms of Joshua[a].

[904] Although certain creative liberties may be taken with the ordering of the fragments to reinforce the connection between 4Q378 and Deut 1-11, I have decided not to rely upon any particular model of their sequencing but rather rely upon the subject matter within each fragment to support my position, contra *WAC*, 340-342.

Joshua[b] frag.17 ll.2-4 which suggest Joshua's "blessing", and the curse passage itself, frag.22 col.2 ll.5-14, which depicts Joshua as "pra[ying and offe]ring psalms of praise".

This development of material blessings is also found in 4Q393 (4QLiturgical Work(?)), which uses Deut 7:9 and 6:11 again as an *inclusio*, framing references to Jer 11:8 and Num 6:25.[905] God's keeping of covenantal love with those who love him in return and keep the commandments is first presented (Deut 7:9), then the passage from Jeremiah is attached, counseling or perhaps warning others not to walk in "the stubbornness of ... evil heart". This passage is itself used as a minor *inclusio*, framing an acknowledgement that God might forsake his people and his inheritance. Then the Qumran author alludes to Num 6:25, asking: "upon whom shall You make Your face to shine?" Finally, Deuteronomy 6:11 closes the document, as God's provision of houses, goods, pools, and cisterns is recalled by the Qumran author.

Further, these two themes—wise leadership and material blessings, in the form of abundant offspring—will be combined in other Qumran materials which borrow from Deut 1-11. Deuteronomic influence continues in the same vein with 4Q171 (4QPsalms Pesher[a]) frags.1-2 col.3 ll.2-7. Here, Psalm 37:19-20a is interpreted thus: "the ones who will return from the wilderness, who will live a thousand generations in virtue. To them and their descendants belongs all the heritage of Adam forever ... He will sustain them in famine during the time of error, but many will perish from famine and pestilence, all who did not ... jo[in] the company of His chosen".[906] The original Psalmic text does not provide these additional details, but Deut 5:9-10 gives: "... for I יהוה your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing steadfast love to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments". Likewise, Deut 7:9 gives, "יהוה

[905] 4Q393 also appears in *WAC* as "Prayers for Forgiveness" and is cited from that collection.
[906] *WAC*, 222.

your God is God ... who keeps covenant and steadfast love with those who love him and keep his commandments, to a *thousand generations*".[907] These Israelites, having returned to the promised land from the wilderness, are promised "thousands" which the Qumran author interprets as a thousand generations in keeping with Deut 7:9. Similarly, Deut 8:15-16 addresses famine and pestilence, announcing that these calamities befell wandering Israel, as they journeyed through "the great and terrible wilderness, with its fiery serpents and scorpions and thirsty ground where there was no water ... who fed you in the wilderness with manna". The unfaithful Israelites who refused to promptly occupy the land perished in the wilderness; Moses's audience at Moab is comprised of the subsequent and hopefully obedient generation. Finally, the Qumran author interprets Psalm 37:20b as "leaders and princes", an allusion to Deut 1:15 which is made clearer through 1QSa's (Rule of the Congregation) mention of a "captain of hundreds, fifties, and tens". If these authors are in agreement—or even a single author, although this is impossible to assert—then the vision of leadership given in Deut 1:15 informs both of these Psalmic interpretations.

Therefore, in some Qumran materials we see a specific type of interaction with wisdom themes and Deut 1-11. The themes are mentioned, but very sparsely developed. In other Qumran texts, however, we see significant theological involvement with wisdom themes as set forth in Deut 1-11. These wisdom themes are linked with the strong tendencies toward predestinarian thought found elsewhere in the Qumran materials.[908] This trend stands in uneasy tension with the exhortation to decide, and accordingly the presupposition that one *can* meaningfully decide, how one should live, featured prominently in Deut 1-11 and also attested in the Qumran materials. This tension is fueled by the realization that one is foreordained to make

[907] This interpretation is continued in col.4, l.2.
[908] Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature", in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, CRINT 2.2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 536-538. For more on predestinarianism as an alien overlay upon biblical wisdom see Goff, *4QInstruction*, 14-16.

certain decisions and be a part of the *yaḥad*, as is clearly attested in the Qumran materials, in juxtaposition with the necessary belief in one's free agency that must presuppose any meaningful exhortation to obedience and perseverance. Here too, wisdom ideas are used to further encourage the sectarians to adhere to the lives they have sworn to follow.

The importance of decision found in Deut 1-11 is shown in Geniza manuscript A2 ll.2-4. Here, the speaker will "make plain the ways of the wicked ... God, who loves true knowledge, has positioned Wisdom and Cleverness in front of Him". Supplementary text from 4Q267 gives at the ellipsis: "so you can leave the paths of sin".[909] Here, wisdom is promised as a reward for having made a good choice, or having left behind "the ways of the wicked". In 1QH (1QHymns) col.5 ll.9-11. Here, "evil, wisdom, and foll[y]" are presented with "righteousness" and "truth". The author continues to attest "eternal mercies to all [who walk] in peace, but ruin ...". Two paths are set before humanity, as revealed by God, with two separate destinies for those who choose either good or evil.

However, the Qumran materials not only introduce wisdom in the context of predestinarian thought, but include wisdom within the greater framework of this construct. In other words, not only is the discussion of predestinarian thinking part of the wisdom domain, but the possession of wisdom itself becomes embedded within this same predestinarianism. It is now seemingly the case that when wisdom— and the thinking it engenders— is present, it is *decreed* to be so. As stated earlier, the Hebrew scriptures present a vision of the world as governed by orderliness which underlies the apparent disorder of the world. This order, or *ḥākmâ*, "wisdom", is seen in Proverbs, developed in Job and Qohelet, and further treated by Ben Sira. As we have seen earlier, Ben Sira presents a complex picture of the relationship between this *ḥākmâ*, humanity's access to it, and God; while humanity can and should seek out wisdom,

[909] *WAC*, 52.

God must also bestow this wisdom upon the individual aspirant.[910] This understanding of *ḥākmâ* is shared by the Qumran materials, who chiefly explore the miraculous nature of *ḥākmâ* and how it is obtained. For them, and for Ben Sira, wisdom must be bestowed by God.[911]

Yet the Qumran authors do not completely agree with Ben Sira and, for that matter, other Second Temple wisdom writers. They often suggest that wisdom is not approached by human effort *at all*, but is a divine gift with no causal link to human effort. To this end, the concept of "mysteries" appears in the Qumran materials as an indicator of God's decree, allowing a causative link between these "mysteries" and the reception of wisdom. According to Matthew Goff, the "mysteries" are revelations which are "alien to biblical wisdom".[912] This is correct insofar that the wisdom texts do not propose that God's actions are entirely transparent to the wise, most notably in the realm of God's ordaining of reality. However, in the Qumran materials, wisdom and the "mysteries" are positively linked, indicating that these "mysteries" are the instrument by which God imparts wisdom.

4Q185 (4QSapiential Work) revisits many recurring themes we have seen thus far in the Qumran corpus. Frags.1-2 col.1 ll.9-13 further explore the Isaianic themes seen earlier, describing the mortality of humanity as an ephemeral plant of the earth: "just like grass man sprouts from the earth, and his virtue blossoms like the flower; but the wind blows [on it], and his stalk dries up, and the wind carries its flower to nothingness ... one may seek it, but not find

---

[910] Contra *WAC*, 175, who imply that Ben Sira merely equates wisdom with the revealed law of Moses, and thereby reconciles "ancient 'philosophy' with Israel's covenant faith". This is an insufficiently nuanced articulation, in my view, of Ben Sira's position. Also unclear is the implicit equivalence given to the law of Moses and ideas of "natural law" which is still a contentious issue. See Martens, *God/Law*; Hindy Najman, "Text and Figure in Ancient Jewish *Paideia*", in *Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity*, JSJSupp 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 243-256; et al.

[911] *WAC*, 175. For wisdom teachings in the Aramaic Qumran materials see Daniel A. Machiela, "'Wisdom Motifs' in the Compositional Strategy of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20) and Other Aramaic Texts from Qumran" in *Hā-ʾîsh Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*, STDJ 122, ed. George J. Brooke (Leiden: Brill, 2018): 223-247.

[912] Goff, *4QInstruction*, 16.

it".[913] 4QSapiential Work, however, adds that it is not only man who suffers mortality, but virtue as well. This is followed by a distinctly Deuteronomic exhortation to "the great deeds of our God" and to "call to mind the miracles He did in Egypt".[914] However, while in Deut 1-11 the successful completion of these commands produces long life and possession/inhabitance of the promised land, in this Qumran text the commands are given to the "unlearned" who should "learn" and "grow wise".[915] There is also an emphasis on *mûsar/paideia*, as the author instructs the reader to "grow wise by learning".[916] This would appear to support the observation that the author or authors of 4QSapiential believed wisdom could be and should be acquired through holy obedience, choosing the "good way", etc. However, successive passages suggest this is not the case, and that wisdom cannot be attained without divine assistance. Frags.1-2 col.1 l.8 gives: "Happy is the man to whom [Wisdom] is given ... The wicked should not boast, saying, It is not given to me ... the braggarts say, Truly we have found it by ourselves. Seek it, and you will find it".[917]

1QHymns continues in col.6 ll.3-4, which give: "men of truth and ... insight and seekers of understanding ... purified of ... [by] affliction ... and You have established Your statutes [among them] ... to distribute the inheritance among all". In this excerpt, the purification of the "men of truth" and "seekers of understanding", in other words, the wise, is accomplished by God with Deut 1-11 inheritance language reminiscent of the reception of the land, the land dominion theme. 1QWar Scroll also gives: "Your people Israel, whom You have chosen for Yourself ... learned in the statutes, enlightened in understanding".[918] In 1QHymns col.6 ll.8-10 this is further clarified, that God "places understanding" in the hearts of his servants, so that those servants

[913] See Isa 40:6-8; *WAC*, 242.
[914] 4Q185 frags.1-2 col.1 ll.13-15.
[915] 4Q185 frags.1-2 col.1 l.14.
[916] 4Q185 frags.1-2 col.1 l.14.
[917] There are strong thematic connections here with New Testament writings; see Matt 7:7; Eph 2:8-9.
[918] Col.10 ll.9-10.

might better align themselves to God's desires. More is present in col.9 ll.7-8, "by Your wisdom [You have establish]ed the successive [generations]... [apart from You no]thing is done".[919] This is pursued as the text progresses, and it becomes clear that the *reason* why wisdom can be obtained is precisely this governing nature of God. By sharing in God's understanding, wisdom may be obtained, since God is not only all-knowing but has appointed all that which occurs.[920] Further, this wisdom is God's to destroy as is given in apocalyptic language reminiscent of Isaiah 66:7: "she that is pregnant with wickedness experiences excruciating pain ... those who go down to the sea are terrified ... their wise men are for them as sailors ... For all their [human] wisdom is swallowed up".[921]

4Q298 (4QCryptic A: Words of the Sage to the Sons of Dawn) is a wisdom text which also promotes the sectarians' commitment to predestinarian ideas. Although extremely fragmentary, several markers have survived within the text that allow wisdom concepts to be identified. Col.2 of 4QCryptic A seems to represent the personification of Wisdom in Prov 8. Col.2 ll.1-3 give: "her roots go [out ...] lofty dwelling in the deeps be[neath ...] and in them consider ... dust ...", alluding to the creation of Wisdom "before the mountains had been shaped ... before ... the dust of the world ... I was there ... when he established the fountains of the deep".[922] In col.3, the author connects predestinarian thought with an allusion to Mic 6:8. Lines 4-10 give: "men of understanding ... and those who require justice, walk humbly ... men of truth ... increase humility and ... predestined trials ... that you might understand at the end of the eternal ages and look in the ancient things, to know".[923]

---

[919] Also ll.9-10, 14-15, 19-20; col.11 ll.22-25; col.15 ll.26-27; col.17 l.38-col.18 l.2; col.19 ll.9-10; col.20 l.13.
[920] Col.9 ll.24-26; 1QS(1QRule of the Community) col.3 ll.15-18.
[921] 1QHymns col.11 ll.12-15.
[922] Prov 8:25-28.
[923] *WAC*, 295; see García Martínez, 382, for an alternate reading.

Yet wisdom for the Qumran authors is not only unearned, but on occasion bestowed to the wicked. However, this wisdom which the wicked receive, while technically "wisdom", is not the same as that which is received by the righteous. Support for this concept of a "double" wisdom may be found in 4Q392 (4QLiturgical Work). Here, we find the concept of a double creation, first explored in the double nature of light and darkness, then extended to all that God has made.[924] 4QLiturgical Work frag.1 ll.4-7 give:

He created darkness [and li]ght for Himself, but in His dwelling place is the light of their light and all darkness rests before Him as well. He has no need to distinguish between light and darkness, but for the sons [of ma]n He distinguished them as the li[ght of] day, with the sun, and night, with the moon and stars ... [F]or all the works of God are doubled in this manner.

Perhaps this darkness which, for God, need not be distinguished from light is the origin of the mysterious embedded reference at line 7: "He has a light which cannot be searched out, nor can its end be known".[925]

These "double creation" ideas are not seen elsewhere in Second Temple writings.[926] They are further explored in 1QMysteries. Here, familiar wisdom tropes are recast in such a way that suggests the author's belief in a "double wisdom" or a "wisdom of the wicked". 1QMysteries col.1 ll.2-3 give: "secrets of sin ... but they did not know the secret of the way things are, nor did they understand the things of old ... so they did not rescue themselves without the secret of the way things are". Here, the author presents two kinds of "secrets": the "secrets of sin", which lead to calamity, and the "secret of the way things are" which is presumably the positive wisdom long

[924] *WAC*, 356.
[925] 4Q392 frag.1 l.7; also 1QHymns col.13 l.36 and col.24 l.8, "mysteries of transgression".
[926] *WAC*, 356.

cherished by Israel and which can bring those who do evil out of the dangerous circumstances in which they have implicated themselves. This sort of "doubled" wisdom may have found additional inspiration in Proverbs, as is shown in 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman). Here, the female personification of Wisdom is doubled in the guise of "Lady Folly", a development of the adulteress depicted in Prov 7:6-27. 4QWiles of the Wicked Woman transforms this woman, described in almost exclusively mundane language by Proverbs, into the apotheosis of adultery.[927] Her physical interactions in frag.1 ll.1-7 are with abstract nouns, her possessions likewise characterized by cosmic principles: "her heart creates lewdness ... her hands grip corruption ... her thighs are pillars of darkness, a horde of sins is under her tent ... her robes are gloom of twilight, while her jewelry is infected with rot". For this reason, Edward Cook attests that this woman is a "personification of Folly, and such appears to be the intent of the present work".[928] 1QapGen ar (1QGenesis Apocryphon), however, presents female wisdom positively in its depiction of Sarai who in addition to great beauty "possesses great wisdom".[929]

For this, consider 4Q299 (4QMysteries[a]) frag.2 col.2 l.3 which states "every deed of the righteous has been judged im[pure] ... [wisdom is hidden ex-]cept for the wisdom of cunning evil". This statement is further explained by the immediate context of the passage. The opening of 4QMysteries[a] gives "parables and riddles, and those who would penetrate the origins of knowledge, along with those who hold fast to ... those who walk in simplicity as well as those who are devious in every activity of the deeds ...", illustrating the affinity between this document and the wisdom book of Proverbs.[930] Already, however, we find differences; the Qumran author

[927] Excepting Prov 7:27: "Her house is the way to Sheol, going down to the chambers of death".
[928] *WAC*, 240. This view of women should be qualified by the honor due to mothers (see interpretation of Deut 5:16-21 in 4Q158, above; Collins, *Biography*, 43-45.
[929] Col.21 l.7.
[930] 4Q301 frag.1 l.2; Prov 1:1-6. Further similarities between the Qumran wisdom corpus and Proverbs can be seen in 4Q184 (Wiles of the Wicked Woman).

implies that it is not only the virtuous who may obtain wisdom. This is reinforced by the language of 1Q27 (1QMysteries) col.1 ll.8-11, which give:

> all the peoples reject evil, yet it advances in all of them ... truth is esteemed in the utterances of all the nations—yet is there any tongue or language that grasps it? What nation wants to be oppressed by another that is stronger ... Yet what nation is there that has not oppressed its neighbor?

Likewise, this passage shows strong kinship with the pessimistic wisdom thought of Qoh.[931]

Given these allusions to other wisdom texts, it appears that 4QMysteries[a] frag.2 col.2 l.3 should be interpreted with the same understanding. Evil is a reality and even the seemingly righteous are not unaffected by it. We might consider an ironic interpretation of "wisdom of cunning evil" if not for the reality of the "devious" having access to wisdom as given in 4Q301 (4QMysteries[c]) frag.1 l.2. These "devious" seekers are vividly described as having as a "[stiff] neck", an allusion not only to Exod 32:9 but also to Deut 9:13. This might seem counter-intuitive—and it is—but consider the following; if wisdom is obtainable through right action, surely the righteous would possess wisdom, given that they are themselves models of right action by virtue of their righteousness. To assert otherwise, as the Qumran authors do, would imply that wisdom exists apart from righteousness and unrighteousness, good and evil. This in turn creates the possibility that wisdom, being somehow unconnected to good and evil action, is instead bestowed by God as God sees fit.[932]

---

[931] Similarities with Qoh 3:11 are also seen in 1QHymns col.21 ll.12-13: "You have engraved eternity on the heart [of stone]".

[932] Nor are the Qumran materials unanimous in this regard; see 1QRule of the Community col.4 ll.2-11 for the distinction between the ways of the good and of the wicked, "wisdom" v. "cunning".

1QMysteries and 4Q299-301 (4QMysteries[a-c]) provide more insight concerning the position of the Qumran authors regarding the accessibility of wisdom, as well as the strong tendencies toward predestination observed elsewhere in the Qumran corpus. Firstly, while "secrets of sin" are available to all, true wisdom is not so easily attained and requires God's active intervention if it is to be gained. This is seen in 1QMysteries col.1 ll.5-8, which predict that in the future "the sources of evil are shut up ... The world will be made firm and all the adherents of the secrets of [sin? wonder?] shall be no more". Access to evil secrets, available now, will not be available in the future. Evil is common, as 1QMysteries col.1 l.9 gives: "the peoples reject evil, yet it advances in all of them". However, the famous masters of evil secrets, the practitioners of magic so common in biblical warnings, cannot obtain the secrets of good: "[Consider the sooth]sayers, those teachers of sin ... the vision is sealed up from you, and you have not properly understood the eternal mysteries and you have not become wise in understanding ... for you have not properly understood the origin of wisdom".[933] This is because wisdom is hidden as is given by 4QMysteries[a] frag.8 ll.1-6: "How can a man understand without knowledge or hearing? ... He created insight for his children, by much wisdom He uncovered our ears that we may h[ear]". This is all in accordance with God's plan, as is seen in 4QMysteries[a] frag.2 col.2 ll.9-15: "every secret ... and every thought ... from long ago He established it, and ... the purpose of the origins". This passage also demonstrates the Qumranic affinity between wisdom and "mysteries", as observed above.

To sum up, the wisdom materials at Qumran emphasize wise rulership, avoidance of bribes, impartial judging, material blessings, and the benefits of abundant offspring. They also unsurprisingly attest the importance of choosing good over evil and pursuing a virtuous life, in accordance with Deut 1-11 and the disciplined life described in the Qumran materials. However,

[933] 4Q300 frag.1 col.1 ll.1-4; *WAC*, 177.

this presents theological problems when considered alongside the observed tendency toward predestinarian thought which is a recognized element within the Qumran materials. In contrast with Ben Sira, the wisdom authors assert that God must solely provide wisdom if it is to be obtained at all. Because of this enmeshing of predeterminism with wisdom, two trends emerge within the Qumran materials. First, an association of wisdom with the "mysteries" removes wisdom from the exclusive domain of proper living and reassigns in it within the greater context of the divine decree according to which mankind is enlightened by these "mysteries". Second, a concept emerges of "dual wisdom" that seemingly describes two kinds of wisdom, the "cunning wisdom" of the wicked and the more conventional wisdom of the virtuous. This second concept especially creates the possibility for the reconciliation of free agency that enables meaningful obedience alongside God's decretal action, as while "mysteries" are indeed bestowed by God, the ability to determine in which "mysteries" one participates is partially if not wholly determined by one's virtue and supported by the Proverbs tradition of Lady Wisdom v. Lady Folly.

It may be posited that what we are witnessing is a developmental process: the result of the wisdom teachings of the Jewish scriptures, in context of Deut 1-11, being brought in theological dialogue with the idea of predeterminism. As predeterminism is a strong and recognized trend within Qumran writings, it is unsurprising that the Qumran materials, indicative as they are of pious concern with the Jewish scriptures, should produce a singular fusion of wisdom concerns and predeterminism. In this they are at odds with Ben Sira, who does not share this focus on predeterminism, and with Josephus, who while strongly espousing a belief in divine providence does not often engage with wisdom *per se*. However, it may also be the case that these Qumran materials present a variety of views, which may have circulated at one time, of even have emerged at different times without interaction or linear development. What can be

said, however, is that the Qumran materials present a unique and complex interpretive perspective, fascinating in its as yet unascertained details and ripe for additional study.

7.5. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—Covenant

In the Qumran materials, we see covenantalism extended from the corporate sensibilities expressed in Deut 1-11 into individual responsibility. This individualism may be observed not only as an expansion of the individual person's capacity for action, but as a natural extension of the 1QHymns speaker who seems to have been rejected by his surrounding community. Occasionally there are exceptions, discussed immediately below. However, the majority of covenantal references in Qumran materials, pertaining to Deut 1-11, are concerned with the responsibilities of obedience against a background of predestinarian thought, as well as the covenantal importance of not only the Decalogue, but also the "mysteries" as apparent precursors to or representatives of the oral law. There is also an odd reference to the common theme of the "zealous" priesthood of Phinehas, usually invoked to justify the Hasmonean priesthood, as well as a suggestion that the individual v. community view of covenant may have been directly or indirectly related to a possible controversy between a religious leader and his followers. Again, the common theme in these examples is a broad sense of individual and corporate responsibility, conceived against the philosophical grounding of predestinarian thought and mediated once again by the concept of "mysteries".

As mentioned above, exceptions to general covenantal trends do occur at Qumran. There is mention of covenant in terms of apocalyptic messianism, for example, in 4Q252 (4QGenesis Pesher[a]) where the blessing of Jacob/Israel upon Judah (Gen 49:9-12) is interpreted as indicating

the covenant, specifically the "ruler's staff" mentioned in Gen 49:10. 4Q252 col.5 ll.2-4 give: "the ruler's staff is the covenant of the kingdom, [and the thou]sands of Israel are the feet, until the Righteous Messiah, the Branch of David, has come. For to him and his seed the covenant of the kingdom of His people has been given for the eternal generations".

There are also attempts to provide historical continuity, such as in 1Q34 (1QFestival Prayers). This text focuses on the Noahic covenant, and makes unusual claims which link this covenant to later, Mosaic understandings of covenantalism. Here, the act of election, or "in the time of your goodwill You chose a people for Yourself" is caused by a covenant: "because you remembered Your covenant".[934] This covenant was "established" during which the chosen people were set "apart from all the peoples as holy to Yourself".[935] Later, the covenant is "renewed ... in a vision of Your glory and words of Your holy [spirit], by the works of Your hands and the writing of Your right hand". This three-part scheme, during which the covenant is seemingly created, then remembered and because of which Israel is chosen, then renewed amid spiritual visions, a speaking spirit, and the provision of writing, is highly suggestive of the Pentateuchal narrative sequence in which a covenant is made with Noah, remembered during the Abrahamic selection of a people, then renewed as the law is given to Moses. Here, we find covenantalism engaged in the Qumran materials with what seems to be a desire to simplify the mentions of covenant given in scripture. What might be construed as three separate covenants—Noah, Abraham, Moses—is given a unifying framework that presents God's actions as singular in purpose, as well as providing Israel with a history of election that connects the Pentateuchal writings.

[934] 1QFestival Prayers col.2 l.5.
[935] 1QFestival Prayers col.2 l.6.

Yet the majority of covenantal references in the Qumran materials involve obedience to the covenant. Covenantalism almost always involves adherence to a set of established conditions, and the covenantalism of Deut 1-11 conforms to general principles in this respect. In Deut 1-11, these conditions are given as connected with the presentation of the covenant, specifically the tablets that Moses receives at Sinai.[936] The Jewish scriptures did not comprise the totality of teachings adopted by the groups described in 1QS; rather, the sectarians held to the idea of "mysteries" that were continually revealed, even to themselves—perhaps especially to themselves.[937] Rabbinic tradition holds that while Moses received the covenant at Sinai in the form of engraved tablets, as is given in Deut 9-11, Moses also received additional information which would become known as the oral law.[938] In 1QS we find indications of the same idea, with the sectarians promoting certain "mysteries" which were not written down. Yet despite the covenant being clearly represented by the tablets in Deut 1-11, the sectarians seem to expand their view of the covenant's scope. Here, it appears that keeping covenant involves not only the written material of the tablets but the "mysteries" as well.

The motif of covenantal presentation, and of the tablets, invoked at 4Q470 (The Archangel Michael and King Zedekiah), is extremely brief and references a covenant made between Zedekiah and Michael. This covenant will be witnessed between the entire congregation. Although it is not explicitly stated in the text, these figures are likely King Zedekiah, last king of Judah, and Michael the archangel. If so, this text provides witness to the idea that angels are covenantal mediators as is given in the LXX and in New Testament texts.[939]

---

[936] The tablets of Moses may have inspired a later story of the tablets of Seth, inscriptions which he created and could only be read by the virtuous. These tablets are found in the *Testament of Adam*, but also in 4Q417 frag.2 col.1 ll.15-17; see *WAC*, 381, and Josephus, *A.J.*1.70.
[937] *WAC*, 125-126; 1QS col.11 l.19 *et al*.
[938] *WAC*, 126.
[939] See LXX Deut 33:2; Acts 7:53; Gal 3:19; Hindy Najman, "Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Scriptural Authority", *DSD* 7/3 (2000): 318-320.

It also provides thematic connection to Deut 1-11, specifically Deut 5 and 9-11 where the giving of the tablets is detailed. 4Q505-506 (4QWords of the Luminaries[b-c]) also makes reference to the covenant given at Sinai, stating: "and you with us you established [a covenant on Horeb] ... for Isaac and for Ja[cob]", as well as the "stiff-necked" tendency of the people attested in Exodus and Deuteronomy.[940] The tablet motif is also mentioned in 1QM (1QWar Scroll) col.11 l.3-4. Here, the "covenant of peace" is described as having been written with a "stylus of life" with which the "hosts of ... elect" are "engraved". This "covenant of peace", being unusually linked with the Exodus language of the "book of life", should be differentiated from other covenantal treatments which show strong affinities not only to wisdom and *mûsar/paideia*, but to Deut. It should be noted also that the recipients of this covenant are not disturbed by disobedience, and seem to show no tendency whatsoever in that direction; they are the "hos[ts of] ... [e]lect ... With the elect of heaven [they] shall prev[ail]".[941]

But the necessity for obedience is reiterated in Deut 11:26-28. Here, at the closing of Moses's paraenetic address, Moses leaves the Israelites with the practical summary of their lives in the promised land. Having given historical reasons and detailed examinations of the sorts of lives they will lead, Moses closes with a dramatic restatement: obey and you will be blessed, disobey and you will be cursed. While this blessing-cursing formula, as stated in Deut 11:26-28, is not explicitly covenantal, the covenantal renewal ceremony performed at mountains Ebal and Gerizim suggests that this warning should be viewed as part of a larger vision of covenantalism.[942] In 4Q473 (4QThe Two Ways) we find the same language as is given in Deut 11:26-28. 4Q473 frag.1 ll.2-7 give: "... He is setting ... [t]wo ways, one goo[d] ... He will bless

[940] For 4QWords of the Luminaries[b-c] I give the García Martínez Brill edition, 418; Exod 32:9; Deut 9:6.
[941] 1QWar Scroll col.12 ll.4-6.
[942] Deut 29:1.

you. But if you walk in the [evil] way ... He will exterminate you ...".[943] Obedience is also stressed in 1QS, the "Community Rule". This document governed not only whatever community may have existed at Qumran, but other communities throughout Palestine.[944] The community's necessary fidelity to holy laws is given almost immediately in 1QS and in distinctly Deuteronomic terms. Col.1 ll.1-2 give that the Instructor is to teach the initiates "to seek God with all their heart and with all their soul, to do that which is good and upright before Him, just as he commanded through Moses and all His servants the prophets. ... to love everything He chose and to hate everything He rejected".[945] This is language native to Deut 1-11, from the Shema of Deut 6:4-5 to the statement of love and hate reciprocity in Deut 7:9-10. Those that can do this are to be inducted into the "Covenant of Mercy" to be "joined to God's society and to walk faultless before Him".[946] Further, these newly inducted sectarians are to "bring the full measure of their knowledge, strength, and wealth into the *yaḥad* of God".[947] This too echoes the Shema, which commands to "love יהוה your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might", with "might" often interpreted as "wealth" especially in other Second Temple texts including the Damascus Document.[948] Col.8 ll.21 tells that the members of the *yaḥad* must "walk blamelessly as He commanded", an allusion to Deut 8:6.

This emphasis on obedience is continued in other portions of the Qumran materials, in which covenant themes are closely allied with *mûsar/paideia*. In 4Q504 (4QWords of the Luminaries[a]), the covenant protects disobedient Israel from God's destruction, which in this passage is juxtaposed with the atonement Moses made for the sins of Israel. The author,

---

[943] *WAC*, 405.
[944] *WAC*, 123.
[945] 1QS col.1 ll.1-4.
[946] 1QS col.1 ll.7-8.
[947] 1QS col.1 ll.11-12.
[948] 4Q266-272 col.9 l.11 and col.12 l.10, as well as Sir 7:30. See Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 77, 358.

however, does not directly connect Moses's atonement with God's mercy, or even with the covenant itself. Rather, it is so that God's "great power and abundant compassion might be known to generations to come, forever".[949] The author also prays that God would "remember the wonders" which God has done in the sight of the nations.[950] While this certainly alludes to Exod 2:24, it is also evocative of Deut 4:6-7, especially in light of col.2 ll.13-14, which give "that we might [repe]nt with all our heart and all our soul, to plant Your law in our hearts [that we not turn from it, straying] either to the right or to the left", references to Deut 5:32 and 6:5. The author, then, transitions from the covenantal passage to themes of memory and generational learning, indicative of *mûsar/paideia*. Covenant is mentioned again in col.3, in which the author connects covenant and *mûsar/paideia*, stating explicitly that the covenantal curses are, thanks to God's merciful election of Israel, to be understood as discipline. Lines 6-9 give: "You have chastened us as a man chastens his child. You have raised us ... [disciplining us] with terrible disease, famine, thirst, even plague and the sword—[every reproa]ch of Your covenant". In col.4, the Davidic covenant is mentioned, returning to a more thorough treatment of the ancestral covenant with the fathers in col.5. Here, God once again "remembers" the covenant, but now listing the positive merits of covenantal inclusion—mercy, desire for obedience, and imbuement with the spirit of God.[951] But this meditation is not free from the preoccupation with predestination that characterizes so much of the religious thought found in the Qumran documents. The sentiment of predestinarianism is surprisingly mitigated somewhat, as 4QWords of the Luminaries[a] has that

[949] 4QWords of the Luminaries[a] col.2 ll.10-11.
[950] 4QWords of the Luminaries[a] col.2 ll.11-12.
[951] 4QWords of the Luminaries[a] col.5 ll.11-15; line 15 gives: "You have poured out Your holy spirit upon us, [br]inging Your blessings to us".

God "caused us to seek You in our time of tribulation", "us" understood as Israel, but also that "You have [not] compelled us to serve You".[952]

In 4QWords of the Luminaries[a] col.6, however, covenant is mentioned again but with a different emphasis. Here, the covenant is described not as a pledge which God has given, but as set of conditions which Israel, although unfaithful, has not trangressed so as to render it void. Despite the "iniquities" and "rebellion and continued hostility" in ll.5-6, col.6 ll.6-8 give: "we have not refused Your trials, nor has our spirit loathed Your chastisement, so as to break our covenant with You, despite all our distress of soul when You sent our enemies against us". Once again, the overtones of *mûsar/paideia* are present. In this, the Qumran document makes clear an important development in covenantal thinking, as well as further clarifying interactions between ideas of covenant and *mûsar/paideia*. The tension between covenantal ideas and the repeated disobedience of Israel need not be elaborated here, only mentioned as motivating a great deal of theological reflection. How can disobedient Israel be viewed as somehow remaining within the bounds of a covenant that, as Deut 1-11 and other texts so clearly indicate, requires obedience? By viewing misfortune not as the curses of covenant disobedience, but as chastisement within a framework of parental *mûsar/paideia*, Israel remains hopeful that the chance to repent remains a possibility even during periods of great apostasy. This too recasts covenant away from predestinarianism and proposes that human agency has a much greater role than previously considered, again a surprising conclusion to be found in the Qumran materials.

1QWar Scroll places covenant within the greater treatment of an apocalyptic battle narrative. This battle is between the Sons of Light, or the *yaḥad*, and the Sons of Darkness, or

[952] This expression of God's simultaneous direction of Israel's actions as well as his bestowal of freedom upon them relies upon supplements to the readings; however, these supplements are provided by both the Brill and HarperCollins editions. See *WAC*, 412; García Martínez, 415; 4QWords of the Luminaries[a] col.5 ll.15-21. While *WAC* give "caused", García Martínez gives "so that we would look for you" at line 15.

the enemies of the *yaḥad*.[953] Covenant is first mentioned in col.1 l.2, where the enemy's roster includes "those who have violated the covenant". As the Sons of Light are understood to be the *yahad*, this description of the enemy requires all Sons of Light to adhere to the covenant, as otherwise they will be numbered among the enemy. Covenant here, then, describes the specifically faithful within the *yaḥad*. Following a lengthy description of the *yaḥad*'s ranks, covenant reappears in a prayer for courage, in which the warriors are exhorted and reminded that they are "the people of the saints of the covenant, learned in the statutes, enlightened in understanding".[954] Here the *yaḥad* is described not only as covenantal adherents, but with "understanding" or recipients of wisdom, and "learned in the statutes" a marker of the type of adherence praised in Deut 4:1. Col.13 ll.7-17, however, return to a more "orthodox" understanding of Qumran covenantalism. Here, the covenant is interpreted in accordance with a strong sense of predestination. Covenantal fidelity here is never in question, as the covenant is depicted as a completely divine and flawless institution. Here:

> You made a covenant with our fathers, and will establish it for their seed throughout the ages of eternity ... there has been remembrances of Your [kindness] ... for the sake of Your covenant ... You ... created us for yourself as an eternal people, and into the lot of light you cast us ... You appointed the Prince of Light to assist us ... You yourself made Belial for the pit.

Covenant here becomes a shorthand for God's eternal and predetermined purpose, which in the eyes of the sectarians shows favor to the fathers of Israel, and Israel (read: *yaḥad*) itself. This sense of the covenant continues in col.14 l.8 where God is "the One who kept the covenant for

[953] See 1QS 3:13; *WAC*, 150.
[954] 1QM col.10 l.10.

our forefathers ... With all the mysteries of his hatred they have not led us astray from your covenant ... You have preserved the lives of Your redeemed".[955]

It is in col.17 ll.2-3 that covenant is mentioned once more within 1QWar Scroll, and in this instance it provides a substantial marker of provenance and factional allegiance within the Qumran community. As noted above, the identity of the sectarians and their theological position, in comparison to those who were not aligned with the Qumran community, is much debated in scholarship. It is also debated whether or not it is accurate to speak of a "Qumran position" or whether the convictions of the sectarians changed over the roughly 250 years of its existence as might be reasonably expected. Here, however, the audience is told to "remember the judgment [of Nadab and Abi]hu, the sons of Aaron, by whose judgment God showed Himself holy before [all the people. But Eleazar] and Ithamar He preserved for himself for an eternal covenant [of priesthood]". Here, the Qumran author displays the same language found in Ben Sira to justify the Hasmonean priesthood, a decidedly unusual move for Qumran theologians. This comment lends more credence to the theory that, while the Qumran community was comprised of separatists, these dissenters themselves were vulnerable to division. This pro-Hasmonean sentiment, unsurprisingly possessing martial sympathies, perhaps opposed the sectarians more usually described in scholarship, who reserved the title "Wicked Priests" for Hasmonean rulers such as Alexander Jannaeus and, likely, Judas Maccabeus himself.[956]

In 1QH we also find a modification to the covenantalism of Deut 1-11. In the Deuteronomic narrative, Moses addresses Israel and always considers them a corporate body. While it is true that they are not being given a territory because of their abundance in population, but only because God loves them, it is also true that the choice to obey or disobey the covenant is

[955] Here, "his" refers to Belial, while "they" means the followers of Belial/sons of darkness. See *WAC*, 163.
[956] See García Martínez, *Dead Sea Scrolls*. Further priestly sympathies—in this case, a priest exhorting survivors of war—are noted in Tzvi Novick, "On the Paucity of Biblical Exemplars in Sectarian Texts", *Hā-ʾîsh Mōshe*, 250.

within their power.[957] But 1QH declares that whether one obeys or disobeys is predestined by God:

> nor is a person able to determine his step ... You alone have [creat]ed the righteous one, and from the womb You established him to give heed to Your covenant ... But the wicked ... from the womb You set them apart for the day of slaughter. For they walk in a way that is not profitable, and they reject Your covenant and their soul abhors Your truth.[958]

Also evident in 1QH is the individualism of the sectarian's relationship to the covenant, expressed consistently in the first person. Although the speaker is concerned with the covenantal interactions of others, much of the text is devoted to his own fidelity to the covenant, or lack thereof. As 1QH col. 12 ll. 34-39 give: "For I remember my guilt ... I said in my transgression, I am abandoned by Your covenant. But, when I remembered ... the abundance of your mercies, I stood upright and firm ... I will show myself to be strong in Your covenant". But this individualism is not necessarily benevolent, as 1QH col. 13 l.20 - col.14 l.5 indicate. In these passages, the author assumes a familiar mode of the Psalms, that of the oppressed psalmist who is constantly harassed by his enemies.[959] But these enemies are the speaker's "fellows" and it appears that he is accused of "jealousy and anger to those who have entered into *my* covenant".[960] The use of the first person singular possessive is striking and disturbing. The covenant, heretofore reserved for interactions between God and man when adopted in the religious milieu, is now construed in the mundane sense which has precedent in the Hebrew Scriptures only as a

---

[957] Deut 7:7-8, 12.
[958] 1QH col.7 ll.12-18; also col.10 l.31 echoing Prov 16:9.
[959] Pss 3, 5, 7, 22, 59, 109, *et al*.
[960] 1QH col.13 l.23.

treaty or covenant, a practical agreement between humans. The synonymity between the Qumran word for covenant, *yaḥad,* and that term's use to describe the community itself, becomes particularly ominous as the reader can no longer take the speaker's self-alleged innocence at face value. The speaker continues: "Ev[en those who sha]re my bread have lifted up their heel against me, and all those who have committed themselves to my counsel speak perversely against me with unjust lips".[961] It is impossible to know the exact circumstances behind this dispute amongst the *yaḥad*, but the image of a completely virtuous leader cannot, at this point, be uncritically maintained.[962]

Significantly, the speaker uses the word "grumble" in lines 24-25: "The men of my [coun]cil rebel and grumble round about". While there are many biblical precedents for religious figures who themselves do not fulfill their pious duties—Eli, his sons Hophni and Phinehas, the Danite priest of Judges 17—as well as an extensive litany of kings who do not satisfy the demands of a proper ruler, only Moses is depicted as the leader of a religious community who condemns the people he supervises for *their* failure to comport with God's instructions.[963] The Israelites also "grumble" while enduring the concomitant hardships of Moses's leadership, in Exod 16:2-13 and Deut 1:26-28. By providing this linguistic clue, the speaker reveals a likely self-identification with Moses, who similarly suffered, in the Qumran speaker's eyes, the indignant and unfounded complaints of an ungrateful people. This evocation of Moses as a peer justifies the speaker's complaints and possibly his self-appropriation of the covenant we have

[961] 1QH col.13 ll.23-24.
[962] See also 1QH col.14 l.19: "They who committed themselves to my testimony have let themselves be seduced by ... in the service of righteousness".
[963] While Samuel and other prophets do in fact rebuke the people, they do not have the governing authority of the lawgiver Moses.

seen earlier. The Qumran speaker may have viewed himself as another Moses, an inspired giver of law and covenant who suffered at the hands of a rebellious people.[964]

Perhaps most enlightening is the 1QH speaker's mention of his enemies' poetic endeavors, writing that they "intone their dispute against me on the lyre, and compose their complaint to music; together with ruin and desolation".[965] This suggests that the enemies of the 1QH speaker are writing their own psalms and complaints, likely preserved as well among the Qumran materials. Again, we find that the one-sided picture presented by the 1QH speaker should not be accepted uncritically but viewed with some skepticism, resisting any temptation to create hagiographical accounts.[966]

In conclusion, the preponderance of covenantal references in the Qumran materials, pertaining to Deut 1-11, concern individual v. corporate responsibilities. This is exactly the emphasis we would expect to see if these materials were written for the use of a religious community that often needed to confront the daily realities that followed attempts to live in accordance with a sacred code. But there is also an emphasis on predeterminism, as well as the militarism we have seen earlier in the Qumran materials' general interaction with Deut 1-11, militarism that usually signals pro-Hasmonean sympathies. Some covenantal references hint at messianism and historical synthesis, most notably a view of the Noahic covenant as elective. Obedience to the covenant is stressed with the "mysteries" giving additional requirements for satisfaction of the covenant, much like later rabbinic ideas. There is also, however, a "covenant

---

[964] See also 1QH col.16 ll.21-25, in which the speaker identifies with Moses by ascribing to his hands the power of divine agency, and employing the metaphor of "extending" and "withdrawing" to the care of a garden, itself an allusion to Gen 1-3: "by my hand You have opened their spring ... When I extend my hand to weed its ditches, its roots stretch out into the flinty stone ... But if I withdraw my hand, it shall become like a junip[er] ..."

[965] 1QH col.13 ll.29-30.

[966] On the identification of the author of 1QH as the Teacher of Righteousness, however, see A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. G. Vermes (Gloucester, MA: Smith, 1973), 361; Collins, *Biography*, 66. For a conflation of the identity of the Teacher with a religious figure who has suffered a "breach" after the theories of Victor Turner, see Wise, "Origins", 92-122.

of peace" mediated angels and written with a "stylus of life". In this covenant there is seemingly no disobedience, and those who are included are predetermined to be so. This is not to say, however, that mentions of covenant at Qumran have no exhortation to obey, as this is made clear through restatements of the ceremony at Ebal and Gerizim, as well as summary statements of obedience that are much like the Shema of Deut 6:4-5. Also, covenant is discussed in militaristic terms, again with strongly predeterministic overtones. Some of these militaristic covenantal mentions also refer to the "zealous" covenant of Eleazar, a sign that a pro-Hasmonean faction is represented among the Qumran materials. Finally, there are signs that a power struggle did occur at some point, as recorded in 1QH and in which a speaker seems to have experienced something of a schism within his religious movement as can be determined from the subtext of rebellion seen against the speaker of 1QH. These signs point to a certain ideological conformity within the Qumran materials. Theologies of predeterminism are powerful enough to pervade not only the Qumranic engagement with Deut 1-11 regarding wisdom themes, but also treatments of covenant. There is, of course, the expected emphasis on covenantal inclusion within the community and the serious commitment that accompanies it. Interestingly, however, there is militarism and reference to "zealous" covenant, indicators that pro-Hasmonean sentiment is not foreign to the Qumran materials. Debate continues over the various theories of political and religious conviction at Qumran, and these findings show that the case for pro-Hasmonean sentiment at Qumran is quite strong.

But perhaps most interesting is an example of covenantal and *mûsar/paideia* themes interacting that *de-emphasizes* predeterminism, highly unusual for the Qumran materials. As we have seen, the wisdom traditions often interact with predeterminism at Qumran to produce highly nuanced theologies of God's bestowal of wisdom and man's responsibility in obtaining wisdom.

A similar result seems to have obtained with this synthesis of covenant and *mûsar/paideia* themes. The powerful effects of training and discipline to produce good habits seem not to have eluded the authors of the Qumran materials, and the observable efficacy of these practices provide a strong motivation to rethink theology in the light of evidence that cannot be ignored. In this case, a strong correlation between obedience and *mûsar/paideia* resulted in a mitigated view of the predeterminism typical for the Qumran materials.

7.6. Deut 1-11 at Qumran—*Mûsar/Paideia*

As we have previously noted, the tripartite lenses of wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia* prove especially useful when analyzing the use of Deut 1-11 among the Qumran sectarians. *Mûsar/paideia* assumes special significance when considering the Qumran materials, as its principles are fundamental for the community which these materials often describe. *Mûsar/paideia* is most clearly seen in the rigor and daily discipline of sectarian life, in accordance with clearly articulated philosophies of ideal community existence. If the documents accurately depict a mode of life at Qumran, the Qumran community lived intentionally in accordance with strict rules of conduct and religious devotion, much like the Therapeutai as given in Philo's *De vita contemplativa*.[967] At least some sectarians were able to marry, however, according to the Damascus Document and Community Rule.[968] There were other associations and factions known for their commonly-held codes of life, of course; famously, Josephus describes the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in *B.J.*2.119-166. Here, Josephus describes these factions as philosophical *hairetistai*, or "divisions", while detailing the principles that

[967] Philo, *Contempl.*16-20, 25-28.
[968] Maxine L. Grossman, "Sectarian Marital Practice: Rethinking the Role of Sexuality in the Dead Sea Scrolls", *DSD* 26 (2019): 339-361.

govern their habits of thought and life. His descriptions of the Pharisees and Sadducees are extremely brief; however, his observations of their beliefs concerning predestination and community are of special interest of any consideration of the Qumran sectarians. While the Pharisees acknowledge some degree of divine predetermination of human affairs, they also recognize the reality of human free agency.[969] The Sadducees, on the other hand, dismiss predeterminism completely and espouse a position more akin to Enlightenment-era Deism; man is perfectly free to choose between good and evil largely because God cannot be bothered with such concerns and has removed himself completely from mundane affairs.[970] In this matter, the Pharisees may be viewed as taking a position of compromise between the Sadducees and the Qumran sectarians, who are, almost without exception, predestinarian as is indicated through their documents.[971]

The Qumran community, by their camaraderie and spirit of friendliness, also bears much more similarity to the Pharisees than the Sadducees, who "in their intercourse with their peers are as rude as with aliens".[972] Whether or not the Qumran community shared the same approach to complete sharing of life that Josephus reports of the Essenes, however, is impossible to tell.[973] Because Josephus provides such extensive detail regarding the Essenes, it is possible to compare them with what is known of the Qumran sectarians through their documents, and there is in fact a great deal of similarity, most especially regarding a disciplined, controlled way of life as is found

---

[969] Josephus, *B.J.*2.162-164 (LCL 203). See also Philo, *Prob.*75-91; Josephus, *A.J.*15.371, 18:22; Pliny, *Nat.*5.17.4; Collins, *Biography*, 30-46.
[970] *B.J.*2.164-165.
[971] 1QH col.5 ll.5-12; col.7 ll.12-21; col.9 ll.3-9; 1QS col.11 ll.15-22; the deterministic implications of 4Q186 and 4Q318; 4Q402 frags.3-4 ll.5-15; 4Q418 frag.126 col.2 ll.4-5; but see also 4Q393 frag.3 l.3; 4Q473 frag.1. See also Dimant, "Qumran"; but also see below for divergent opinions within the Qumran documents.
[972] *B.J.* 2.166; Cairo Geniza A 14.12-18 (*WAC*, 72). My discussion of the "Qumran community", again, should be qualified by my restriction of that term to the "ideal" community described in the Qumran materials, and is not a claim concerning the real state of the "Qumran community", if any, at any given historical period. See John J. Collins, "Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *Oxford Handbook*, 151-172.
[973] *B.J.* 2.119-161.

in the *Damascus Document* and *Community Rule*.[974] Even the more arcane aspects of Essene life—the probable use of pseudo-Solomonic texts, the creation of gemstone healing talismans, and the espousal of prophetic practices—have analogs in the astrological practices of the Qumran sectarians and their own prophecies which, in their case, tend strongly to the apocalyptic.[975]

That the Qumran community viewed itself as disciplined can easily be determined from the documents that survive them. 1QS col.3 l.1 gives that no one will be admitted into the *yaḥad* who "has rejected the disciplines foundational to knowledge". These "disciplines" are the *mûsar/paideia* of the community, the orderly rules which govern their day-to-day life. 1QS col.3 l.6 continues, noting that this dissenter is unclean as he is "refusing to be disciplined in the *yaḥad* of his society". 4Q275, although previously considered a work concerned with ritual purity, is now held to be discussing induction within the membership of the *yaḥad*, and as such is relevant for discussions of non-liturgical *mûsar*/*paideia*.[976] In this text, the author appears to be describing the proceedings when an erring novitiate, or apostate brother, has broken the rules of the sectarian community. The "Overseer sha[ll damn (?) ... without] mercy ... [and they shall remove him] from his inheritance fore[ver ...] and they shall discipline themselves".[977] While it is unclear who exactly is being disciplined, what is certain is that this practice is invoked in the context of correction and possibly a fearful response to avoid one's own expulsion after having seen others made examples.[978] Interestingly, the text continues: "they [shall pos]sess their inheritance fore[ver]". By invoking the idea of "inheritance" in the context of disciplinary

[974] Cairo Geniza 12.22-13.22; 4Q266 frag.18 col.4, 4Q270 frag.11 col.1; 4Q266 frag.18 col.5.
[975] *B.J.* 2.136, 159; 4Q318, 4Q560, 4Q561, 4Q177; for a sharp differentiation between Essene practice and Qumran apocalyptic writings see Collins, *Biography*, 43-45. The general scholarly equivalence between the sectarians and Essenes (see above, Taylor/Goodman) is presented by Lincicum, *Paul*, 65.
[976] *WAC*, 283.
[977] 4Q275 frag.1 l.3 - frag.2 l.1.
[978] See Heb 3:12; 4:11; 12:5-6; also Gal 6:1 for an observation somewhat to the contrary.

obedience, the author modifies the presumed inalienable quality of the inheritance, as well as merging wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* themes. Rather, in this context it is given a distinctively Deuteronomic slant, and that in the terms most concretely expressed in Deut 1-11: obedience enables life in the land of one's inheritance, while disobedience warrants expulsion. Other factors also suggest a way of life in alignment with Deut 1-11; the ability to marry and have children, the strong emphasis on written texts, the importance of humility, and most of all the primacy of God's power in determining all aspects of life, which at Qumran took the form of a strong predestinarian theology.

Other texts that show the strict discipline of the community, as depicted in the Qumran materials, are 4Q394-399 (4QMMT, Halakhic Letter). These texts address the problem of works and righteousness, otherwise found only in Paul's letters to the Romans and Galatians; second, these texts alone confront another sectarian group.[979] 4QMMT collects several laws governing ritual purity and permissible marriages. These laws are drawn almost entirely from Leviticus and Numbers, as well as several parallels with rabbinic regulations.[980] Deuteronomy 17 and 31 also provide material for 4QMMT; the borrowing from Deut 17 is highly fragmentary and concerns some sort of transgression involving women, while the use of Deut 31 concerns the necessity of obedience and repentance in the case of disobedience. This is also the concern of 4QMMT C.2.1 which borrows from Deut 7:26, stating "for in these ... the violence and the fornication ... places have been destroyed ... you shall [not] bring an abomination in[to your house]". Here, Deuteronomy is used to support the separatist tendencies of the Qumran sectarians. Yet as Tzvi Novick observes, the exhortation to "remember the kings of Israe[l] and

[979] *WAC*, 358.
[980] m. Parah, Zabim, Hul, Yad., Yebam., Tehar.; *WAC*, 359-363.

consider their deeds" is evocative of the blessings and curses found in Deuteronomy, especially the use of "straits" and "many straits" drawn from Deut 4:30, 31:17, and 31:21.[981]

Discipline is also found in 4Q412. Conventionally understood as part of the textual complex entitled "4QInstruction" or "The Secret of the Way Things Are", this mention of discipline reinforces the strong connection found between *mûsar/paideia* and wisdom teachings found in Proverbs. Here, the reader is exhorted to "[impo]se discipline" on the lips. Discipline of the tongue is found in this passage's Second Temple contemporary Ben Sira, but also in Deut 1-11 as perhaps the most immediate and frequent outworking of that section's emphasis on *mûsar/paideia*. Here, the Israelites are instructed to "teach [the words] diligently" to their children, and to "talk of them ... in your house, and ... by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise".[982]

Most importantly, these aspects of organized life bear no connection to priestly or liturgical practices. Instead, in their rules of community life, the Qumran materials detail principles designed to promote harmonious life among the laity through obedience. This is itself a thematic interpretation of Deut 1-11; just as Moses presents the necessity of obedience for a blessed life, so do the Qumran materials demand that the people actively covenant to live virtuous lives of discipline, willingly submitting to the rule of a superior.

There is also evidence that the sectarians held a complex view of Moses as teacher and exhorter, as seen in 11Q19-20 (11QTemple Scroll[a-b]). In this text, much of Deuteronomy is restated, but whereas in Deuteronomy Moses is the speaker, this fact is omitted in 11QTemple Scroll[a-b]. Because of this, it seems that God, or another human speaker, has replaced the

[981] Tzvi Novick, "Paucity", 250-251; also Hanne von Weissenberg, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue*, STDJ 82 (Leiden: Brill: 2009); also Lincicum, *Paul*, 77. According to Feldman this warns Israel of future apostasy; see Feldman, "Deuteronomy", 378.
[982] Deut 6:7.

authority of Moses. There are many possibilities here: the intentional replacement of Moses, which is admittedly hard to believe; the use of Moses's words to grant teaching authority to a speaker, with credit to Moses unwritten and possibly unspoken; or, most likely, the subtle authentication of Moses's teaching authority by removing him, thereby implying that these were God's words all along. This is also symptomatic of a general de-emphasis of exemplarity in the Qumran materials.[983] It is also indicative of the varying views of Moses we have seen earlier in more general use of Deut 1-11 in the Qumran materials. The motif of teaching is also evident in 4QCryptic A. Here, the *mûsar/paideia* theme of the instructor is found in frag.1 col.1, in which the "instructor" speaks to the "sons of dawn", exhorting them to "hear[ken]", "under[st]and", and "l[ist]en". Such language is immediately evocative of the appeals of the teacher, found extensively in Proverbs but also Moses's command in Deut 6:4-5 to "hear".[984] Yet in frag.1 col.1 l.2 the audience is further identified as "[those who purs]ue righteousness" giving even stronger connection to Proverbs which often describes righteousness in the context of instruction.[985]

In 1QSa (1QRule of the Congregation) the Deuteronomic theme of *mûsar/paideia* is linked to textual clues within Deut 1-11, in this case the enumeration of the armies. Here, the priests are identified as the "Sons of Zadok" along with "the men of their Covenant".[986] This is followed with the requirement that they be "indoctrinated" and "read all the statutes of the

[983] See Novick, "Paucity", 254. This has also been witnessed above in general observations concerning Deut 1-11 and the Qumran materials. Moshe Weinfeld, however, holds a view that harmonizes Exodus with Deuteronomy. He writes that Deuteronomy actually replaces the Exodus covenant, which was annulled by the incident of the golden calf. By emphasizing God as the speaker, the Qumran author shows that Moses is not merely reiterating an old covenant, but that God is reinstituting a new one. See Moshe Weinfeld, *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, LSTS 54 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 158; also Lincicum, *Paul*, 70-71, who interprets the relationship between the "rewritten Bible" with God's voice replacing Moses and the text of Deuteronomy as possibly indicating a subordinate position of the Deuteronomic text (?) but finally dismisses this due to the omission of the *Shema* from the rewritten text.
[984] Prov 1:2; 2:2, 5, 6; 4:1; 5:1; 8:33; et al.
[985] Prov 1:3; 2:9; 8:20.
[986] 1QSa col.1 ll.1-2.

Covenant".[987] Before they are introduced into the militaristic structure of the *yaḥad*, however, the boys are to be similarly educated, "instructed in the Book of Meditation ... they shall teach him the statutes of the Covenant, and ... they shall [gro]und him in their laws. For ten years he is to be considered a youth".[988] Finally, he will join the military structure of the *yaḥad*, divided into "hundreds, fifties, and tens".[989] Here we find another juxtaposition of wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* themes, in this case the "hundreds/fifties/tens" motif of wise leadership with the indoctrination and education found in *mûsar/paideia*. Further, the militarism viewed as part of the wisdom and covenantal themes is seen again in the context of *mûsar/paideia*.

Discipline provides the key to what is perhaps the most concise description of "wisdom" to which the Qumran sectarians continually allude, as 4Q418 frag.9 ll.14-17 give: "To all discipline [bend your shoulder] ... [Investigate the mystery of existence, consider] all the paths of truth and examine all the roots of evil. [Then you shall know what is bitter for man] and what is sweet for a man". The same injunction to honor father and mother continues here, as seen earlier, again echoing Deut 5:16.

In conclusion, the ideas of *mûsar/paideia* in the Qumran materials are best shown through the idealized "Qumran community" itself, which, while little can be objectively said regarding where and how it existed, is depicted within the Qumran materials as an orderly and disciplined society. This society may be roughly characterized through comparison with the accounts of Essenes, Sadducees, and Pharisees provided by ancient witnesses. The discipline of community life, in the Qumran materials, is often communicated through allusions to "inheritance", recalling the possession of the land detailed in Deut 1-11. The discipline in teaching and speaking shown in the Qumran materials recalls the commands to teach and

[987] 1QSa col.1 ll.4-5.
[988] Age 10-20; 1QSa col.1 ll.7-8; *WAC*, 345.
[989] 1QSa col.1 ll.14-15.

verbally train seen in Deut 1-11. The militarism of Deut 7 may be seen in the demands for martial readiness shown in 1QWar Scroll and elsewhere in the Qumran materials. Yet it seems that, as we have already observed, there is an explicitly recorded need to contend with the realities of disobedience which, at the plains of Moab, had not yet occurred to the Israelites, or at least the generation which Moses addressed. This may be seen in the provision for repentance given in the Qumran materials and expressed in Deut 1-11 in terms of land occupancy. However, we have seen very little explicit connection between the Deut 1-11 *mûsar/paideia* themes at Qumran and the predestinarianism for which the Qumran materials are so well known.

7.7. Chapter Conclusion

Wisdom materials at Qumran specifically mention the importance of properly exerted rulership, plentiful wealth and offspring, and incorruptible judges. Good must be chosen over evil, and virtue must be chosen over vice. But the Qumran materials also show a marked tendency toward predestinarian theology; unlike Ben Sira, the authors of these materials often that it is God who dispenses wisdom according to his own schedule. This predestinarian approach to wisdom results in wisdom being detached from considerations of wise life choices and now becomes part of the divine "mysteries". Wisdom is also divided into two varieties; the wisdom of the wicked and the wisdom of the virtuous. This synthesis of wisdom teaching and predestinarianism is unique to the Qumran materials, and shows the strong possibility of a gradual development of thought from the more common views expressed by Ben Sira to the hybrid that resulted from the emergence of predestination theology at Qumran.

This emphasis on predestinarian theology can also be found in the Qumran materials that reference covenant. While there is a strong delineation between individual and corporate responsibility, the logical conclusions of this dual exhortation to obey as well as the reality of predestination leads to a somewhat conflicted mode of encouragement, as can also be seen in reception of the epistle to the Hebrews. Covenant at Qumran also assumes militaristic overtones, and the Qumran materials show a strong possibility of internecine struggle, military activity, and armed support for the nascent Hasmonean movement.

Mûsar/paideia materials at Qumran are especially prominent as the Qumran site appears to have hosted, possibly at various times and in various iterations, a religious community. *Mûsar/paideia* would be of great use to them as any writings concerning this topic would have immediate practical necessity for the religious aspirants who dwelt there. This may be seen in references to "inheritance", the need for verbal training, and military readiness. However, the synthesis between wisdom and predestination, and for that matter the covenant and predestination, does not occur with *mûsar/paideia*. It is seemingly a straightforward matter to command obedience and praise its benefits that does not inherently demand an adjustment for predestinarian theology. With the covenant, it is a different matter; considering elective covenantal inclusion leads one to the unavoidable conundrum that follows when obedience is viewed to have real meaning and exerted with agency. This is more evidence that the interaction between wisdom teachings and predestinarian thought is a gradual development and not an authorial decision, for in the other two cases, the association between predestination and the lens in question is determined by the logical result of the doctrines in combination. This suggests that the authors, when assimilating these ideas, did so with a view towards their logical cooperation. We have a case of this in the affirmative (covenant) and in the negative (*mûsar/paideia*). With

the wisdom traditions, however, the interaction is more complex and seemingly not determined by any intellectual necessity of the wisdom material itself.

Chapter 8. Conclusion

And so we reach the end of two hundred years of Second Temple exegesis. Perhaps the most exciting part of this journey has been the sheer vitality that Deut 1-11 has exerted over the Second Temple Jewish authors. This text participated in the justification of revolutionary regimes, the defense of priesthoods on the verge of collapse, and the creation of mysterious ascetic communities as yet still not fully understood, or even defined, by scholarship. It also inspired the creation of elaborate philosophical and theological treatises that would provide a foundation for the nascent sect of Christianity. Last but not least, it played a part in the voluminous writings of Flavius Josephus, a Jewish general somewhat closer to an Odysseus than a David and whose ultimate goals and loyalties, even today, scholars have not yet managed to fully comprehend. Viewing these texts' use of Deut 1-11 through the lenses of wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia* has allowed us to perceive new subtleties and complexities in the texts, and has paved the way toward new areas of study. Deut 1-11 will survive past the Second Temple period, continuing to exert influence in the Jewish diaspora, passing into the new lands of the European Gentiles, and eventually the entire world; but for now, we must close the book. Before we do that, however, let us review the study thus far. The observations we have made allow us to group these Second Temple works in three categories, which I will detail below, then summarize the findings in the works studied. The observations made also allow us to identify two major trends which transcend these categories and provide for additional observations and conclusions; I will also address these trends in the summaries of findings given below.

First, we see in Second Temple interpretations of Deut 1-11 perspectives that may be called *theologically transformative*. In these interpretations, Deut 1-11, and the themes of

wisdom, *mûsar/paideia,* and covenant are used to describe a set of beliefs and practices that will result in the physical and spiritual betterment of the practitioner. Wisdom, in these interpretations, denotes proper thought, belief, and action. *Mûsar/paideia* is used to describe the regularity and disciplined commitment one must possess with respect to wisdom in order to reap its benefits. The theme of covenant, in theologically transformative perspectives, describes the certainty that adherence to these systems, as prescribed by God, will produce a good end.

In these approaches, we will see, relatively speaking, minimal attention given to the priesthood. The first reason for this, and perhaps an obvious one, is that texts which make use of Deut 1-11 tend not to be priestly in nature, as Deut 1-11 is not a priestly text, excepting the golden calf incident. The second reason for this is that depictions of the priesthood, in the texts under examination, are historiographical rather than expositional. In other words, while priests play an important role in historical accounts, they do not appear as often in more theoretical texts, namely Sir and the works of Philo. While it may be possible to deduce, from Sir, that theologically transformative approaches were part of the priesthood's teaching, the priests themselves do not appear in these texts; after all, it is in something of a second-hand manner, relying upon mentions of scribalism and a memorialistic passage for high priest Simon, that we conclude Ben Sira was a priest at all.

Second, we see in Second Temple interpretations of Deut 1-11 perspectives that may be called *historically explanatory*. In these interpretations, Deut 1-11, and the themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant are used to support historical claims and biases on the part of the author. As might be guessed, these are historiographic perspectives and as such, use wisdom, *mûsar/paideia,* and covenant as subordinate motifs toward the end of supporting the claims which the authors wish to promote. Accordingly, they do not demonstrate regularity in their use.

The priesthood occurs often in these documents, but rather than support any specific priestly doctrines, wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant ideas are used to illustrate the role played by the priesthood in the greater thematic goals of the authors.

Third, with one text serving as an example of this classification, we find *theological history*. In theological-historical interpretations, an account of the divine interacting in the world is presented in contexts and with personages that are attested in other historiographical works. In this work—2 Macc—Deut 1-11, itself a marginal form of theological history, supports specific claims about the Jerusalem temple, priesthood, and Jewish people. Just as the priesthood is only marginally mentioned in theologically transformative texts, due to the details of Deut 1-11, in 2 Macc Deut 1-11 is used to provide supplementary and explanatory information about the priesthood with great difficulty.

There are also trends which may be observed, trends which cross the boundary lines we have suggested above. One of these trends is *interconnectivity*. As shown in the introduction to this thesis, the themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant, are not discretely separated in Deut 1-11. The great speech of Moses at Moab interweaves these themes, which appear and reappear throughout. The Second Temple texts examined here will often treat these themes in the same manner.

Another trend is involvement with the problem of *immortality*. Deut 1-11 discusses long life, a wisdom theme, but this references a long, happy life in the promised land. After death, things change, as Job and Qoh are quick to illustrate. Ben Sira will link death to covenantalism, but also immortality, as if one satisfies the terms of the covenant, one cannot die. The chief role played here is to provide a theoretical structure for the concept of immortality; by *obeying* the

covenant, the faithful person has entered the domain of not only wisdom but *mûsar/paideia*, for as noted earlier, obedience is a liminal point between these two thematic domains.

Yet another trend is the flexibility of the covenantal theme that we have observed. Despite the great variety of motivations that drive these authors, the theme of covenant allows them to articulate their goals be they religious or political. It may also be used to differentiate within groups when the authors believe that part of one discrete group such as the priesthood, but not all, are responsible for wrongdoing.

8.1. Theologically Transformative Texts—Ben Sira

For Ben Sira, engaging with wisdom ideas in the context of Deut 1-11 results in theological conclusions that stress the importance of holding the right attitude towards God if one is to be considered truly wise. God's assistance is necessary to obtain wisdom, but not sufficient; one must also seek wisdom out as well as God's help. It is also important to fear God, which will produce material blessings and a blessed death, but also to engage in the disciplined pursuit of wisdom and to love God covenantally, as well as to obey Torah which is itself wisdom but another point of interconnectivity between *mûsar/paideia* and covenant, as Ben Sira implies that Torah is "the book of the covenant" which must be regularly obeyed in the honoring of parents. The interconnectivity of these three themes, as well as the specifically Deuteronomic idea of covenantal love as observed by Moran, suggests a largely unbiased concern on Ben Sira's part to present the themes of Deut 1-11 without coloration. In Sir, we find a continued interconnectivity between the three themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant when Ben Sira emphasizes *mûsar/paideia*. This is chiefly communicated in Sir through an emphasis on

Ben Sira's own writing practices and life as a priest. The most critical element of *mûsar/paideia*, for Ben Sira, is Torah, the chief instrument with which discipline is imparted. Parental involvement and physical correction are also stressed. This strong interconnectivity also emerges in Ben Sira's elaboration of the topic of right speech, a type of *mûsar/paideia* that Ben Sira expresses in terms of binarism, a hallmark of wisdom themes. This right speech is also in conformity with the law, again a maintenance of the thematic interconnectivity that is typical, thus far, of Sir. Writing, however, is not mentioned; it is possible that Ben Sira wrote this passage specifically to address unwritten communication and the potential problems that can proceed from spoken interaction. As a literate priest, well versed in both oral and written discourse, he would have been well aware of the need for teaching of this sort.

There is much scholarship addressing the affinity of covenantal writing in Deut to Assyrian and Hittite covenant formulation. While Weinfeld *et al.* established that the Assyrian form more significantly influences Deut 1-11, the debate is perhaps not yet concluded. There is evidence for this latter position perhaps in Ben Sira's attitude concerning covenant, which he finds within the Edenic transgression. He is able to do this by viewing death as a connecting motif; just as the wicked died in connection with a covenant, so must the punishment of death at Eden be also covenantal. This conception of covenant, seemingly influenced by the Hittite treaties, extends into the patriarchal era, as Ben Sira engages with covenants both of Hittite sovereign declaration (granting of the land) and Assyrian participation between vassal and suzerain (circumcision, covenant predicate on obedience).

Ben Sira will also approach the Sinaitic covenant in the same terms. This is a result of the author's awareness of the problem of immortality, the idea of a blessed existence as given in Deut 1-11 vs. the inevitability of an ignominious death as found in Job and Qoh. The tension

between these opposing concepts will appear often in Second Temple literature, most notably in Philo and the Qumran materials but also 2 Macc. For Ben Sira, immortality is expressed in a generational sense, insofar that for the righteous, immortality may be achieved through obedience and the generational fidelity that will result. Here, Ben Sira has linked *mûsar/paideia* with covenant, as he provides a new solution for the problem of covenantal obedience. It is through the consistent obedience of *mûsar/paideia* that immortality is obtained, a persistence not only in one's own life but in the lives of one's descendants. Ben Sira begins here to dialogue with the intergenerational theme of Deut 1-11. With respect to covenantalism, the influence of Deut 1-11 seems stronger as Ben Sira's work is translated and edited, revealing a shift in treatment of covenant away from human affairs and toward divine considerations. Deut 1-11 also emerges in Ben Sira's conflation of the physical record of the covenant, given on tablets, with the "book of the law" to create the "book of the covenant" according to the practice of composite citation. But covenantal ideas assume even more importance for Sir with respect to the priesthood, and he uses Deuteronomy to support the claim that the priestly covenant prescribes a priesthood not merely Levitical but specifically Aaronic. This influence of Deuteronomy appears to be localized in Sir; later additions to the text, further limiting the priesthood to the Zadokites presumably as a response to the Hasmoneans, do not rely upon Deuteronomy.

Therefore, the same emphases we have seen in Ben Sira's other engagement with Deut 1-11, wisdom and *mûsar/paideia*, continue in his treatment of covenant. A moderate solution is obtained for the problem of covenantal obedience, without the extremism of the Qumran materials' deliberations of predeterminism. The covenant is available to whoever can obey, by means of *mûsar/paideia*. And of course, Ben Sira provides an apology for the priesthood.

8.2. Theologically Transformative Texts—Philo

In the works of Philo, engagement with wisdom themes assumes a radically new context. This is due to Philo's singular approach: his use of allegorical exegesis to expound the Jewish scriptures. In his treatment of the theme of material goods, the very theme itself becomes minimized as his allegorical approach, by its very nature, seems to de-emphasize the importance of this theme. The theme of material goods, in Deut 1-11, clearly praises the importance of the physical apparatus of life: foodstuffs, water, homes, land itself. Yet Philo's allegorical method inherently assigns priority of meaning to spiritual and intangible realities such as virtue. The result of this is that his engagement with the theme of material provision seems to present a diminished view of this theme's importance. Instead, the immateriality of virtue, the relative poverty of the Levitical priesthood, and God himself become the recipients of focus. If a choice is to be made between God and the world, Philo seems to say, the choice is obvious—one should choose God. Yet this is not the choice presented in Deut 1-11, where a choice for God *results* in the world, as a blessing. Philo would perhaps not disagree, and instead suggest that he merely emphasizes the choice for God, but this is speculative. On the other hand, his emphasis on the virtue of the dispossessed Levites—who nonetheless possess God—implies the contrary. This minimization of material goods is taken so far as to result in the characterization of godliness not as a possession to be held, but as a faculty which should be considered part of the person, as an ontological property. It continues as Philo engages with material creation, which he does in a context that suggests Solomonic wisdom themes, but for Philo becomes an opportunity to describe God's act of creation and especially the *immaterial*, intelligible world which God created as well and which cannot be apprehended by the senses. Likewise, Philo's legal

discussions highlight the importance of intangible virtue. Only with respect to charity for the unfortunate—a wisdom theme which, notably, 2 Macc de-emphasizes—Philo is sure to stress the practical need to pursue this practice in the world, a likely result of his having witnesses a great deal of poverty made all the more poignant due to the contrast created by his own great wealth.

For Philo, *mûsar/paideia* in the context of Deut 1-11 assumes a quality that is, while not uniformly undesirable, seems to hold a secondary position to his loftier uses of allegorical exegesis. The first way in which *mûsar/paideia* enters his writing is through the use of the *kubernētēs*, or "pilot", as a metaphor for those who exhibit strong self-mastery. Melchizedek is an example of this; however, in the same textual excerpt Philo allegorizes Melchizedek not as a pilot, but as right principle or reason. Virtues then, are represented allegorically in biblical narratives, but the idea of *mûsar/paideia* is merely invoked as a metaphor, to ease the understanding of the concept. The same principle is at work when Philo describes the Logos, a Power of God through which God exerts agency in creation. Notably, Philo does not allegorize the Logos, but uses the metaphor of the *kubernētēs* once more to describe the Logos. To say then that the *kubernētēs* metaphor is linked to either divine or human concerns would be improper, as it describes both Melchizedek and the Logos. Further, each time Philo uses the *kubernētēs* metaphor, again in context of Deut 1-11, he associates with it the theme of *mûsar/paideia*. Given that we cannot consider Philo to have held a low view of the *logos*, it may be said that, for Philo, the *kubernētēs*, and by association the theme of *mûsar/paideia*, seems to have a merely literary quality. They are useful tools by which certain theological concepts may be expressed, but do not in and of themselves communicate any special honor to the subjects with which they interact. Allegorical exegesis, however, seems to imply that the allegory is lower than that which it represents. So far, Philo has allegorized Melchizedek, but not the

Logos. To misuse the allegorical exegesis would imply that the subject allegorized is higher, or lower, than it should be viewed. The *kubernētēs*, however, as well as the theme of *mûsar/paideia*, cannot be misappropriated in this way. Philo's examination of learning as a pregnancy metaphor reinforces this, as Philo examines God's nature but does not employ allegorical exegesis. When *mûsar/paideia* is concerned, in context of Deut 1-11, Philo does not say that God is an allegory for anything, or that anything allegorically represents God. This again suggests that for Philo *mûsar/paideia* indicates a lessening of abilities or the presence of imperfection, a dangerous situation in which to involve attributions of God's nature or qualities.

This trend continues in Philo's discussion of chastisement in the context of Deut 10:17. Here, the idea of *mûsar/paideia* becomes a direct opportunity to argue for the existence of multiple Powers. Sans the *kubernētēs*, this is an identical situation to Philo's depiction of the Logos. The concept of training, even painful training, becomes a helpful metaphor to communicate a difficult idea. Allegory, however, is not employed. More of the same can be seen in Philo's discussion of anthropomorphism in the context of Deut 1-11. According to Philo, anthropomorphism is something of a necessary evil, a way for those who are less able to rightly apprehend God—i.e., those in need of *mûsar/paideia*—to somehow experience God. Those who are more developed, however, such as Moses, do not need the intermediary apparatus of anthropomorphism. Again, *mûsar/paideia* is presented as part of an ideological system that provides necessary assistance for those in need.

A clue is provided in Philo's use of *mûsar/paideia* in the context of the stability, or better immutability, of God. Here, a discussion of *mûsar/paideia* is immediately averted in favor of a focus on God's nature. This controlling concern, the nature of God, seems to encourage a de-emphasis of *mûsar/paideia*. This is fitting, as for Philo to assert that God requires

mûsar/paideia, or learning of any kind, would be unthinkable. The situation is seemingly complicated in *Congr*.168-174, where chastening becomes "affliction", an allegorical representation of the death of the passions. However, as itself a lesser construct, *mûsar/paideia* may itself serve as an allegorical representation of a higher concept, in keeping with what is observed above. Also, *mûsar/paideia* is a hallmark of the proselyte, or seeker of God. Although Philo is quick to assert that God helps the seeker, instantaneously, nevertheless some training is required, and its presence reveals that the one undergoing training is not yet perfected.

Further, in *Praem*.79-80 and 94-97 we see that to be effective, *mûsar/paideia* must be afforded some measure of divine grace; in other words, it is impossible for the unaided human to practice it effectively when the desired result is the apprehension of God. This seems oppositional to Philo's treatment of wisdom themes, which in context of Deut 1-11 often assume a quality of *quid pro quo*, but as we have seen there is a discrete separation in Philo between wisdom ideas and the attainment of good. Wisdom ideas, for Philo and again in context of Deut 1-11, are used to promote the detachment from materiality and while the idea of meaningful choice is emphasized, the immateriality of the goals themselves suggests there is more to the story than pure transactionalism. This, then, is reinforced by Philo's observations of grace and *mûsar/paideia*. Philo has here synthesized his teachings on wisdom and *mûsar/paideia* to suggest a gracious and spiritualized view of the good life and material blessing wisdom themes.

Before embarking on an analysis of Philo's use of covenantal themes in context of Deut 1-11, it is worth mentioning again the fragility of covenant as presented in Deut 1-11 to these authors. As no other theme, the idea of covenant is appropriated and altered to suit the needs, social and political, of these Second Temple authors. One possible reason for this would be the historical unreliability of the covenant in the eyes of many. As we have seen, the covenant of

Eleazar is used to justify the Hasmonean priesthood over the Zadokite priesthood, despite the Aaronid priesthood also having been instituted by covenant.[990] Further, after Cyrus permits the Jews to return to the holy land in Ezra-Nehemiah, it seems that Daniel's prayer of repentance has successfully interceded for the Jews who may now dwell in the land once more due to the mercies of the covenant as given in Deut 1-11. However, Alexander's successful conquest, or that of his successors if Josephus is to be believed, presents a problem: how, now, has the covenant been violated? Rather than look for an answer, it could also be argued that the covenant itself is somehow void, or not to be believed at all. This would create an opportunity for Second Temple Jewish authors to use the concept of covenant, so clearly depicted in Deut 1-11 as a divinely instituted ordinance, as an enabling device supporting their own purposes.

Also, we cannot ignore the geographical similarities of these authors, writing in the midst of the perpetual political turmoil of Jerusalem. The priesthood of Simon II, praised by Ben Sira, is only a short while after the afore-mentioned fratricide that scandalized the priesthood. 1 and 2 Macc contend with the sudden overthrow of Greek rule by the Hasmonean dynasty. And Josephus is a literal participant in the transfer of Jerusalem from the Herodians to full Roman control during the siege and destruction of Jerusalem. Comparatively speaking, Philo's circumstances are more tranquil. For him, covenantal ideas are an entry point into philosophical and theological examination of the Jewish scriptures. That being said, however, there remain certain similarities between himself and other Second Temple authors. Like Ben Sira, Philo views the covenant in context of Deut 1-11 as signifying the law, and the divine origin of those laws; he also freely merges wisdom themes with his covenantal exegesis, like material provision as in the drawing of water from a rock. Another favorite theme is the stability or immutability of God, which Philo often freely combines with covenant as well. However, in this case, the

[990] Num 18:19.

covenant now becomes intertwined with allegorical interpretation. Instead of representing laws, covenant now represents the immutability of God, as well as God's gift of himself to others. The allegory, however, applies to the water from the rock, which allegorically represents wisdom.

Philo also compares the covenant to justice and the arrangements between men, claiming that Jethro's status is lesser than Moses due to the sorts of arrangements over which Jethro presides. Yet the actual allegorization of the covenant does not occur until Philo claims that the covenant is an allegory for grace, the gifts of God which make perfect those who receive it. Philo also uses covenant as part of his ongoing concern with the struggle between the mind and the senses, specifically the covenant of circumcision which for Philo allegorically represents the circumcision of the flesh, as opposed to the circumcision of the heart in Deut 10:16.

Philo also uses covenant, specifically the Abrahamic covenant of Gen 15, to help describe the allegory of the land, which represents wisdom. This soon becomes a meditation on the dividing powers of the Logos, and Philo is quick to mention Deut 5:5, another mention of standing and of the Logos. This becomes two covenants, one between God and the Logos, one between the creature and the Logos. Finally, Philo uses covenant to describe the internal quality of Israel, as a largesse of soul, using Deut 7:7.

Earlier we saw that Philo does not allegorize *mûsar/paideia*. He does, however, allegorize wisdom as seen above as well as covenant itself. Even more interestingly, Philo allegorizes covenant as a "gift of grace". This is remarkably close to the Godhead, something which seems to provide caution in Philo's use of allegorical exegesis. It should be noted that the covenant itself is attributed with perfection, as is God and, presumably, the *logos*. *Mûsar/paideia* is not perfect, as it is a transitional operation. But Philo's use of covenant here suggests that he views wisdom as perfect as well. This is in keeping with Prov 8 and the

personification of Wisdom, which perhaps for Philo is yet another Power, or considered as analogous to one. But unlike so many authors in the Second Temple period, for Philo, covenant remains purely a construct of the Jewish scriptures, an opportunity to exegete and explore the nature of God. One could be cynical and say that this purist approach is a luxury afforded to Philo by the relatively tranquil political circumstances he inhabits. But this is not always the case, as *Flacc*. indicates. It is better to think of Philo as fortunate, in that while he did in fact inhabit a largely peaceful city, once the siege of Actium had decided its fate, he made good use of that security to create theological treatises that would endure thousands of years after him.

8.3. Theologically Transformative Texts—Qumran Materials

The great pressure of social and institutional influence is especially evident in the Qumran materials' treatment of Deut 1-11 wisdom themes. The expected approval of themes such as wise rulership, avoidance of bribes, impartial judging, and material blessings are present, as well as a perhaps unexpected emphasis on offspring. Yet the insistent pressure of predeterminism, a known theological propensity in the Qumran materials, exerts strong pressure on the treatment of wisdom themes. In the Qumran materials, there is no indication that wisdom themes are explored in discrete separation from predeterminist convictions, and so multiple syntheses emerge between the two. This includes a strong view of God as the sole provider of wisdom, irrespective of human action, by means of revelatory "mysteries", and an idea of "dual wisdom" explaining the apparent wisdom of the wicked and which is required by the exact correspondence, at Qumran, between wisdom and God's impartation of it.

It may be posited that this is a developmental process: the result of the wisdom teachings of the Jewish scriptures, in context of Deut 1-11, being brought in theological dialogue with the idea of predeterminism. As predeterminism is a strong and recognized trend within Qumran writings, it is unsurprising that the Qumran materials, indicative as they are of pious concern with the Jewish scriptures, should produce a singular fusion of wisdom concerns and predeterminism. In this they are at odds with Ben Sira, who does not share this focus on predeterminism, and with Josephus, who while strongly espousing a belief in divine providence does not often engage with wisdom *per se*. However, it may also be the case that these Qumran materials present a variety of views, which may have circulated at one time, or even have emerged at different times without interaction or linear development.

The Qumran materials describe an ideal community, or communities, that have espoused the principles of *mûsar/paideia* to the extent that their lives are governed by orderly discipline. Further, this discipline seems to be much in line with the disciplinary, *mûsar/paideia* ideas given in Deut 1-11. Like the Therapeutai, the Qumran community embraced strict rules of life, but were nonetheless able to marry. They followed a strict way of life, however, that, if the preponderance of documents discovered are any indication, featured an intense involvement with the Jewish scriptures, especially Deuteronomy. Disobedience, at Qumran, meant expulsion from "the land" in which they lived. This discipline is strictly enforced and, as Deut 1-11 specifies a specific mode of speech, speaking often of the laws and teaching them to children at all times, so do the Qumran materials prescribe that discipline be placed on the lips. Nor are these rules bound to liturgy or temple practice; it appears that at Qumran, as is given in Deut 1-11, liturgical practice was not a regular part of life. Much value was assigned to the figure of Moses as a teacher, as well as the possibility of military action. It is likely, then, that Deut 1-11 served as a

foundational text for the *yahad*, providing the basics of community life as it does for the Israelites at Moab it describes.

The view of Moses, however, as a teacher and leader is nuanced; some texts imply that it is Moses's office that shows power, not Moses himself. Further, *mûsar/paideia* is linked to gaining wisdom. The Qumran materials, then, suggest a view of *mûsar/paideia* that has gained prominence in relation to wisdom. The generalized practical benefits of wisdom, just as Deut 1-11 implies, are contingent upon the successful discipline of the chosen people.

Most notably, the power of God as determinant of the Israelites' fate manifested as a strong sentiment of predestinarian theology at Qumran. This can be seen from the Qumran materials in general as well as ancient testimonies such as Josephus. However, with respect to the Deut 1-11 *mûsar/paideia* themes, there is very little interaction with predeterministic thinking at Qumran. This may be the natural result of an inherent antipathy between the ideas, as predeterminism easily leads to fatalism which can discourage the perceived need for strenuous living. However, it is clear that, again if the Qumran materials are any indication, the Qumran sectarians almost unanimously embraced the strict *mûsar/paideia* as given in the materials. It is also possible, however, that these materials reflect the convictions of rival factions, some of whom adopted a strict predeterministic outlook, while others suppressed this theology in favor of personal agency and the need for strict living. Perhaps this group, having seen the difficulties of maintaining a belief in personal agency alongside a robust sense of predeterminism, originated from the first.

The preponderance of covenantal references in the Qumran materials, pertaining to Deut 1-11, concern individual v. corporate responsibilities. This is exactly the emphasis we would expect to see if these materials were written for the use of a religious community that often

needed to confront the daily realities that followed attempts to live in accordance with a sacred code. But there is also an emphasis on predeterminism, as well as the militarism we have seen earlier in the Qumran materials' general interaction with Deut 1-11, militarism that usually signals pro-Hasmonean sympathies. Some covenantal references hint at messianism and historical synthesis, most notably a view of the Noahic covenant as elective. Obedience to the covenant is stressed with the "mysteries" giving additional requirements for satisfaction of the covenant, much like later rabbinic ideas. There is also, however, a "covenant of peace" mediated angels and written with a "stylus of life". In this covenant there is seemingly no disobedience, and those who are included are predetermined to be so. This is not to say, however, that mentions of covenant at Qumran have no exhortation to obey, as this is made clear through restatements of the ceremony at Ebal and Gerizim, as well as summary statements of obedience that are much like the Shema of Deut 6:4-5. Also, covenant is discussed in militaristic terms, again with strongly predeterministic overtones. Some of these militaristic covenantal mentions also refer to the "zealous" covenant of Eleazar, a sign that a pro-Hasmonean faction is represented among the Qumran materials. Finally, there are signs that a power struggle did occur at some point, as recorded in 1QH and in which a speaker seems to have experienced something of a schism within his religious movement as can be determined from the subtext of rebellion seen against the speaker of 1QH, evidence for the "Gröningen Hypothesis". These signs point to a certain pressure for ideological conformity within the Qumran materials. Theologies of predeterminism are powerful enough to pervade not only the Qumranic engagement with Deut 1-11 regarding wisdom themes, but also treatments of covenant. There is, of course, the expected emphasis on covenantal inclusion within the community and the serious commitment that accompanies it. Interestingly, however, there is militarism and reference to

"zealous" covenant, indicators that pro-Hasmonean sentiment is not foreign to the Qumran materials. Debate continues over the various theories of political and religious conviction at Qumran, and these findings show that the case for pro-Hasmonean sentiment at Qumran is quite strong.

But perhaps most interesting is an example of covenantal and *mûsar/paideia* themes interacting that *de-emphasizes* predeterminism, highly unusual for the Qumran materials. As we have seen, the wisdom traditions often interact with predeterminism at Qumran to produce highly nuanced theologies of God's bestowal of wisdom and man's responsibility in obtaining wisdom. A similar result seems to have obtained with this synthesis of covenant and *mûsar/paideia* themes. The powerful effects of training and discipline to produce good habits seem not to have eluded the authors of the Qumran materials, and the observable efficacy of these practices provide a strong motivation to rethink theology in the light of evidence that cannot be ignored. In this case, a strong correlation between obedience and *mûsar/paideia* resulted in a mitigated view of the predeterminism typical for the Qumran materials.

8.4. Historically Explanatory Texts—1 Macc

For 1 Macc, there is a merging of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant. In this case, however, this merging serves the purpose of promoting the Hasmonean dynasty. In 1 Macc, engagement with *mûsar/paideia* takes a distinctly different shape than what is witnessed in Sir. Here, the focus is upon the *gymnasium*, an emblem of Hellenistic society and of the *enkuklia paideia*. The themes of *mûsar/paideia* found in Deut 1-11 are almost completely submerged under the author's governing interest in criticizing the "lawless men" who involved themselves

with Greek affairs. The theme of generational education, a key element of *mûsar/paideia* in Deut 1-11, is also dramatically changed as the responsibility of each generation to faithfully follow God, as is seen in the grace afforded to the second generation of Israel at Moab whom Moses addresses in Deut 1-11, is replaced by the equivalency of culpability seen between Mattahias and his sons. Generational power transference also serves the ends of the author, as in this case the stable passing of command from Mattathias to Judas in contrasted with the instability of the Greek succession, depicted in conjunction with the *paedagōgos*.

We have seen earlier that 1 Macc displays an interconnectivity between the themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia,* and covenant, and that this interconnectivity assists the author in promoting the Hasmonean dynasty. Here, however, this interconnectivity is not present, and in fact the theme of *mûsar/paideia* is radically reworked in favor of the author's controlling interests. This shows that a strong bias, as the author of 1 Macc possesses, does not preclude the adoption of thematic interconnectivity. However, the author is never compelled to maintain this interconnectivity in all circumstances, and if it is more favorable for the author to completely abandon an approach, the author freely does so, as we see in this case regarding *mûsar/paideia*.

In 1 Macc, the authorial motivations once again emerge and control the author's use of covenantal themes. As in Deut 1-11, disobedience of the covenant results in punishment. However, the author of 1 Macc mitigates this, and the covenant is cast in terms that protect the Oniads as their infractions appear to have been against other men, not God. Further, the "book of the covenant" appears in a context that authenticates a covenant made with the nations as non-sacred. The effect of this is to restrict all mention of the covenant to terms that will protect the Hasmonean monarchy. It is clear that the author of 1 Macc has very few qualms with taking great liberties with the sense of Deut 1-11 to demonstrate his points. He requires covenantalism,

to justify the Hasmonean ascendancy and priesthood, as this relies upon the "covenant of zeal" made with Eleazar. Yet he must mitigate covenant as well, creating a new category for the covenant made with surrounding nations. This is accomplished through clever textual manipulation. Certainly in this case, we can say that the social and political circumstances that surrounded the author of 1 Macc compelled him to interpret Deut 1-11's emphasis on covenant in a highly idiosyncratic manner, one that suited his political ends.

8.5. Historically Explanatory Texts—Josephus

This trend to modify wisdom themes in keeping with authorial goals continues dramatically with the works of Josephus. In the twelve key speeches he presents, the wisdom themes presented are contextually appropriate for their dramatic setting, a series of military conflicts between Rome and Jerusalem. These themes are, unsurprisingly, themes of long life and land dominion. Here also, as might be expected, Josephus introduces ideas of immortality. While for Ben Sira, immortality is a concern largely associated with covenantalism, Josephus engages with immortality in the context of wisdom themes which easily transfer to a Roman perspective. Immortality is not the exclusive possession of covenantally faithful Jews; it is now available to all, including the Romans. However, Josephus's use of wisdom themes is not limited to mere inclusion of the Romans; it often supports an even more extreme position of Roman preference. Repeatedly, Josephus's use of wisdom themes indicates that the Romans now enjoy the favor of God, and Josephus goes so far as to invert the conventions of Deut 1-11 to accomplish this. Once more, authorial goals greatly impact the use of Deut 1-11, in this case wisdom themes of Deut 1-11. Josephus has a strong vested interest in praising his Roman

patrons and is not reluctant to place speeches in the mouths of his historical characters that subvert the text of Deut 1-11.

In Josephus's speeches within *B.J.*, *mûsar/paideia* is often used to support Josephus's usual position that the Romans have acquired divine favor, while still retaining resonances from its original Deut 1-11 context. The emperor Vespasian, according to his son Titus, will enter Judaea to "admonish" the Jews; instead of God administering this helpful *mûsar/paideia*, it is Vespasian who will do so. Agrippa takes the same approach to the young Jews who violently oppose religious interference and once again, *mûsar/paideia* is subverted. However, the same sentiment is expressed by Ananus, who accuses the Jews of failing to properly oppose the Zealots in a timely manner, leading to their inevitable revolt. As can be predicted in Josephus, *mûsar/paideia* can represent both positive and negative consequences, depending on who exerts it. When it *is* exercised, to helpful effect, or will be exercised, it is the Romans who wield *mûsar/paideia*. When it is *not* used properly, the blame lies squarely with the Jews. Once again, then, a key theme of Deut 1-11 becomes a means for Josephus to accomplish his authorial ends, irrespective of the original context of the theme in Deut 1-11.

As expected, Josephus greatly minimizes his exposition of covenant, specifically *diathēkē*, in *A.J.* Here, Josephus consistently substitutes words like *horkos, pistis,* and *sunthēkē,* which allow for a much more inclusive view of Israel's history and provide non-Jewish peoples with a sympathetic perspective, from which they can view themselves also as part of God's purposes. Josephus runs a great risk in discussing covenantal concerns, as the Jewish scriptures show covenant as the means by which God shows unique favor to Israel. This by necessity divests the Romans of their place as the most favored nation, an idea which Josephus is quick to endorse elsewhere, and so he must mitigate his discussion of covenant to remove any intimation

that the Jewish are the greatest of all peoples and therefore superior to the Romans. This he does first by substituting *diathēkē* with *orkon* and *pistis,* words which only connote man-made agreements. Josephus shows the Jews often engaging in these agreements, a depiction which could have only earned Jews favor in the eyes of the Romans. Josephus also minimizes the unique and exotic character of Jewish worship, a quality that had earned them so much scorn in the regard of other peoples, especially concerning the Sabbath. Josephus has two strategies for these examples; he either creates reasons for the Jews to engage in worship that would similarly motivate other nations, such as simple piety or the naturalistic desire for transactional favor, or he simply omits the passage when its salient points are too bizarre to recast in a positive light, such as the covenant of salt.

For Josephus, the theme of obedience, a wisdom theme, emerges in the context of covenant. This is unsurprising, as covenants must be obeyed, but in Deut 1-11 obedience is more commonly depicted in terms of the rules and statutes. Given Josephus's broad engagement with covenant, he must account for covenant in many contexts, and must contend with the claim of the Jewish scriptures that covenantal obedience, for Israel, is necessary for them to receive blessings and maintain favor with God, a favor that includes political power. Therefore, Josephus is careful to never show the Jews as gaining power due to their covenantal obedience. Narratives that do show political reward are changed so as not to challenge the Romans. Likewise, mentions of covenant that show Jews gaining control of a territory are removed, while those that show Jews losing land are left unchanged, and narratives involving the ark as a symbol of military conquest receive the same treatment; when the ark shows victory, it is removed, but when it shows defeat, it is left unchanged.

8.6. Theological-Historical Texts—2 Macc

For 2 Macc, we find something of a hybrid approach between Sir and 1 Macc. Here, the goal is to defend the Jerusalem priesthood, as well as the validity but not exclusivity of the Jerusalem temple, and to show the spiritual efficacy of the Jewish people. One might expect that wisdom themes will serve to support these objectives, and this is exactly what we find. Even wisdom themes as socially necessary as the care for the vulnerable are subdued in favor of defending the priesthood, if this is required. Again, the author's goals take priority over any larger considerations of wisdom.

2 Macc is also greatly occupied with the *gymnasium*. In this case, however, the author is quick to assert that, while the priests did in fact involve themselves with the *gymnasium*, they did not thereby break any religious laws. Instead, their crime was to form an idolatrous attachment to the activities of the *gymnasium*. By doing so, the author of 2 Macc gives the *gymnasium* with a morally neutral status, important for his somewhat complex attitude toward the priests. Some priests—Jason's cohort—are rogue and to be blamed, but others are not. The author therefore does not wish to either exonerate or implicate the entire priesthood, as the reality the author depicts is more complex than that. By assigning the actual crime to the hearts of the individual priests, the author delivers the priesthood writ large from any culpability and permits the assignation of blame to individual priests, further allowing Jason and his followers to be singled out from the herd. *Paideia* is also used to describe the calamities that befell Israel as a result of their sins, these calamities being themselves a form of *paideia*; however, the author recognizes that it is the sins of the rogue priesthood that are principally responsible, and prioritizes Deut 1-11 over name-place theology found in later portions of Deut to reinforce the equivalence

between the temple and the people rather than the exclusivity of the temple. By doing so, the immediate purpose of providing an explanation for suffering is harmonized with the greater goal of promoting the legitimacy, but also non-exclusivity, of the Jerusalem temple. The sufferings of *paideia* are next considered in the context of martyrdom. While it seems that martyrdom cannot be construed as "discipline", inasmuch that it does not result in the further education of the sufferer but rather death, a cessation of learning and growth, the author of 2 Macc conceives of *paideia* in intergenerational terms, using Deut 1-11 to this effect. Therefore, while the martyrs do not effect their own *paideia*, their deaths serve to train and educate the Jews as a whole. This has the corollary effect of promoting the author's interest in the Jewish people as a whole and their holiness.

For the author of 2 Macc, then, *mûsar/paideia* is a moveable feast, used flexibly to support authorial goals. Martyrdom will become an arena to discuss immortality in other authors; for the author of 2 Macc, however, the important quality of martyrdom is its intergenerational effect, and the theme of *mûsar/paideia* is employed to this effect. So, too, is *mûsar/paideia* used to reinforce the sufficiency of the Jerusalem temple without promoting a sense of its liturgical exclusivity. Much as we have seen above in 1 Macc, the author of 2 Macc freely adapts themes to suit authorial purposes. This freedom is strongly attested by the author of 2 Macc, who has yet to display the interconnectivity that is permissive of, but does not mandate, an "orthodox" reading of Deut 1-11.

There are many parallels between the use of covenantal motifs in 1 Macc and 2 Macc. Although the authors of these documents have different goals, each is willing to modify covenant as presented in Deut 1-11 to better support their own ends. In the case of 2 Macc, this modification of covenant is first used to defend the Jerusalem temple as legitimate but not

exclusive, relying upon not only covenantal motifs but the mention of the "heart" and prayer to do so. Deut 1-11 is also used, albeit in a truncated and curated manner, to defend the doctrine of immortality as presented in the martyrdom narrative of 2 Macc 6 and 7. These chapters rely upon the equivalence in Deut 1-11 between covenant and law to meaningfully assert immortality beyond death as a reward for obedience. Yet this is not the assertion of Deut 1-11, which instead promises long life as a reward for obedience. Deut 1-11, specifically Deut 5, also provides the justification for the prayer of the Jews in 2 Macc 8:15, imploring God to deliver the Jews whom Nicanor seeks to enslave.

Sunthekon is also used uniquely in 2 Macc. Here, the word is used only to describe agreements between human parties, not agreements between God/gods and humans. In contrast with *diathēkē,* it has been shown that a *diathēkē* is, in accordance with its usage in the LXX, an arrangement between God and humans, and that it is not a privilege for the wicked. This is in keeping with the distinction made in Deut 1-11 between divine and human covenants, as well as the author's governing goals.

8.7. Contribution and Future Work

In this work, I have identified a text of critical importance for a certain historical epoch. That work is the book of Deuteronomy; that epoch is the Second Temple Period. I have further identified a sub-unit of that text, Deut 1-11, and demonstrated below how three principal themes—wisdom, covenant, and *mûsar/paideia*—may be used to encapsulate the entirety of that sub-unit's content. With these themes as lenses of focus, I trace the influence of Deut 1-11 on selected works of the Second Temple period. The authors of these works have literary goals that

are well-attested by scholarship; my goal is to determine the nature of their interpretations of Deut 1-11, again using these lenses, and to ascertain how these interpretations coincide with their literary goals.

It is my hope that further studies may be done, and that other critical pericopes may be identified, possibly even with the same motivic consistency that I have identified in Deut 1-11, albeit in all likelihood with different themes. Examples that come to mind are the *Akedah* sequence or perhaps the Joseph "novel", each of which might be analyzed for motivic composition and how they are interpreted by later authors. In this way, the "intertextuality", or better, "textual interaction" of the Jewish scriptures can be continually demonstrated, in precise and reliable ways, further showing the richness of the Jewish scriptural tradition as a whole.

One area of special interest is the interconnectivity of the major themes of wisdom, *mûsar/paideia*, and covenant. This has significance for Ben Sira and 1 Macc and, in my opinion, warrants further study. There are strong implications that the theme of immortality has developmental connections to the "long life" wisdom theme; I was unable to fully explore that here, and it is a rich mine indeed for future study. No work to my knowledge sufficiently fills that gap, although Nickelsburg's *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* is an excellent starting place, although much broader in its initial scriptural sample set.

Another area of impact, one which I believe has implications for the current state of research, is the ability of my approach to establish patterns of interaction between texts. By isolating themes in texts, then studying how later texts use that original text and those same themes, it is possible to observe patterns of interaction that would not have been as immediately apparent if the study of textual interaction had been limited to, for example, direct quotations.

Examples in this study include the interconnectivity of themes, as well as the flexibility with which many of the texts use covenant. This thematic isolation also allowed new categories to be determined, as shown above with theological-transformative types, historical-explanatory types, and theological-historical types. Literary approaches that incorporate this approach, therefore, may generate new data and therefore should implement this approach to maximize their findings.

Perhaps most interesting are the questions this study raises for the Qumran community. I have shown evidence for developmental theologies in these materials, most notably in the area of the predestinarianism for which the Qumran materials are noted. Further study in this area, studying the Qumran materials using specific scriptures and themes as filters, could shed even more light on these as yet dimly understood documents. This study began with the question, did historical, theological, and social circumstances influence the interpretation of Deut 1-11? The answer is yes; while it was initially known that the Second Temple authors wrote with social, historical, and theological goals, those goals have been observed in their use of Deut 1-11 materials. There are more issues here, of course; this study has confirmed much of what was known and suspected about the Second Temple period, but has raised many questions as well. Hopefully these will be addressed by myself and others in the future.

The thesis seeks to prove that historical, theological, and social circumstances influenced the interpretation of Deut 1-11 and this is answered in the affirmative. In Jewish texts, the priesthood is described not in terms of their liturgical activity or theological dogma, but as a historical presence within Israel. Thus, when Second Temple interpretations of Deuteronomy describe theologically transformative processes, they do not use priestly activities as additional information as these activities are not explicitly detailed in the historical literature. Often, Second Temple interpretations of Deuteronomy are explicitly historical, seeking to explain

events within the Second Temple period, and as might be expected Deut 1-11 is brought to bear to assist the authors in their goals—even without especial concern for what Deut 1-11 might attest in its own right. It is in one instance, that of 2 Macc, that the author appears to use Deut 1-11 as a supporting text *without* the derivative material providing an incentive to interpret Deut 1-11 in a certain way. In this case, Deut 1-11 neatly supports the author's emphasis on the holiness of the Jewish people without featuring the priesthood in a substantial manner. But this is an outlier—regarding the other texts under consideration, as well as how these texts interact with the discernible trends of interconnectivity and flexibility in the themes under scrutiny, we find, overall, an ability of Second Temple authors to interpret Deut 1-11 in accordance with their own purposes, not necessarily bound by any controlling view of Deut 1-11 itself.

Bibliography

This bibliography, and all abbreviations, will adhere to *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). LCL titles are given in English when the *Handbook* does not specify their Latin titles.

Primary Sources and Commentaries

Athenaeus. *The Learned Banqueters*. 2007. Edited and translated by S. Douglas Olson. 8 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Ben Sira. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts.*Edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Ben Sira. *A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Manuscripts of Ben Sira With Translations and Philological Notes*. JSJSupp 217. Edited by Frédérique Michèle Rey and Eric D. Reymond. Leiden: Brill, 2024.

Ben Sira. *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum XII.2. Edited by Joseph Ziegler. Göttingen:Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

The Bible with Apocrypha. New Revised Standard Version. Anglicized Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Charles, R.H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.

Charlesworth, James H, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. London: Dartman, Longman and Todd, 1983.

Cicero. *De oratore*. 1942. Translated by E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham. 2 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Craigie, Peter C. *Deuteronomy*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976.

Dio Cassius. *Roman History*. 1914. Translated by Earnest Cary. 9 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Dio Chrysostom. *De dei cognitione (Or. 12)*. 1939. Translated by J.W. Cohoon. 5 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. 1933. Translated by C.H. Oldfather. 12 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. 1972.Translated by R.D. Hicks. 2 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Dioscorides. *De materia medica*. Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte Und Studien 38. 4th ed. Translated and edited by Lily Y. Beck. Zürich: Edition Olms AG, 2020.

Doran, Robert. *2 Maccabees*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012.

Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. Gloucester, MA: Smith, 1973.

Euripides. *Bacchae*. 2003. Edited and translated by David Kovacs. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Goff, Matthew. *4QInstruction*. Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World 2. Atlanta: SBL, 2013.

Goldstein, Jonathan A. *1 Maccabees*. AB 41. New York: Doubleday, 1976.

Goldstein, Jonathan A. *II Maccabees*. AB 41A. London: Doubleday, 1983.

Heraclides of Pontus. *Heraclides of Pontus: Texts and Translation*. Edited by Eckart Schütrumpf, Peter Stork, Jan van Ophuijsen, and Susan Prince. Oxford: Routledge, 2017.

Homer. *Iliad*. 1988. Translated by A.T. Murray. 2 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Josephus. *Against Apion*. BJP 10. Edited by John M.G. Barclay. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Josephus. *Antiquitates judaicae*. 1930. Translated by H.St.J. Thackeray. 9 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Josephus. *Belli judaicum*. 1927. Translated by H.St.J Thackeray. 2 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Josephus. *Josephus: The Jewish War*. Edited by Gaalya Cornfeld and Benjamin Mazar. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982.

Josephus. *Judean Antiquities 5-7*. BJP 4. Edited by Christopher H. Begg. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Josephus. *Judean War 2*. BJP 1B. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Josephus. *Judean War 4*. BJP 2A. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2022.

Kampen, John. *Wisdom Literature*. Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

Kappler, Werner. *Maccabaeorum liber I*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum IX.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Kappler, Werner. *Maccabaeorum liber II*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum IX.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.

King James Version with Apocrypha, American Edition: https://www.bible.com/bible/546/SIR.1_1.KJVAAE

Lundbom, Jack R. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013.

Mackenzie, R. *Sirach*. OTMes 19. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983.

Martínez , Florentino. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Nelson, Richard D. *Deuteronomy*. OTL. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Philo. *De Abrahamo*. 1984. Translated by F.H. Colson. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De agricultura*. 1930. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De congressu eruditionis gratia*. 1985. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De confusione linguarum*. 1985. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De fuga et inventione*. 1968. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De gigantibus*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De migratione Abrahami*. 1985. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De mutatione nominum*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De plantatione*. 1930. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De posteritate Caini*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De praemiis et poenis*. 1989. Translated by F.H. Colson. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*. 1979. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De sobrietate*. 1930. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De somniis I-II*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De specialibus legibus I-IV*. 1998. Translated by F.H. Colson. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De virtutibus*. 1989. Translated by F.H. Colson. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De vita contemplativa*. 1954. Translated by F.H. Colson. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *De vita Mosis I-II*. 1984. Translated by F.H. Colson. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *Legum allegoriae I-III*. 1991. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *Philo of Alexandria: On Cultivation*: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PACS 4. Edited by Albert C. Geljon and David T. Runia. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Philo. *Philo of Alexandria: On the Life of Abraham*: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PACS 6. Edited by Ellen Birnbaum and John Dillon. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

Philo. *Philo of Alexandria: On Planting*: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PACS 5. Edited by Albert C. Geljon and David T. Runia. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Philo. *Philo of Alexandria: On Virtues*: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PACS 3. Edited by Walter T. Wilson. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Philo. *Philo of Alexandria: Philo's Flaccus - The First Pogrom: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PACS 2. Edited by Pieter van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Philo. *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*. 1985. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*. 1930. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *Quod omnis probus liber sit*. 1954. Translated by F.H. Colson. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Philo. *On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PCAS 1. Edited by David T. Runia. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Plato. *Leges*. 1926. Translated by R.G. Bury. 2 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Pliny. *Naturalis Historia*.1938. Translated by H. Rackham. 10 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Plutarch. *Lives*. 1914. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. 11 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Plutarch. *Moralia*. 1969. Translated by F.H. Sandbach. 15 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Polybius. *The Histories*. 2010. Translated by W.R. Paton. 6 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Schwartz, Daniel. *2 Maccabees*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Suetonius. *Divus Titus*. 1914. Translated by J.C. Rolfe. LCL. London: Heinemann.

Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Snaith, J. *Ecclesiasticus, or, The Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach*. CBC. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1-11*. AB 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers, 1996.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Sean A. "Greek Education and Composite Citations of Homer". Pages 17-34 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. LNTS 525. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth E. Ehorn. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2016.

Adams, Sean A. and Seth M. Ehorn. "What is a Composite Citation? An Introduction". Pages 1-16 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. LNTS 525. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth E. Ehorn. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2016.

Albright, W.F. "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus". *JBL* 56 (1937): 145-176.

Albright, W.F. *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Albright, W.F. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. 2nd ed. New York: Doubleday, 1957.

Askin, Lindsey A. "Beyond Encomium or Eulogy: The Role of Simon the High Priest in the *Book of Ben Sira*". *JAJ* 9 (2019): 344-365.

Attridge, Harold W. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. HTR Dissertation 7. University of Montana: Scholars Press, 1976.

Attridge, Harold W. "Josephus and His Works". Pages 185-232 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

Balla, Ibolya. *Ben Sira on Family, Gender, and Sexuality*. DCLS 8. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Baltzer, Klaus. *Das Bundesformular*. WMANT 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.

Barré, M. "'Fear of God' and the World View of Wisdom". *BTB* 11:2 (1982): 41-43.

Bautch, Richard. *Glory and Power, Ritual and Relationship: The Sinai Covenant in the Postexilic Period*. LHBOTS 471. London: T & T Clark, 2009.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. "'Full Wisdom is from the Lord': Sir 1:1-10 and its Place in Israel's Wisdom Literature". Pages 139-155 in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. DCLS 1. Edited by A. Passaro and G. Bellia. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Bergsma, John. "Covenant". https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780195393361/obo-9780195393361-0225.

Berthelot, Katell. "Reclaiming the Land (1 Maccabees 15:28-36): Hasmonean Discourse between Biblical Tradition and Seleucid Rhetoric". *JBL* 133:3 (2014): 539-559.

Berthelot, Katell. "The Superiority and Universality of the Torah in Philo's *Life of Moses* 2.12-24: The Significance of the Roman Context". *JSQ* 29/3 (2022): 217-241.

Bickerman, Elias. *The God of the Maccabees*. Pages 1025-1149 in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees*. Translated by Horst R. Moering. Edited by Amram Tropper. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Bickerman, Elias J. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. London: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Birnbaum, Ellen. *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes*. BJS 290. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. "Where Does Ben Sira Belong?". Pages 21-41 in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18-20 May, 2006*. JSJSupp 127. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Bowen, James. *A History of Western Education, Vol I: The Ancient World*. London: Methuen & Co, 1972.

Box, G.H., and W.O.E. Oesterley. "Sirach". Pages 268-317 in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. 1. Edited by R.H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1981.

Calabi, Francesca. *God's Acting, Man's Acting: Tradition and Philosophy in Philo of Alexandria*. SPhA 4. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Calduch-Benages, Nuria. "Amid Trials: Ben Sira 2:1 and James 1:2". Pages 255-263 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M*. CBQ Monograph Series 48. Edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005.

Calduch-Benages, Nuria. "Fear of the Powerful or Respect for Authority in Sirach". Pages 40-52 in *For Wisdom's Sake: Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira*. BZAW 499. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021.

Calduch-Benages, Nuria. "Trial Motif in the Book of Ben Sira with Special Reference to Sir 2,1-6". Pages 27-39 in *For Wisdom's Sake: Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira*. BZAW 499. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021.

Carpenter, J. Estlin. "The Book of Deuteronomy". *Modern Review* 4 (1883): 252-281.

Choi, Dongbin. *The Use and Function of Scripture in 1 Maccabees*, LSTS 98. London: T & T Clark, 2022.

Clarke, M.L. *Higher Education in the Ancient World*. London: Routledge, 1971.

Cohen, Naomi G. *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse*. BEATAJ 24. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1995.

Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem:Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

Collins, John J. *Beyond the Qumran Community*: *The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Collins, John J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography*. Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Collins, John J. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.

Collins, John J. "Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls". Pages 151-172 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Cooke, Stanley A. "A Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus". *PSBA* 25 (1903): 34-56.

Corley, Jeremy. *Ben Sira's Teaching on Friendship*. BJS 316. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2002.

Corley, J. "Searching for Structure and Redaction in Ben Sira". Pages 21-47 in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. DCLS 1. Edited by A. Passaro and G. Bellia. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Court, John M. *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament*. London: SPCK, 2002.

Crawford, Sidnie White. "Reading the Present in the Second Temple Period". Pages 127-140 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library*. SBLSymS 30. Edited by Kristin de Troyer and Armin Lange. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2005.

Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

Creelman, Harlan. "Are There Maccabean Psalms? II". *The Old and New Testament Student* 15:5/6 (1892): 192-201.

Crenshaw, J. "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon "Historical' Literature". *JBL* 88:2 (1969): 129-142.

Cross, Frank M., and David Noel Freedman. "Josiah's Revolt against Assyria". *JNES* 12 (1953): 56-58.

Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. 3rd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Crouch, Carly. *Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon, and the Nature of Subversion*. SBLANEM 8. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.

Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Daniélou, Jean. *Philo of Alexandria*. Translated by James G. Colbert. Cambridge: James Clark and Co, 2014.

Daube, David. "The Culture of Deuteronomy". *Orita* 3 (1969): 27-52.

Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Philo of Alexandria*. Oxford: University of California Press, 1992.

Deusberg, H, and I. Fransen, *Ecclesiastico*. La Sacra Bibbia: Antico Testamento. Edited by G. Rinaldi. Turin: Marietti, 1966.

DiLella, A. A. "Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom". *CBQ* 28 (1966): 139-154.

Di Lella, A.A. "The Meaning of Wisdom in Ben Sira". Pages 133-148 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Edited by L. Perdue, B.B. Scott, and W.J. Wiseman. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

Di Lella, Alexander A. "Ben Sira's Doctrine on the Discipline of the Tongue: An Intertextual and Synchronic Analysis". Pages 233-252 in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. DCLS 1. Edited by A. Passaro and G. Bellia. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Dillon, John. *The Heirs of Plato: A Study of the Old Academy (347-274 BC)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.

Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature". Pages 483-550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT 2.2. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

Don Chang, Dongshin. *Phinehas, the Sons of Zadok, and Melchizedek: Priestly Covenant in Late Second Temple Texts*. LSTS 90. Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.

Doran, Robert. "Emending 1 Macc 7,16". *Biblica* 87:2 (2006): 261-262.

Doran, Robert. "The Revolt of the Maccabees". *The National Interest* 85 (2006): 99-103.

Driver, G.R. *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.

Driver, S.R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. 7th ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1898.

Duggan, Michael W. "1 Maccabees: Emotions of Life and Death in Narrative and Lament". Pages 95-116 in *Ancient Jewish Prayers and Emotions: Emotions Associated with Jewish Prayer in and Around the Second Temple Period*. DCLS 26. Edited by Stefan C. Reif and Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.

Dumbrell, William J. "The Prospect of Unconditionality in the Sinaitic Covenant". Pages 141-155 in *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*. Edited by Avraham Gileadi. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988.

Eckhardt, Benedikt. "The Hasmoneans and their Rivals in Seleucid and Post-Seleucid Judea". *JSJ* 47 (2016): 55-70.

Egger-Wenzel, Renate. "'Faith in God' Rather Than 'Fear of God' in Ben Sira and Job: A Necessary Adjustment in Terminology and Understanding". Pages 211-226 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M*. CBQ Monograph Series 48. Edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005.

Ehorn, Seth E. "Composite Citations in Plutarch". Pages 35-56 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. LNTS 525. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth E. Ehorn. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2016.

Eichrodt, Walther. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. 3 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Heinrichs, 1933-1939.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *Das Lied Moses, Deuteronomium 32, 1-43, und das Lehrgedicht Asaphs, Psalm 78, samt einer Analyse der Umgebung des Mose-Liedes*. Berlin: Akademie, 1965.

Enermalm, Agneta. "Prayers in Wartime: Thematic Tensions in 1 Maccabees". *ST* 49 (1995): 272-286.

Etzion, Yedidya Y. "Philo's Jewish Law: Uncovering the Foundations of a Second-Temple System of Jewish Law". PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2015.

Evans, Craig A. "Covenant in the Qumran Literature". Pages 55-80 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. JSJSupp 71. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Feldman, Ariel. "Deuteronomy in the Texts of the Judean Desert". Pages 365-383 in *The Oxford Handbook of Deuteronomy*. Edited by Don C. Benjamin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2025.

Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible.* London: University of California Press, 1998.

Feldman, Louis. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. JSJSupp 58. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Fensham, F.C. "Father and Son as Terminology for Treaty and Covenant". Pages 121-135 in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by H. Goedicke. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1971.

Fensham, C. "Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature". *JNES* 21:2 (1962): 129-139.

Finkelstein, Ari. "Fitting a Round Peg into a Square Hole: Categorizing Works of Jewish Historiography or the Second Temple Period". *JSJ* 49 (2018): 304-329.

Flint, Peter W. and James C. Vanderkam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Fohrer, Georg. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Steven D. Fraade, "The Temple Scroll as Rewritten Bible: When Genres Bend". Pages 136-154 in *Hā-ʾîsh Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*. STDJ 122. Edited by George J. Brooke. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Frankena, Rintje. "The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy". *OTS* 14 (1965): 122-154.

Freedman, David Noel. "Divine Commitment and Human Obligation". *Interpretation* 18 (1964): 419-431.

Freedman, David Noel, and David Miano. "People of the New Covenant". Pages 7-26 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period.* JSJSupp 71. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Gese, H. *Lehre und Wirklichkeit in der alten Weisheit*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1958.

Gilbert, M. "Wisdom Literature". Pages 290-301 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Vol. 2 of *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

Goering, Greg Schmidt. *Wisdom's Root Revealed: Ben Sira and the Election of Israel*. JSJSupp 139. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Goldstein, Jonathan A. *Semites, Iranians, Greeks, and Romans: Studies in their Interactions*. BJS 217. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2020.

Goldstein, Jonathan A. "How the Authors in I and II Maccabees Treated the 'Messianic' Promises". Pages 221-250 in *Semites, Iranians, Greeks, and Romans: Studies in their Interactions*. BJS 217. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2020.

Goodenough, E.R. "A Neo-Pythagorean Source in Philo Judaeus," *YCS* 3 (1932): 115-164.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.

Goodman, Martin. "Religious Variety and the Temple in the Late Second Temple Period". *JJS* 60.2 (2009): 202-213.

Gnuse, R.K. *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus: A Traditio-Historical Analysis.* AGJU 36. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Grabbe, Lester L. "Did All Jews Think Alike? 'Covenant' in Philo and Josephus in the Context of Second Temple Judaic Religion". Pages 251-268 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. JSJSupp 71. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Griffith, Mark. "The Earliest Greek Systems of Education". Pages 26-60 in *A Companion to Ancient Education*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Edited by W. Martin Bloomer. Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2015.

Grossman, Maxine L. "Sectarian Marital Practice: Rethinking the Role of Sexuality in the Dead Sea Scrolls". *DSD* 26 (2019): 339-361.

Gruen, Erich. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. London: University of California Press, 1984.

Gruen, Erich. *Heritage and Hellenism*. HCS 30. London: University of California Press, 1998.

Hadas-Lebel, Mireille. *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora*. SPA 7. Traslated by Robyn Fréchet. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Halpern-Amaru, B. *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.

Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. "Land Theology in Josephus' 'Jewish Antiquities'". *JQR* 71:4 (1981): 228.

Harvey, J. "Toward a Degree of Order in Ben Sira's Book". *ZAW* 105 (1993): 52-62.

Haspecker, J. *Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach: Ihre religiöse Struktur und ihre literarische und doktrinäre Bedeutung*. AnBib 30. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. London: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hays, Richard B. "Who Has Believed Our Message?; Paul's Reading of Isaiah". Pages 48-68 in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament*. Edited by John M. Court. London: SPCK, 2002.

Hengel, Martin. *Hellenism and Judaism*. London: SCM Press, 1991.

Hillers, Delbert R. "Covenant". *The Encyclopedia of Religion* 4:133-137.

Hillers, Delbert R. *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*. BibOr 16. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964.

Honigman, Sylvie. *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochus IV*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2014.

Horbury, William. "Moses and the Covenant in *The Assumption of Moses* and the Pentateuch". Pages 191-208 in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E.W. Nicholson*. Edited by A.D.H. Mayes and R.B. Salters. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Horsley, R.A., and P. Tiller. "Ben Sira and the Sociology of the Second Temple". Pages 74-107 in *Second Temple Studies III: Studies in Politics, Class, and Material Culture*. JSOTSupp 340. Edited by P.R. Davies and J.M. Halligan. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. STDJ 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Jamieson-Drake, David W. *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archaeological Approach*. SWBA 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.

Janowitz, Naomi. *The Family Romance of Martyrdom in Second Maccabees.* London: Routledge, 2017.

Jipp, Joshua W. Review of *Paul in Athens: The Popular Religious Context of Acts 17*, Clare K. Rothschild. *Themelios* 40:3. https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/review/paul-in-athens-the-popular-religious-context-of-acts-17-clare-rothschild/.

Jonquière, Tessel M. *Prayer in Josephus*. AGJU 70. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Kah, Daniel, and Peter Scholz. *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.

Kaiser, Otto. "Covenant and Law in Ben Sira". Pages 235-260 in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E.W. Nicholson*. Edited by A.D.H. Mayes and R.B. Salters. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Kayatz, C. *Studien zu Proverbien 1-9.* Neukirchen-Yluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966.

Kelhoffer, James A. "The Maccabees at Prayer: Pro- and Anti-Hasmonean Tendencies in the Prayers of First and Second Maccabees". *EC* 2 (2011): 198-218.

Kline, Meredith. *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963.

Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Hellenistic and Jewish World 200 BC to 200 AD. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Koch, K. "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?". *Theodicy in the Old Testament*. Edited by James Crenshaw. IRT 4. London: SPCK, 1983.

Kupreeva, Inna. "Heraclides' *On Soul* (?) and Its Various Readers". Pages 93-138 in *Heraclides of Pontus*. Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities XV. Edited by William W. Fortenbaugh and Elizabeth Pender. London: Transaction Publishers, 2009.

Küssmaul, P. *Sunthekai: Beitrage zur Geschichte des attischen*. Obligationenrechts: Basel, 1969.

Lambert, David. *How Repentance Became Biblical*: *Judaism, Christianity, and the Interpretation of Scripture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Lambert, W.G. "The Fifth Tablet of the Era Epic". *Iraq* 24 (1962): 122, ll.43-44.

Lange, Armin, and Matthias Weigold. *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*. JAJSupp 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2011.

Lanziger, Daniel. "Alcimus' (sic) Last Command: History and Propaganda in 1 Maccabees 9:54", *JSJ* 46:1 (2015): 86-102.

Leipoldt, J., and S. Morenz. *Heilige Schriften: Betrachtungen zur Religionsgeschichte der antiken Mittelmeerwelt*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1953.

Leonhardt, Jutta. *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*. TSAJ 84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

Levene, David S. "Theology and Non-Theology in the Rabbinic Ben Sira". Pages 305-321 in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference Durham - Ushaw College*. Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.

Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature vol 1: The Old and Middle Kingdoms*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973-1976.

Lim, Timothy H., and John J. Collins. "Current Issues in Dead Sea Scrolls Research". Pages 1-18 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Lim, Timothy H. "Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period". Pages 6-26 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*. LNTS 358. Edited by Maarten J.J. Menken and Steve Moyise. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Lincicum, David. *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2010.

Lohfink, Norbert. *Lectures in Deuteronomy*. Transcribed by Sean McEvenue. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968.

López, Elisa Estévez. "Quick to Listen, Slow to Speak, and Slow to Anger (Jas 1:19 and Sir 5:11)". Pages 301-320 in *Ben Sira in Conversation with Traditions: A Festschrift for Prof. Núria Calduch-Benages*. DCLS 47. Edited by Francis M. Matacangay and Francisco-Javier Ruiz-Ortiz in collaboration with Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2022.

Lundbom, Jack R. "The Lawbook of the Josianic Reform". *CBQ* 38 (1976): 293-302.

Mack, B. *Logos and Sophia*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.

Machiela, Daniel A. "'Wisdom Motifs' in the Compositional Strategy of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20) and Other Aramaic Texts from Qumran". Pages 223-247 in *Hā-ʾîsh Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*. STDJ 122. Edited by George J. Brooke. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

MacRae, Duncan E. "Reading the Roman-Jewish Treaty in 1 Maccabees 8". *Hermathena* 200/201 (2016): 73-94.

Marböck, J. *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheittheologie bei Ben Sira.* BZAW 272. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971.

Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. London: Sheed and Ward, 1956.

Martens, John W. *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*. SPhAMA 2. Leiden: Brill,2003.

Martínez, Florentino García. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. VTSupp 53. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Mason, Steve. *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins*: *Methods and Categories*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.

McCarthy, Dennis J. *Treaty and Covenant*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

Mendelson, Alan."Philo's Dialectic of Reward and Punishment". *SPhiloA* 9 (1997): 105

Mendenhall, G.E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East.* Pittsburgh, PA: Biblical Colloquium, 1955.

Montanari, Franco. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek.* Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Moran, William M. "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy". *CBQ* 25 (1963): 77-87.

Morenz, S. *Ägyptische Religion*. Die Religionen der Menscheit, Bd.8. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1960.

Morgan, D. *Wisdom in the Old Testament Traditions*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1981.

Murphy, Roland E. *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002.

Murphy, Roland E. "Wisdom in the OT". *ABD* 6:920-931.

Najman, Hindy. "Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Scriptural Authority". *DSD* 7:3 (2000): 313-333.

Najman, Hindy. "Text and Figure in Ancient Jewish *Paideia*". Pages 243-256 in *Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity*, JSJSupp 53. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Nicholson, E.W. *Deuteronomy and Tradition*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1967.

Nicholson, Ernest W. *God and his People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. HTS 56. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Niehoff, Marin R. *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography*. AYBRL. London: Yale University Press, 2018.

Niehoff, Marin R. "What is in a Name? Philo's Mystical Philosophy of Language". *JSQ* 2:3 (1995): 220-252.

Nitzan, Bilhah. "The Concept of the Covenant in Qumran Literature". Pages 163-176 in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-32 January 1999*. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Norton, Jonathan D.H. "Composite Quotations in the Damascus Document", Pages 92-118 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Greco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. LTNS 525. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn. Oxford: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.

Novick, Tzvi. "On the Paucity of Biblical Exemplars in Sectarian Texts". Pages 248-256 in *Hā-ʾîsh Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*. STDJ 122. Edited by George J. Brooke. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Noth, Martin. *The Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSup 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.

Oesterley, W. *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1912.

Olyan, Saul M. "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood". *HTS* 80:3 (1987): 261-286.

Paton, Lewis Bayles. "The Case for the Post-Exilic Origin of Deuteronomy". *JBL* 47 (1928): 332-357.

Perlitt, Lothar. *Bundestheologie in Alten Testament*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Rev.ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948.

Pouchelle, Patrick. *Dieu educateur*. FAT 77. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Pouchelle, Patrick. "*Kyropaideia* versus *Paideia Kyriou*: The Semantic Transformation of Paideia and Cognates in the Translated Books of the Septuagint". Pages 101-134 in *Pedagogy in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. EJL 41. Edited by Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Geoff, and Emma Wasserman. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

Quick, Laura. "Detextualizing and Retextualizing the Torah: Writing and Performing Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period". *HBAI* 12 (2022): 60-77.

Rajak, Tessa. "The *Against Apion* and the Continuities in Josephus's Political Thought". Pages 222-246 in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*. JSPSupp 32. Edited by Steve Mason. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Series, 1998.

Rankin, O.S. *Israel's Wisdom Literature*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1964.

Reiterer, Friedrich Vincenz. "The Theological and Philosophical Concepts of Ben Sira". Pages 285-318 in *Discovering, Deciphering and Dissenting: Ben Sira Manuscripts after 120 Years*. DCLYearbook 2018. Edited by James K. Aitken, Renate Egger-Wenzel, and Stefan C. Reif . Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.

Rengstorff, K.H. *Hirbet Qumran and the Problem of the Dead Sea Cave Scrolls.* Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Roth, Cecil. *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.

Roth, W. "On the Gnomic-Discursive Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach". *Semeia* 17 (1980): 59-79.

Rothschild, Clare K. *Paul in Athens: The Popular Religious Context of Acts 17*. WUNT 341. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Rowley, H.H. *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy*. London: Nelson, 1963.

Royse, James R. "The Works of Philo". Pages 32-64 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Runia, D.T. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. 2 vols. Kampen: VU Boekhandel, 1983.

Runia, David T. "The Structure of Philo's Allegorical Treatises". *VC* 38 (1984): 209-256.

Siegert, Folker. "Philo and the New Testament". Pages 175-209 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

VanderKam, James C. "Covenant". Pages 151-154 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol.1. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

von Rad, Gerhard. *Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs*. BWANT 26. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938.

von Rad, Gerhard. "Deuteronomy". *IBD* 1:831-838.

von Rad, Gerhard. *The Problem of the Pentateuch and Other Essays*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd, 1966.

von Rad, Gerhard. *Wisdom in Israel*. Norwich: SCM Press, 1972.

Sanders, E.P. "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism". Pages 11-44 in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies*, vol. 1. Edited by Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Schäfer, Peter. *The History of the Jews in the Greco-Roman World*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Second Temple Law in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Widening the Paradigm". Pages 1-26 in *Law, Literature and Society in Legal Texts from Qumran: Papers from the Ninth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Leuven 2016*. STDJ 128. Edited by Jutta Jokiranta and Molly Zahn. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Schmidt, A. Jordan. *Wisdom, Cosmos, and Cultus in the Book of Sirach*. DCLS 42. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2019.

Schmidt, H.H. *Die Verträge der grieschisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v.Chr*. München: Beck, 1969.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. 3 vols. Rev.ed. Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, Martin Goodman, Matthew Black, and Pamela Vermes. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 1973.

Schwartz, S. *Josephus and Judaean Politics*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition XVIII. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Scott, R.B.Y. *The Way of Wisdom*. New York: Macmillan, 1971.

Sheppard, Gerald T. *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.

Ska, Jean-Louis. "Torah, Paideia, and Sophia in Ben Sira". Pages 35-50 in *Ben Sira in Conversation with Traditions: A Festschrift for Prof. Núria Calduch-Benages*. DCLS 47. Edited by Francis M. Matacangay and Francisco-Javier Ruiz-Ortiz in collaboration with Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2022.

Smend, R. *Das hebräische Fragment der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*. Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, N. F., 2, 2. Berlin: Weidmannsche, 1897.

Sperling, S. David. "Rethinking Covenant in Late Biblical Books". *Biblica* 70 (1989): 50-73.

Spilsbury, Paul. *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible*. TSAJ 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Staerk, Willy. *Das Deuteronomium: Sein Inhalt und seine literarische Form*. Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1894.

Steurnagel, Carl. *Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums*. Halle: Krausse, 1894.

Taylor, Joan. "A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias". *JSJ* 29:3 (1998): 297-321.

Taylor. Joan E., and David M. Hay. *Philo of Alexandria: On the Contemplative Life*: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PACS 7. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

Taylor, Joan. "Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes: A Case Study of the Use of Classical Sources in Discussions of the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis". *SPhA* 19 (2009): 1-28.

Termini, Cristina. "Philo's Thought Within the Context of Middle Judaism". Pages 95-123 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Tcherikover, Victor. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews.* New York: Athenaeum, 1974.

Tiede, David Lenz. *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker.* SBL Dissertation Series 1. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1972.

de Tillesse, Minette. "Sections 'tu' et sections 'vous' dans le Deuteronomie". *VT* 12:1 (1962): 29-87.

van der Toorn, Karel, Bob Becking, and Pieter w. van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Weeks, Stuart. *Early Israelite Wisdom*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1-11*. AB 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Weiser, Artur. *The Old Testament: Its Formulation and Development*. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. New York: Association, 1961.

von Weissenberg, Hanne. *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue*. STDJ 82. Leiden: Brill: 2009.

Weitzman, Steven. "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution". *JBL* 123:2 (2004): 219-234.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 3rd ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1889.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. New York: Meridian, 1957.

de Wette, W.M.L. "Dissertatio critica qua a prioribus deuteronomium pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur". Pages 150-154 in *Opus theologica*, vol.2. Berlin: Reimerum, 1843.

Whybray, R.N. *The Intellectual Tradition of the Old Testament*. BZAW 135. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974.

v.Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. *Die Glaube der Hellenen.* 2 vols. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: 1955.

Winston, David. *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria.* Cincinnati, OH: HUC Press, 1985.

Winston, David. “Philo’s Conception of the Divine Nature”. Pages 21-42 in *Neoplatonism and Jewish Thought*. Studies in Neoplatonism: Ancient and Modern 7. Edited by Lenn E. Goodman. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Winston, David. *Philo of Alexandria: The Contemplative Life, The Giants, and Selections.* New York: Paulist Press, 1981.

Wischmeyer, Oda. "The Book of Ben Sira From a Reception-Historical Perspective: Hubert Frankenmölle's Commentary on the Letter of James". Pages 297-312 in *Ben Sira in Conversation*

with Traditions: A Festschrift for Prof. Núria Calduch-Benages. DCLS 47. Edited by Francis M. Matacangay and Francisco-Javier Ruiz-Ortiz in collaboration with Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2022.

Wise, Michael O. "The Concept of a New Covenant in the Teacher Hymns from Qumran (1QH^{a} x-xvii)". Pages 99-128 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. JSJSupp 71. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Wise, Michael O. "The Origins of the Teacher's Movement". Pages 92-122 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim. Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2011.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 3rd. rev. ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Wright, Benjamin G. "Sirach". Pages 715-719 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Wright, Benjamin G. III. "'Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest': Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood". Pages 97-126 in *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction*: *Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*. JSJSupp 131. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Yli-Karjaanmaa, Sami. *Reincarnation in Philo of Alexandria*. SPhiloM 7. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.

Žába, Z. *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep, Texte, Traduction et Commentaire*. Ed. de l'Acad. Tchécoslovaque des Sciences: Prague, 1956.

Zahn, Molly. "Rewritten Scriptures". Pages 323-336 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Zimmerli, W. "The Place and the Limit of Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology". *SJT* 17:2 (1964): 146-148.

Zimmermann, Christiane. *Die Namen des Vaters: Studien zu ausgewählten neutestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnungen vor ihrem früjüdischen und paganen Sprachhorizont*. AJEC 69. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Appendix—Philo and *Paideia*

A1. Introduction

Paideia is a Greek term which roughly translates to "culture" or "instruction". In its earliest textual appearances, it describes training in a broad sense, specifically the training of the young. During the Hellenistic period, however, it becomes associated with the idea of the *enkuklia*, or a set of academic topics viewed as a necessary precursor to more advanced studies such as rhetoric and philosophy. In this appendix, I will focus specifically on Philo's treatment of *paideia*. Philo has much to say about *paideia*, generally speaking, but as he engages *paideia* under the headings of reason, wisdom, and virtue, we begin to see specific emphases which suggest Philo is not merely immersed in the world of Hellenistic education. Philo's governing presupposition, namely, that *paideia* is merely a stepping stone along the way to the acquisition of goods which are ultimately bestowed by God, shows a much closer grounding in the Hebrew Bible's discussion of *mûsar* and Wisdom as is personified in Proverbs.

The Greek authors present a practical view of *paideia*, concerned solely with the measurable gains which result from its practice.[991] Plato, for example, claims that *paideia* is for the young, to be presented in youth and not as an unhappy, compulsory discipline.[992] This separates the early Greek understanding of *paideia* from the Hebrew *mûsar* and suggests that, for the Greeks, *paideia* does not serve any mystical or spiritual end, but instead serves a purely utilitarian purpose. That purpose is to assist the young along the way to higher education, namely rhetoric and philosophy. If a given youth does not need the *paideia*, it may be discarded, but only on a case-by-case basis. Isocrates asserts that *paideia* is useful as a form of mental

[991] I am greatly indebted to M.L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World*, Routledge Library Editions: Education 92 (London: Routledge, 1971), for providing an entry point into the following body of research.
[992] Plato, *Resp*.6.497-498, 7; but also in the sense of dialectic and rhetoric (*Euthyd*.290e).

gymnastics, but should be abandoned if a youth does not intend to earn a living with them. Whereas Xenocrates refuses a potential philosophical student who has never learned geometry, music, or mathematics, Chrysippus claims that the "ordinary Greek education (*enkuklia mathemata*)" is "serviceable", Zeno likewise denounces the *enkuklia*, and Epicurus skips *paideia* entirely, proceeding directly to philosophy.[993]

At the end of the era we find Seneca asserting that the *enkuklios* should be mastered but that it is foolish to persist in it beyond what is necessary, as the *paideia* itself does not impart virtue but merely provides a good launching point.[994] Invoking the image of pliable wax, Plutarch comments on the plasticity of early minds, and that education prevents children from becoming beasts while using the metaphor of the maidservant found earlier in Philo.[995] Quintilian echoes these sentiments of the young mind's ability to retain information, and in fact recommends the ancient equivalent of "grade-skipping"; that a young learner, able to quickly assimilate preliminary material, should not be prevented from progressing further.[996] The pragmatic tendencies typical to the Greek estimation of *paideia* also continue in Quintilian, who while admitting that the *paideia* is necessary for literature study, also concedes that while the ideal orator has full mastery of the *paideia*, this is in most cases unnecessary and superfluous.[997] Cicero, the giant of late Hellenistic/early Roman literature, goes so far as to comment from a hyper-utilitarian perspective, questioning the *paideia* itself and suggesting that, if acquired *too* early, a youth may be forever beholden to the precepts acquired and unable to critically assess

---

[993] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, *4*.10, 7.32, 7.129, 10.2, 10.14.
[994] Seneca, *Ep*. 88.2, 20, 89.23.
[995] Plutarch, *Mor*.3e-f, 5a-c, 7c-d, 9e. See also Ariston of Chios, in Alan Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*, MHUC 7 (New York: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982), xxiii; also K. Freeman, *Ancilla to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 139; also A. Heinrichs, "Philosophy, the Handmaiden of Theology", *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 9 (1968): 143-156.
[996] Quintilian, *Inst*.1.1.5, 1.1.16, 1.12. See also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Comp*. 25.
[997] Quintilian, *Inst*.1.4.1-4, 1.10.

them at a later date.[998] This pragmatic trend goes so far as to create a blurring between the traditional assignment of *paideia* and boyhood, and Romans like Aulus Gellius continued their educations into adulthood after the toga of manhood had been assumed.[999]

Many studies of *paideia* have focused on the differences between the Spartan system, which emphasized discipline and a very specialized subset of life skills, and the later set of disciplines entitled the *enkuklia paideia* which would reach its culmination in the Hellenistic period. The Spartan system bears many similarities to *mûsar* as is presented in the wisdom texts, and therefore suggests an alternative influence for Philo's *mûsar*-like ideas as expressed in his writings on *paideia*. Scholarly consideration of *paideia* begins with Freeman's *Schools of Hellas*, which is invaluable for its emphasis on primary sources and its detailed presentation of the Spartan system.[1000]

This relatively brief work is followed by Werner Jaeger's *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, which served as a definitive resource for many years.[1001] Like Freeman, this work makes early mention of the unique Spartan system. Out of all the Greek modes of training, the Spartan method of education, with its focus on strict life discipline and a de-emphasis on the acquisition of intellectual knowledge, most resembles *mûsar*. Jaeger attributes this Spartan system to the early activities of conquering invaders, and to the Homeric corpus in general; but in Hesiod he finds the lessons of ordinary work and daily toil, or the *paideia* of a very different social class. This contrast leads to Jaeger's thesis, which is that Greek intellectual life prioritizes *paideia*, as a concept, above all else, and that the quest to produce a superior human with respect

---

[998] Cicero, *Acad.post.*2.8-9.
[999] Gellius, *N.A.*18.4.1.
[1000] Kenneth J. Freeman, *Schools of Hellas: An Essay on the Practice and Theory of Ancient Greek Education* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1907).
[1001] Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, 3 vols, 2nd ed., trans. Gilbert Highet (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946).

to customs and knowledge becomes, in the hands of Plato and his followers, a loftier pursuit with religious overtones.

Nearly twenty years after Jaeger's work appeared, H. I. Marrou followed suit with his own study of ancient education.[1002] *A History of Education in Antiquity* broadly agrees with Jaeger, especially regarding the immense scope and historical impact of Greek education and "culture" or *paideia* in its broadest sense; however, he often nuances these findings. Marrou calls attention to the difference between early Greek education of the Homeric period, which emphasizes aristocratic, warlike pursuits, and the scribal disciplines of the ancient Near East. Importantly, Marrou connects this training with the *mûsar* found in Ben Sira, and also with both Hebrew and Egyptian wisdom writings. According to Marrou, Spartan society, while disciplined, follows from this ancient substratum of Greek life, and its discipline should not be equated to the scribal disciplines which originate in the ancient Near East and which will return by necessity in the Hellenistic era. As the Greeks codify their intellectual discoveries, the Sophists become the first professional teachers, and a system of dissemination is required. As it happens, this system will much resemble the scribal practices of the ancient Near East, but for practical rather than idealistic purposes. This is not to say, however, that Greek *paideia* never accumulated a spiritual overlay of its own, and Marrou relates how through *paideia* the Greeks expected to court the favor of the Muses and thereby achieve immortality. Beginning with the legendary fate of Pythagoras and continuing onward, *paideia* "was invested with a kind of sacred radiance that gave it a special dignity of a genuinely religious kind ... Hellenistic culture ... became for many the equivalent of a religion".[1003] Therefore, when we encounter *paideia* among the Greeks, we should not expect to find a dry, thoroughly de-spiritualized set of academic

[1002] H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956).
[1003] Marrou, *Antiquity*, 101.

exercises. Nonetheless, it is also true that the spirituality we find in Philo's writings, which strongly stress the power of God, is not the same as these Greek practices which, while always properly respectful toward deity, delineate this academic-religious practice in ultimately anthropocentric terms.[1004]

Jaeger and Marrou's work undoubtedly provide substantial groundings for a study of *paideia*, as well as serving as important surveys of the period. However, as Jaś Elsner observes, their work emerged during historical circumstances of their own; a cataclysmic few years within the twentieth century that still resonate within this second decade of the twenty-first.[1005] In "Paideia: Ancient Concept and Modern Reception", Elsner relates how Jaeger's work was largely composed in WWII Germany, and that much of its content resonates within the German regime of that time, especially Jaeger's discussion of eugenics as related in Plato's work. Marrou's text, then becomes a post-war response to this, with its mention of *Kultur* and how this German word should be differentiated from the corresponding French usage. For Elsner, both Jaeger and Marrou are idealizing ancient *paideia*, viewing it through a wishful lens that imbues *paideia* with a hopeful and salutary effect. Jaeger and Marrou's tendency to seek solutions for their own time in the writings of the past, claims Elsner, problematizes the objectivity of their findings. Elsner provides an important warning which, as we seek more details regarding ancient *paideia*, and the *enkuklia paideia* more specifically, it will be wise to heed.[1006]

[1004] For an extension of Marrou's ideas into a re-characterization of sophists as educators see Andrew Ford, "Sophists Without Rhetoric: The Arts of Speech in Fifth-Century Athens", in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

[1005] Jaś Elsner, "Paideia: Ancient Concept and Modern Reception", *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 20:4 (2013): 136-152.

[1006] Elsner is not the only one to suggest that we have misconstrued ancient *paideia*: for an anti-propositional perspective see James Magrini, "Dialectic and Dialogue in Plato: Refuting the Model of Socrates-As-Teacher in the Pursuit of Authentic *Paideia*", *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 46:12 (2014): 1320-1336.

Also, as an outlier, in *Educational Ideals of the Ancient World,* William Barclay discusses at length Jewish educational practices.[1007] This alone sets him apart from his predecessors, who have not mentioned the issue. He mentions the Jewish focus upon the written Law, the primacy of home and parents in the educational process, and even God as an instructor, using the land and interaction with the land as a teaching tool.[1008] Numerous Scriptures and other texts support this observation: Ben Sira Prologue 1:3 (which renders *paideia* as "instruction"), Exod 2:2-26, Deuteronomy 33:4, *Pirke Aboth* 2.5, 12. Barclay has thus summarized salient characteristics which set the Jews apart from their ancient Near Eastern neighbors, as well as both Spartan and Athenian varieties of *paideia*. The Spartans, Barclay writes, trained for a life at war, while the Athenians trained for a life of civic leisure and flexibility.[1009] Neither of these systems overlap with Jewish training, which prioritizes honoring God as the supreme teacher as well as emphasizing the family home; an important element of life which, Barclay astutely observes, suffers in both the Athenian and Spartan systems.[1010] More recently, Patrick Pouchelle has written on the use of *paideia* in the Psalms of Solomon, emphasizing its role in this text as a disciplinary instrument, imposed by the divine for the purpose of leading the wicked to righteousness.[1011]

For Peder Borgen, the *enkuklia* is representative of particularly Greek education.[1012] Philo allegorically interprets the Hagar-Sarah narrative as depicting the Greek training, or training of the body, as the teaching of Hagar, while the wisdom of Sarah is to be understood as Jewish teaching. Borgen does, however, note a general trend of scholarship away from this

---

[1007] William Barclay, *Educational Ideals of the Ancient World* (London: Collins, 1957).
[1008] Barclay, *Educational*, 13, 14, 19.
[1009] Barclay, *Educational*, 75, 84.
[1010] Barclay, *Educational*, 60-63.
[1011] Patrick Pouchelle, "Prayers for Being Disciplined: Notes on παιδεύω and παιδεία in the Psalms of Solomon" in *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology*, EJL 40, Eberhard Bons and Patrick Pouchelle, eds. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015): 115-132.
[1012] Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*, NTSupp 86 (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

observation, and a tendency instead to read both the Hellenistic world and Philo specifically as largely similar with respect to their spiritual teachings, aspirations, and methods.[1013] D. A. Russell is far less optimistic than his predecessors, as he doubts that any precise understanding of the *paideia*, specifically the *enkuklios*, may be achieved.[1014] However, he identifies Philo's use of the phrase as conditioned by a different culture, and that Philo is invoking Wisdom as expressed in Jewish writings. This interpretation is taken from the Sarah-Hagar dichotomy found in *Congressu* and elsewhere, and it should be noted that Russell does not draw from the examples which produce more speculative findings, as will Wagner (below). Finally, in *Wisdom Mythology and Hellenistic Paideia in Philo: A Case Study of De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratiae,* Tae Won Kang asserts that, according to Philo's exegesis of *Congressu*, *paideia* should be considered as a separate entity from divine wisdom.[1015]

Therefore we have seen a strong tendency to sharply differentiate Philo's Jewish influence from his Hellenistic training. However, subsequent scholarship will largely reverse this trend, and most studies will instead emphasize the similarities between Philo's Jewish background and is Greek influences. Perhaps most influential in this regard is "Philo and Paideia", in which Walter H. Wagner presents Philo as a religious thinker with very few differences from his Greek contemporaries.[1016] The *Zeitgeist* of the time, according to Wagner, encouraged mystical speculation and spiritual disciplines that, when assiduously implemented, would bring the practitioner into the presence of the divine. *Paideia* is now "a matrix for syncretism" and Wagner emphasizes the similarities between Philo and his non-Jewish peers.[1017] He also presents Philo's depictions of *paideia* as a four-fold model, some facets of which are

[1013] Borgen, *Philo*, 163-165.
[1014] D. A. Russell, "Arts and Sciences in Ancient Education", *Greece & Rome* 36:2 (1989): 210-225.
[1015] Tae Won Kang, "Wisdom Mythology and Hellenistic *Paideia* in Philo: A Case Study of *De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratia*" (PhD diss., Claremont Graduate University, 1999).
[1016] Walter H. Wagner, "Philo and Paideia", *Cithara* 10:2 (1971): 53-64.
[1017] Wagner, "Philo and Paideia", 54.

represented by the presence of the noun *paideia* within the texts under consideration (the Hagar-Sarah comparisons found in *Congressu*, the tendency of learners to follow mother, father, both, or neither as presented in *Ebrietate*), but others are more speculative (Wagner's characterization of *phaulos-prokopos-sophia* as a form of *paideia*, and the realization of this schema within the life of Moses). However, not all of these studies escape criticism. As Zurawski observes in *Jewish Paideia in the Hellenistic Diaspora: Discussing Education, Shaping Identity*, the mention of *paideia*, or *mûsar*, in Deuteronomy 11:2 cannot be understood in the prevalent mode of Hellenistic education.[1018] Although it is unwise to ascribe motivations to the translators, as Zurawski acknowledges, it is nonetheless true that the translators of *mûsar* selected a word with a demonstrably broad semantic range, one that accommodated a process of training and inculcation not limited to the *enkuklia*; in other words, *paideia* for the translators, and presumably most Greek speakers, signified not only the intellectual *enkuklia* but also the disciplinary sense communicated by *mûsar* in other Hebrew contexts. Also, while the wisdom literature uses *paideia* to translate *mûsar* when found in clearly educational contexts, it is not possible to say, *contra* and *pace* Zurawski, that *no* elements of physical rebuke may be found in wisdom literature. Rather we see *mûsar* and *paideia* used, in that corpus, to express educational situations that may require the use of physical discipline (e.g., in the instance of young children) but do not necessitate its use.[1019] But recently Zurawski has also emphasized the co-existence of a Mosaic *paideia*, alongside Philo's Hellenistic training, not to be understood as mutually exclusive but as a lifelong process of training and education in the law.[1020]

[1018] Jason M. Zurawski, "Jewish Paideia in the Hellenistic Diaspora: Discussing Education, Shaping Identity" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2016).
[1019] Zurawski, "Paideia", 92.
[1020] Jason M. Zurawski, "Jewish Education and Identity: Towards an Understanding of Second Temple *Paideia*" in *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*, BZW 228, Jason M. Zurawski and Gabriele Boccacini, eds. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017): 267-278.

So while the Spartan system presented similarities to Philo's depiction of *paideia* as *mûsar*, we find a trend within scholarship to broadly abandon this theory and focus instead on the distinction between the Jewish *mûsar* as, while perhaps akin to the Spartan model, nonetheless recognizable as a Jewish influence within Philo's writings on *paideia*. We also have seen an important study modeled by others.[1021] But these works, while acknowledging an inseparable connection between Philo's Judaism and Hellenism, have emphasized instead the *enkuklia* as an extant model from the earliest days of the archaic period. These studies describe the gradual shift of the *enkuklia* over time, and it should be noted that when *musar*-like discipline appears in these analyses, it is within a scribal context, the discipline of acquiring a craft.

F. H. Colson's article, "Philo on Education", reveals historical disputation over the contents of the *enkuklia* as well as the sentiment that philosophy must take priority and that the *enkuklia* is only valuable insofar as it leads to philosophy, an idea which, Colson claims, continues in the later Christian assimilation of philosophy and education to theology.[1022] Hermann Koller continues Jaeger's work with a philological analysis of *enkuklia paideia*.[1023] Here, he traces this phrase to early musical training as is seen in Aristophanes and the *chorus*. The early *paideia*, he argues, began with music, dance, and language, all critical parts of a choral performance within the context of theater. This will develop in the symposium as a contrast to *technē*, the practical arts, and will serve as an introductory practice to the exploration of philosophy; further, the geometric innovations of the Pythagoreans will be subsumed within the *enkuklia*. By the time of Vitruvius, Philo, and Quintilian, the *enkuklia* will have taken the meaning of non-practical disciplines which serve as a preliminary achievement to philosophy.

[1021] See for example Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (London: SCM Press, 1974), 114; also Jason M. Zurawski, "Paideia".
[1022] F. H. Colson, "Philo on Education", *JTS* 18:70-71 (1917): 151-162.
[1023] Hermann Koller, "Εγκύκλιος Παιδεία", *Glotta* 34:3/4 (1955): 174-189.

Significantly, Koller's work presents an alternative to the Spartan "school", namely, a series of verbal and communicative practices, originating in artistic performance, which gradually incorporates theoretical and speculative inquiries. This trend will persist throughout Greek education, as the *enkuklia* gradually takes a distinct shape very different from the *mûsar*-like habits of Sparta, which focus on individual formation of character and practical ethics of life.

L. M. de Rijk argues for a model of *paideia* that changed continually during the classical period, originally describing music and gymnastics, then only literary study, then finally culminating in the *enkuklia* in the first century BCE.[1024] At this point, mathematics enters the *enkuklia*, which de Rijk attributes to Neopythagorean influence, citing E. R. Goodenough's work as a preliminary investigation. However, it should be noted that Plato commends the inclusion of mathematics as an area of study, so that the incentive to include mathematics need not have arisen from interaction with Pythagorean schools, but with a closer examination of Plato's works.[1025] Teresa Morgan provides an important nuance for the understanding of *enkuklios paideia* which has emerged thus far.[1026] In *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, she points out that we should not think of the *enkuklia* as a rigidly controlled series of disciplines, studied in a proscribed order and subject to the approval of an external regulating body. Rather, papyrus evidence suggests that certain disciplines assumed a higher priority than others, or perhaps that many students failed to progress past a certain level of rudimentary involvement in the *enkuklia*. Actual practice, then, often diverged considerably from the idealized models presented in ancient rhetorical manuals, and showed a spectrum of involvement and thoroughness, from elite centers like Alexandria which boasted many pupils who had studied

[1024] L. M. de Rijk, "῾Εγκύκλιος παιδεία: A Study of Its Original Meaning", *Vivarium* 3:1(1965): 24-94.
[1025] Plato, *Resp*.521c-531c.
[1026] Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

the majority of disciplines, to the more remote and rural areas in which a student might be lucky to learn reading, writing, and to gain familiarity with Homer and Euripides. "The Grammarian's Choice: The Popularity of Euripides' *Phoenissae* in Hellenistic and Roman Education" by Rafaella Cribiore presents the *enkuklia* as featuring a regular return to well established works that had achieved something of a "canonical" status; the "circling" nature of the *enkuklia* therefore describes this cyclical revisitation of familiar material.[1027]

Cribiore also attests this in *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, while adding that *paideia* has assumed a new meaning, removed from its original sense of "child rearing" and now directed toward intellectual achievement and the "culture" which results from this challenging mental work.[1028] But she continues to assert that the *enkuklios paideia* is an intellectual discipline, a series of specific mental exercises. This is bringing us slightly closer to the sense of *mûsar*, but unlike *mûsar*, the exercises strictly build a student's capacity for academic success. Whether or not these "gymnastics of the mind" provided additional benefit for life, the sort of benefit that wisdom/*mûsar* provided, is uncertain. Alan Mendelson presents a thorough look at the *enkuklia* in Philo, with a comprehensive analysis of Philo's discussion of the concept and textual examples.[1029] Mendelson's contribution is a recognition of the spirituality of the *enkuklia* in Philo's writings. While for most ancients, the *enkuklia* served an important practical function, for Philo the *enkuklia*, while certainly not the highest pinnacle of spiritual attainment, or even spiritual in their own right, often provided an important foundation for spiritual progress.

[1027] Raffaella Cribiore, "The Grammarian's Choice: The Popularity of Euripides' *Phoenissae* in Hellenistic and Roman Education", in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Leiden: Brill, 2001): 241-259.
[1028] Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001).
[1029] Mendelson, *Secular Education*.

To conclude, scholarship has presented several perspectives regarding the relationship between Jewish *mûsar* and the *paideia* of the Greek world. Originally assuming that Greek and Jewish ideas could be easily distinguished from each other, this position has been modified to emphasize the similarities between the two. But more recent scholarship has shifted its emphasis from this discussion to take a more detailed look at the specifics of the *enkuklia* in Philo and elsewhere, without necessarily addressing more fundamental questions concerning Philo's philosophical and theological convictions regarding the *enkuklia* and, more broadly, *paideia* as a whole.

In the remainder of the chapter, I will first describe Philo's depiction of *paideia* as a teaching tool, not to be excessively valued for its own sake but used to inculcate more essential ideas. I will next examine Philo's use of φρόνησις and σοφία, demonstrating that these terms are equivalent in certain contexts, and arrive at two conclusions regarding wisdom and virtue. Wisdom, I argue, is viewed by Philo as preceding *paideia* and augmenting the benefits provided by *paideia*. This particular view of wisdom is unprecedented in Hellenistic writings. I also argue that Philo views *paideia* as the principal method for obtaining virtue, that much of *paideia*'s value resides in this exact quality, and that, again according to Philo, the entire process is dependent upon God for its success. Next, I will examine how Philo deals with the ideas of reason (*logos*) in conjunction with *paideia*, and in this context I will conclude that *logos* becomes a masculine engenderer of *paideia*. Correspondingly, and again in this specific context, wisdom will assume a feminine role. Finally, I will consider Philo's use of the *rhabdos* image to connect *paideia* to the priesthood.

A2. *Paideia* As Teaching Tool

Philo does not entirely depart from the classical world in his estimations of *paideia*; much of what he has to say is in agreement with the Greek corpus at large. In *Spec*.3.4, Philo attributes envy as his downfall which enmired him in "the ocean of civil cares". This is presumably his involvement with the Jewish cause as is detailed in *Legatio ad Gaium*, although his mention of envy provokes curiosity. But it is *paideia* which provides him some comfort; "Yet amid my groans I hold my own, for, planted in my soul from my earliest days I keep the yearning for culture (παιδεία) which ever has pity and compassion for me, lifts me up and relieves my pain".[1030] According to Philo, then, the early acquisition of *paideia* can provide benefits, and the mere recollection of it can provide some relief when one is overcome by the cares of the world. With this, Philo shows his indebtedness to Hellenistic thought, as the importance and civilizing influence of *paideia* is well-attested in the literature.[1031]

Det.63-67 also attests to the preliminary, elementary nature of *paideia*. This passage begins by mentioning the fifty-year mark in the life of the Levite, and how it signals a change in their careers from a worker to an overseer of those who work, as given in Num 8:24-26. Philo comments: "Study or practice is a mean, a half-way stage, not a perfect final achievement. It is seen in souls that are not perfect, but bent on reaching the summit. Watching or guarding is something complete, consisting in entrusting to memory those principles of holy things which were acquired by practice".[1032] This is concretely connected to the Num excerpt as follows: "Accordingly the mind of the truly noble man will be guardian and steward of the teachings of

[1030] *Spec*.3.4. All translations by C.H. Colson unless otherwise noted (Loeb Classical Library).
[1031] E.g., Marrou, *Antiquity*, 101; Borgen, *Philo*, 163-165; Mendelson, *Secular Education*; Morgan, *Literate Education*; Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind;* et al.
[1032] *Det*.65.

virtue, while his brother, utterance, will minister to those who are seeking education (παιδείαν), going over with them the doctrines and principles of wisdom".[1033] So *paideia* is here explicitly attributed to the younger brother, the overseer of lesser status. This is not to say that the overseer has never undergone *paideia*, but that for the advanced, *paideia* can be discarded.[1034]

Paideia is not a distant or forbidding goal, itself requiring other prerequisites. Much like *mûsar*, since it is commanded to be visited upon the young, it stands to reason that it is possible for any youth to acquire it, and this is in fact the case concerning Philo's understanding of *paideia*. Philo also attests to *paideia*'s basic quality in *Her*.125, which discusses the heifer of Gen 15 as both literally "unyoked, undamaged, tender, young and fresh in spirit" then continues to an allegorical interpretation; "that is, which can easily receive guidance and instruction (παιδείαν) and ruling". So "instruction" is naturally and easily acquired by the young, which reinforces the sense of *paideia* as a basic or preliminary procedure. *Her*.313-315 develops this idea, while also returning to the concept of *paideia* as related to the fundamental organs of sensory input. The "body and sense and the parts which serve as organs, without which we cannot live, since they are needed for our training (παιδεία) while in the life of the body" are, according to Philo, what the river of Egypt represents.[1035] This river serves as one of the boundaries of the land promised to Abraham in Gen 15:18; the other boundary is the river Euphrates which is "the wisdom of God, that truly great river, brimming over with joy and gladness and all other blessings".[1036] *Paideia* in this example is, while necessary, part of the basic apparatus of incarnate, earthly life.

[1033] *Det*.66.

[1034] Philo indicates elsewhere that it *should* be discarded; *Ebr*.46-51. Compare this to Moses, who needs no training; see Wagner, "Philo and Paideia", 61; Elisa Uusimäki, "The Rise of the Sage in Greek and Jewish Antiquity", *JSJ* 49 (2018): 16.

[1035] *Her*.315. Egypt is not only a symbol for the body, but of oppression as derived etymologically from the Hebrew (מצרים, Egypt, from צרר, to oppress), and Pentateuchal narrative traditions strongly support Philo's interpretation as arising within a natively Jewish context. See Sarah J.K. Pearce, *The Land of the Body: Studies in Philo's Representation of Egypt*, WUNT 208 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 81-97.

[1036] *Her*.315.

The analogy between Egypt and bodily/sensory life (which is also seen in Philo's treatments of Hagar, although not always concerning *paideia*) is continued in *De congressu eruditionis gratia*, with the additional connotation of sojourning which confer a temporary status to *paideia*. Philo begins in *Congr*.20 by asserting that the lower education (μέσης παιδείας) is described by "its race and its name"; its race being Egyptian, its name as Hagar or "sojourner". Philo uses two rough semantic equivalents for *paideia* in the section which follows; ἐγκυκίος θεωρίαις and πολυμαθείας. These are linked to the senses of the body, the recurrent idea that the senses must obtain information before the mind can operate upon it, and that this level of perception is "Egyptian", of the body, and a basic level of apprehension of the world.

These bodily limitations continue in *Ebr*.166-168. Here, Philo presents how the sense-organs limit *paideia*'s educational success. In this passage, Philo describes a darkness (σκότος) which not even *paideia* can penetrate; "For even if instruction (παιδεία), torch in hand, should go before the mind, shedding her own particular light to give it sight of realities, it would do more harm than good. For its little beam is bound to be extinguished by the vast darkness, and when it is extinguished all power of sight is useless".[1037] This darkness is ignorance, as Philo makes clear in *Ebr*.157-161. Philo is affirming here that there must be a body of knowledge within the mind, a type of raw material upon which παιδεία can operate, before *paideia* can have any good effect on the learner. This ignorance is "an affectation of the soul ... the incapacitation of the sense-organs".[1038] However, by differentiating between *paideia* and the raw material it requires - and by characterizing this raw material as that which is obtained through the senses - Philo effectively asserts that παιδεία is not something which itself is dependent upon sensory input. It somehow functions entirely as a type of sympathetic resonance, requiring a base level of

[1037] *Ebr*.168.
[1038] *Ebr*.155.

perception but not to be considered synonymous with perception itself. This seems to imply that Philo, equates faculty and reason, although elsewhere a distinction is made between *paideia* and reason. But here Philo not only introduces another limitation on *paideia*'s operation, but gives it an additional dimension of abstraction. Like the former example, Philo here is careful to distinguish between the understanding of *paideia* which emphasizes its practicality—which indeed he himself has presented elsewhere—and *paideia* as something separate from mundane reality. By doing so, he creates the possibility that God must enable not only the outcome of *paideia*, but to some extent *paideia* itself.[1039]

But before we inordinately ennoble *paideia,* let us note that Philo describes *paideia* also as a sojourner:

> The lower education (μέσην παιδείαν) is in the position of a sojourner. For knowledge and wisdom and every virtue are native born, indigenous, citizens in the truest sense, and in this they are absolutely alone; but the other kinds of training (παιδείαι), which win second or third or last prizes, are on the borderline between foreigners and citizens. For they belong to neither kind in its pure form, and yet in virtue of a certain degree of partnership they touch both.[1040]

In fact, when Philo does consider the intentional agent as acquiring wisdom or *paideia,* he introduces a caveat that is not seen elsewhere. In *Ebr.* Philo describes four kinds of "children"; those who obey both the "father" of spirituality and the "mother" of custom, those who obey neither, those who obey the father only, and those who obey the mother only.

[1039] For Philo's commitment to Judaism in this philosophical discussion see Carlos Lévy, "La conversion du sceptisme chez Philon d'Alexandrie", in *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy,* Studies in Philo of Alexandria 5, Francesca Alesse, ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2008): 104.
[1040] *Congr*.22.

Regarding the fourth, he writes that these are overly enamored with the sensory world and run the risk, if they pursue wisdom too soon, of returning to *paideia* in their old age. This awareness of danger is much like the caution that is typical of Stoic ethical theory, but Philo extends its reach to encompass not only the circumstances which surround the young learner, but the very process of learning which the person undertakes. In *Ebr*.27-34, Philo continues this metaphor but changes the tenor; *paideia*, that which the mother/father Wisdom created, now becomes a "mother" in its own right with reason as the "father". A footnote by Colson observes that these are subsidiary parents, appointed by the Divine (father) and divine knowledge (mother, φρόνησις) as "godparents" who assist in the formation of humanity who are, in a sense, the "children" of both sets of parents.[1041] Philo attests the preliminary nature of *paideia* in *Ebr*.46-51; in this excerpt, Philo unfavorably compares Laban's preferential treatment of his older daughter to the quest for *paideia* vs. philosophy; "But the practiser of Wisdom, knowing that the timeless also exists in nature, desires what is younger first and the elder afterwards".[1042] This, according to Philo, should be read as the necessity of παιδεία before φιλοσοφία; "And therefore ... the lovers of true nobility do not attend at the door of the elder sister, philosophy, till they have taken knowledge of the younger sisters, grammar and geometry and the whole range of the school culture (ἐγκυκλίον μουσικη)".[1043] However, like Laban, it is common to divert from this path; as do "many who have left the right path in their search for culture (παιδείαν)".[1044] Philo intends "culture", παιδείαν, as the end of the "right path" as context would suggest, since he warns that we must seek παιδεία first, *before* philosophy, making παιδεία the proper intermediate goal.

[1041] Colson, LCL 247, 501 (§31).
[1042] *Ebr*. 48.
[1043] *Ebr*. 49.
[1044] *Ebr*. 51.

Here, Philo continues to detail the folly of an excessive preoccupation with philosophy at the expense of an eventual focus upon παιδεία, expressly described as the subjects of the ἐγκύκλια;

> For from the very cradle ... they betake themselves to ... philosophy ... and afterwards, deeming it wrong that they should have no tincture at all of the school subjects, bethink themselves to make a belated and painful effort to grasp them. And then having made their descent from the greater and older branch, philosophy, to the contemplation of the lesser and younger branches, they grow old in their company and thus lose all power of retracing their course to the place from which they started.[1045]

We have therefore seen several examples of Philo's engagement with *paideia* and his effort to emphasize the preliminary, rudimentary nature of this enterprise. Whereas the *enkuklia* is comprised of many disciplines, seemingly requiring many years to master, Philo always describes *paideia* as a basic activity, something which only finds value as part of a process that leads to spiritual goods. However, it is true that Philo on occasion recognizes the complex nature of the *enkuklia*'s subject matter. In *Aet.*13-16, Philo considers *Timaeus* 41A, which seems to assert that the world is created; "Gods sprung from gods, the works of which I am the Maker and Father are indissoluble unless I will otherwise". Philo defends this view, that of the world as created, thus: "throughout the whole treatise he speaks of the great Framer of deities as the Father and Maker and Artificer and this world as His work and offspring".[1046] In support of this, Philo mentions Aristotle as having supported this reading and as one who "had too much respect for philosophy to falsify anything", and "who did not treat culture (παιδείαν) as a by-work or

[1045] *Ebr*. 51.
[1046] *Aet.*15.

with frivolous carelessness, but (who) sought earnestly to transcend the truths discovered by the ancients".[1047] In this instance, Philo is praising Aristotle in order to make Aristotle's agreement with Plato more convincing. If Aristotle is truly a worthy thinker, and he agrees with Plato, then Plato's argument becomes all the more plausible. Philo's praise characterizes Aristotle as one who did not dismiss *paideia* or treat it casually, but took it seriously and attempted to build upon it in his own work. *Paideia* then might be considered the "shoulders of the giants" upon which Aristotle stood, and since Plato's doctrine of the world's origin certainly was included within this foundational teaching, *paideia* in this context serves as a placeholder for Plato's doctrine of the world's origin. Although it might be surpassed or improved by his successors, this doctrine surely would not be considered "basic" or "fundamental"; rather, the *Timaeus* became the *sine qua non* of philosophical studies which rested on the foundation of ἐγκύκλια παιδεία, the "preliminary studies" or "school studies". But this discussion focuses on factual information, or "lore", and is not linked to spiritual excellence. Therefore, despite the arcane nature of the teaching, Philo presumably includes this within the "basic" information conveyed through the *enkuklia*, and this example does not disrupt the general sense of Philo's view of *paideia*. It is not to be neglected, but from a spiritual perspective its value resides wholly in its preparatory benefits.

In conclusion, Philo characterizes *paideia* as a preparatory discipline but separates it from the *enkuklia paideia*. Whereas the *enkuklia* is a series of intellectual disciplines, the forerunners of the *liberales artes*, *paideia* is viewed as "culture" or possibly "cultural immersion", a sense more in keeping with older Greek understandings of the word. Its true and only value is

[1047] *Aet.*16. For Philo's alignment with Plato in this respect see David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, Philosophia Antiqua XLIV (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 232-235.

spiritual, as opposed to the more practical ends of the *enkuklia*, which produces results either in the aesthetic or the pragmatic realms.

A3. *Paideia* and Wisdom

We have seen above that Philo assigns a basic role to *paideia*, as a preparation for spiritual excellence. But in Philo's idiom, *paideia* is also contextually mentioned with other virtues, such as wisdom in both its personified and abstract guises, as well as virtue in the general case. Below, we will first examine Philo's use of φρόνησις and σοφία, to demonstrate that these terms are equivalent in certain contexts. We will then see that wisdom precedes *paideia*, as well as enhancing the benefits which *paideia* provides, which is unprecedented in Hellenistic writings. Finally, we will see that Philo views *paideia* as the principal method for obtaining virtue and that much of *paideia*'s value resides in this exact quality, but that also nonetheless without the active oversight of God this process cannot effectively produce the good ends of virtue. In this context we will also find Philo exploring the converse idea of *paideia*'s inability to produce good ends when God is not involved.

When first reading Philo, it is not clear whether φρόνησις is an equivalent for σοφία. In *Congr*.71-79, Philo examines the relationship between wisdom and *paideia*, specifically with regard to the *enkuklia*. Directly, Philo considers the relationship between wisdom and the "school culture" or *paideia*, here discussed as ἐγγκύκλια or the "school subjects". Wisdom should always be recognized and given the priority, even when engaging with the *enkuklia*, and the good results of labor in *enkuklia* should be presented to wisdom as the means of attaining

wisdom.[1048] Those who do not do this are given as having been "ensnared by the love lures of the handmaids and spurned the mistress, and have grown old, some doting on poetry, some on geometrical figures, some on the blending of musical 'colours' and a host of other things, and have never been able to soar to the winning of the lawful wife".[1049] Here, the devotee of the *enkuklia* runs the risk of over-absorption in the tangible aspects of these studies while forgetting the more subtle benefits they provide—benefits which lead to and prepare for the study of wisdom—and confusing means with ends.

Indirectly, however, Philo addresses the question of *sophia* vs. *phrōnesis*. Here, Philo introduces wisdom as φρονήσεως, by which "we are unable to beget" and so must first mate with ἐγκυκλίον or the "culture of the schools".[1050] Philo further describes the "handmaid of wisdom" as θεραπινίδα φρονήσεως as he begins to answer the question of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar. He positively states that Abraham "does not forget ... his faith plighted to her mistress, but knows that the one is his wife by law and deliberate choice (wisdom, φρόνησις) the other only by necessity and the force of occasion ('school subjects', ἐγκυκλίος)".[1051] This is followed by a polemic against excessive absorption in ἐγκυκλίος for its own sake, as is examined above. But the next mention of wisdom, and those which follow, are σοφία: "just as the school subjects contribute to the acquirement of philosophy, so does philosophy to the getting of wisdom (σοφίας). For philosophy is the practice or study of wisdom (σοφίας) and wisdom (σοφία) is the knowledge of things divine and human and their causes ... therefore just as the culture of the schools is the bond-servant of philosophy, so must philosophy be the servant of wisdom

[1048] See Peder Borgen, "Alternative Aims and Choices in Education", *SPhiloA* 28 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016): 257-271.
[1049] *Congr*.77.
[1050] *Congr*.72.
[1051] *Congr*.73.

(σοφίας)".[1052] This strongly suggests that Philo considers σοφία and φρόνησις as interchangeable terms for Wisdom, not merely a higher classification of knowledge than *paideia* but that which is often personified in the Septuagint and in Philo's own allegorical treatments as a type of divinely inspired theological knowledge which has observable, if somewhat tenuous, links to the Divine. Naomi G. Cohen writes that *phrōnesis*, when used for wisdom, represents wisdom when it is present among a list of virtues. This distinction will continue as we find Philo further exploring the relationship between the two.[1053]

So we find that indeed Philo uses φρόνησις and σοφία interchangeably.[1054] But to understand how Philo interrelates wisdom and *paideia*, we must look further. We will find that by specifically describing *paideia* as the "well-rounded education" commonly found in the ancient world, Philo presents wisdom as a facilitator of the *enkuklia paideia*. Philo develops this understanding of *paideia* and wisdom in *Congr.*151-156. This is semantically related, if not synonymous, to Philo's other considerations of wisdom as *sophia* and as related to *paideia*. But nonetheless Philo's vocabulary has changed, using φρόνησιν. In this text, Philo distinguishes between the "bodily organs and faculties" and the "reasoning faculties", the first being the domain of *paideia*, the second the domain of "wisdom and knowledge", φρόνησιν and ἐπιστήμην.[1055] He most clearly demonstrates the relationship between the two in Abraham's confession which he gives as: "I greet the training of the schools (ἐγκύκλιον παιδείαν), he implies, as the junior and the handmaid, but I have given full honor to knowledge and wisdom as

---

[1052] *Congr*.79.
[1053] Naomi G. Cohen, "The Greek Virtues and the Mosaic Laws in Philo: An Elucidation of the *Specialibus Legibus* IV 133-135", *SPhiloA* 5 (1993): 15.
[1054] Φρόνησιν also appears in *Somn*.2.134, as that which "provides light ... for the immaterial things of the soul" (LCL 275). As the allegorical background to the sun, it is set alongside the moon which is an allegorical representation of *paideia*. For a view of wisdom producing φρόνησιν see Wendy E. Helleman, "Philo on Deification and Assimilation to God", *SPhiloA* 2 (1990): 53.
[1055] *Congr*.20, *Post*.137, *QG* 3.19; see also *Her*.315.

the full-grown and the mistress".[1056] While Philo does not engage with "Wisdom" as a divine figure bestowing *paideia*, what we do find is Philo insisting that the reasonable faculties must be present for the technical and practical elements of *paideia* to emerge properly. This is made clear in his analysis of Gen 16:6, Ἰδοὺ ἡ παιδίσκη σου ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου, "Look, your serving girl is in your hands". Philo tells us that "what is implied by the slave belongs to the domain of the hands in the bodily sense, since the school subjects (ἐγκυκλίου μουσικῆς) require the bodily organs and faculties, what is implied by the mistress reaches to the soul, for wisdom and knowledge and their implications are referred to the reasoning faculties".[1057] In the Genesis text, Sarah was Abraham's wife before Hagar. Therefore, Philo's allegorical interpretation incorporates this and assumes that some form of wisdom, as Sarah, preceded the *enkuklia* in the guise of Hagar, and thus is able to claim a previous commitment and, correspondingly, a betrayal. Of course, it is not the physical marriage which amounts to the wrongdoing, for as we have seen it is Wisdom herself which encourages the marriage to the *enkuklia* if needed. Rather, it is the shifting allegiances of the heart which constitute the transgression; but this does not change the earlier marriage to Sarah, or Wisdom, which provides the grounds for the rebuke in the first place. This position, considering the attainment of wisdom as prior to the *enkuklia*, is rare in antiquity. Ancient discussions do not consider rational prerequisites to the "all-round education" or *enkuklia paideia*, whether in the context of the "liberal arts" or a more generalized semantic domain corresponding to the upbringing and enculturation of children.[1058]

[1056] *Congr*.154.

[1057] *Congr*.155. This contradicts the Stoic principle that the highest virtues are τέχναι and ἐπιστῆμαι. See Sean A. Adams, "Philo's Education Language and Didactic Metaphor", *Adamantius* 28 (2022), 70.

[1058] Isocrates goes so far as to compare *paideia* to the training of animals (see *Antidosis* 214, also the *rhabdos*/*paideia* discussion below). He also describes *paideia* as providing the necessary prerequisite for additional studies, but not itself requiring a preliminary (*Antid*.266-268). Xenophon follows in a similar vein (*Mem*.4.1.3). Plato observes that a *negative* prerequisite (ignorance) may *prevent* the acquisition of *paideia* (*Soph*.230a), but elsewhere states that *paideia* is not practical training (*Phileb*.55d). See Aulus Gellius, *N.A.* 13.8.1 for ancient conceptions of *paideia* leading *to* wisdom.

Philo expounds Wisdom, or *sophia*, at length in *Fug.*51-52, describing Wisdom as both masculine (as engendering qualities in humanity) and feminine (as proceeding from God and as God's rightful subordinate).[1059] It is in the masculine aspect that Wisdom creates "aptness to learn, discipline (παιδεία), knowledge, sound sense, good and laudable actions".[1060] For the time being, what is noteworthy here is that Wisdom creates *paideia*, "begetting in souls", and that one's involvement in *paideia* is not merely part of one's own self-determination. Colson translates *paideia* here as "discipline", likely because the word is preceded by μάθησιν, "aptness to learn", implying that the learning which *paideia* in its usual sense, that of the *enkuklia*, has not yet taken place.[1061] Again, we here see Philo breaking with the Hellenistic tradition, asserting that *paideia* stems *from* wisdom. Overwhelmingly, the Hellenistic world asserted that *paideia* preceded wisdom and in fact prepared the way for its arrival; while in fact one could possibly arrive at wisdom without *paideia*, this was unlikely, and usually one acquired wisdom after undergoing the process of *paideia*. This Genesis text illustrates Philo's willingness to break with standard Hellenistic interpretive practices.

Wisdom, or *sophia*, is further investigated in *Congr.*12-19. This passage examines Sarah's request that Abraham sleep with Hagar to produce a child, which Philo allegorically interprets as the necessity of *paideia* when the learner cannot engage fruitfully with virtue. Here, Philo considers the usual situation which is presented above: the learner who cannot immediately produce the fruits of virtue. It is Wisdom, Philo argues, who grants *paideia* to those who are not prepared for higher pursuits. The excerpt from *Congr.* shows Wisdom as involved from the

[1059] In *Ebr*.88, Philo describes wisdom as the "art of arts". This is unusual and not necessarily grounded in Hellenistic philosophy: see Andrew Hofer, O.P., and Alan Piper, O.P., "Retracing the 'Art of Arts and Science of Sciences' from Gregory the Great to Philo of Alexandria", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 79:4 (2018): 520-523.
[1060] *Fug.*52.
[1061] *Fug.*51.

beginning, and as personified by Sarah in the allegorized text, actively engendering the association of the learner with Hagar, or the *enkuklia*. Although classical sources often show a learner capable of bypassing the *enkuklia* and proceeding directly to philosophy, never is Wisdom—for that matter, a personified, virtually divinized Wisdom—depicted as superintending the interaction.[1062] Again, the emphasis on a twofold division between *paideia* and higher wisdom is provided by Philo's interpretation of the two women, Sarah and Hagar. Also, by using the phrase *mesē paideia*, Philo distinguishes between the traditional *enkuklia*, understood in modern terms as "liberal arts", and the *teknē* or disciplines expressly intended to prepare the learner for professional and financial gain.[1063] Philo's emphasis on the *enkuklia* is clear from the text which follows, in which he mentions grammar, music, geometry, rhetoric, and dialectic.[1064] In this passage, we also find Philo again attributing the acquisition of wisdom to a divine agent. This is virtually unique to Philo's corpus and a sign of Philo's grounding in the Jewish Scriptures.

From the foregoing, several conclusions emerge. *Paideia* is to be considered alongside *enkuklia*, meaning the curriculum of study divided into disciplines. We have seen this earlier, but it is now expressly meant to include arts which produce visible result - geometry, music, etc. These techniques bear a resemblance to liturgical and ritual acts, which much like music and in which music might well be included are disciplined activities which provide visible feedback regarding "success" or "failure", if not theologically then technically. Also, wisdom provides the means by which one can rightfully appraise the products of *paideia*. Although *paideia* is not absolutely dependent upon wisdom, in that the person without wisdom may still practice *paideia*,

[1062] See the accounts of Chrysippus and Epicurus above.
[1063] See Adams, "Education Language", 70.
[1064] Philo here omits astronomy, the one area of the *enkuklia* which is traditionally attributed to Abraham, and will do so again in *Congr*.71-79. For more on Philo's opposition to astronomy in the Babylonian mode, i.e., interaction with a divinized cosmos, see Joan E. Taylor and David Hay, "Astrology in Philo of Alexandria's *De Vita Contemplativa*", *ARAM Periodical* 24 (2012): 56-74, esp. analytical chart p. 60.

wisdom is still superior and in some sense engenders *paideia* itself. For those who are capable of wisdom, an excessive preoccupation with *paideia* is unhelpful and perhaps unhealthy.

A4. *Paideia* and Virtue

Philo has much to say not only regarding Wisdom, the apparatus for obtaining virtue, but virtue (*aretē*) itself. According to Philo, the entire learning process characterized by *paideia* should be viewed not only in a realistic, empirical sense, but as undergirded by divine grace, the presence of God which enables the entire process in all its elements. In short, both the apparatus for growth and the products of growth, *aretē*, remain under God's dispensary jurisdiction. In *Leg*.3.135-137, Philo claims that the best virtue is the sort acquired not by toil, but directly from God; also that this is so because the soul tends to credit itself, rather than God, with the attainment of virtue when it is accomplished by toil. This sentiment is further explored with reference to Aaron, Moses, and the excellence of the person whom God delivers of passions (Moses) rather than the one who must work to do so (Aaron). This is continued, in *Leg*.3.162, with a comparison of manna-gathering to the improper use of *paideia*. The one who gathers as much as they need, for the day, is like the one who uses *paideia* rightly; the one who gathers excessively is like the one who pursues *paideia* for its own sake, or merely to impress and intimidate others. Here, we see that while *paideia* is important for achieving good ends, the manna, bestowed by God, must be present for the *paideia* to have any good effect.[1065] In *Leg*.3.166-168, παιδεία is described as "the light of the soul (φως ψυῆς)", but this "light" is part of an extended metaphor in which "darkness (σκότος)" represents "all elementary lessons

[1065] For pre-rabbinic allegorical interpretations of manna, suggesting early Hebrew traditions in Philo, see Menahem Kister, "Allegorical Interpretations of Biblical Narratives in Rabbinic Literature, Philo, and Origen: Some Case Studies" in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and Early Christianity*, Gary A. Anderson, Ruth A. Clements, and David Satran, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2013): 162-170.

(προπαιδεύματα) ... and what is called school-learning (ἐγγκύκλια λεγόμενα) and philosophy itself when pursued with no motive higher than parading their superiority or from desire of an office under our rulers".[1066] Philo actually aims to praise the acquisition of παιδεία for its own sake, or "light for the sake of light (φως ἕνεκα φωτός)" which is "virtue (ἀρετήν)". This does not necessarily conflict with Philo's other interpretations of *paideia* in which he recommends it specifically as a means to virtue; instead, he teaches in *Leg.* that the supplicant must have another goal than *paideia* in mind. *Paideia*, then, *is* good in and of itself, but only as part of a greater system that includes it as a waypoint to a final destination.[1067] The absence of concrete examples of this excellence further suggests that Philo means to present an abstract view of virtue in this passage. Most importantly, God's direct intervention is an indispensable part of the ideal learner's growth. Philo makes it clear that it is God who, for the ideal individual, provides the ability to learn. Conversely, Aristotle's view of rhetorical training as expressed in *Eth.nic.* and *Rhet*. presents a theory of human sufficiency.[1068] In *Eth.nic.*, Aristotle states that humans innately possess moral and intellectual virtue, but these virtues must be developed by the acquisition of good habits. Practical wisdom, however, must be gained through either experience in the world (*Ethics*) or, conversely and perhaps contradictorily, the pursuit of rhetorical skill as provided by the *progymnasmata*.

As we might expect, Philo's emphasis on God's functional role in the provision of wisdom and virtue requires him, for consistency's sake, to likewise comment on the limitations

---

[1066] *Leg*. 3.167.

[1067] Ancient sources show a great variety of opinions, including the practical futility of *enkuklios paideia* (Diogenes Laertius, 7.32, in J. von Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, vol. 1, Leipzig: Teubner, 1905 (repr. 1968): 3-71); outright equivalency between paideia and virtue (Chrysippus, frags. 224, 225 (J. von Arnim, Stoicorum veterum fragmenta, vol. 3, Leipzig: Teubner, 1903: 3-191)); the possibility of attaining virtue through paideia (Diodorus Siculus, *History*, 4.7; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, 2.76). In general, the historic trend is to increasingly invest paideia with spiritual and moral efficacy.

[1068] See Alastair Miller, "Rhetoric, *Paideia* and the Old Idea of a Liberal Education", *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 41/2 (2007): 189-190.

of *paideia* itself. This is in fact what we find in other portions of his corpus. As a basic practice, Philo first mentions in *Agr.* that παιδεία, or as it is precisely put ἐγκυκλίου μουσικῆs προπαιδεύματα, is "soul-nourishment, such as is milk-like suited to the time of childhood, in the shape of the preliminary stages of school-learning".[1069] Παιδεία here is given a definition as related to the instruction of a child, and thus inherently basic. In *Sacr.*, Philo also recommends toil as essential for the achievement of "any good thing" (ἑλοῦ των ἀγαθων) and that, if even the lower forms of achievement - the "school-learning and the preparatory culture", (των ἐγκυκίον και των λεγομένων προπαιδεύματον) require toil, so much more that which has greater value.[1070] This passage notes the prominence of the virtues - piety, holiness, prudence, courage, and justice - and that toil is required to achieve these as well. But what is relevant here is that Philo distinctly places των ἐγκυκίον καί των λεγομένων προπαιδεύματον as belonging to a category of lesser, preliminary methods. In *Mut.*224-232 Philo addresses the same concern, and as in the previous excerpt *paideia* enters the picture in an indirect way. Here, Philo is concerned with perfection; is perfection required for good deeds to achieve a status of acceptance? Philo begins by commending the action of the Num-Deut scouts who "tried to pluck up by the roots the trunk of virtue and carry it away, and when they could not, took at least a branch and a single cluster, which was all that they could carry as a specimen and part of the whole".[1071] Philo continues: "We should indeed pray that our course may lie amid the collected body of the many virtues. But if this be too great for human nature, let us be content whenever it be granted to consort with

[1069] *Agr*.9; also *Leg*.3.244. Geljon and Runia give "preliminary studies of encyclical culture"; Albert C. Geljon and David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: On Cultivation*, PACS 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 46; also for Philo's interaction with Homeric *paideia* see Geert Roskam, "Nutritious Milk from Hagar's School: Philo's Reception of Homer", *SPhiloA* 29 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017): 1-32. Philo is not the only Jew of this era to compare early training with milk; see 1 Cor 3:2. Epictetus also attests to this (*Diatr*.2.16.39, 3.24.9); see Zurawski, "Paideia", 107.
[1070] *Sacr*.37-38.
[1071] *Mut*.224.

one of the specific virtues, with temperance, or courage, or justice or humanity".[1072] This is further explored in dialogue; should the son become wholly good or not good at all? and continued with the Abraham - God dialogue in Gen 18. In both of these examples, which present the idea of partial virtue, Philo concludes:

> The trained (πεπαιδευμένοι) have the advantage over the untrained, and those who are familiar with the culture of the schools (*ἐγκυκλίω μυσικῆ)* over minds untuned to the muse; they start with better opportunities for growth, because as a rule from boyhood they have been bathed in a stream of ideas which deal with endurance and self-control and every virtue. And therefore if these have not entirely scoured and washed away their iniquity in the cleansing process, they are in a moderate and halfway degree purged.[1073]

Paideia is here presented as a beginning exercise which gives *advantage*; but still growth is required, and *paideia* alone provides purging of a "moderate and halfway degree". In the above, we find Philo envisioning a summit of virtue, but using *paideia* language to describe a lesser attainment, still desirable but not comparable with the acquisition of full virtue. This does not, of course, rule out the usefulness of *paideia* in the final attainment of ultimate virtue, but neither does it claim that *paideia* is an absolute prerequisite for this final attainment. It is helpful for partial attainment, possibly helpful for all, but of uncertain value when the highest goal of virtue is considered. This is in keeping with Philo's general depiction of *paideia*, as always having some value but not absolutely necessary for the wisdom which proceeds from God.

[1072] *Mut.*225.
[1073] *Mut.*229.

Philo also explores the role of virtue in this process, describing them as waters which support the mind's vision, which is separate from the vision granted by the physical eyes (and for that matter, all input obtained through physical sense organs). In *Post.*125-126, Philo asserts, "Would not everyone say that each of the senses is watered from the mind as from a spring, and that it broadens and extends their powers as water does channels? For instance, nobody of sound sense would say that eyes see, but mind by means of eyes, nor that ears hear, but mind by their agency, nor that noses smell, but the ruling faculty by using them". This is not the act of gathering raw data, which has been discussed elsewhere; it is rather virtue's role in empowering the mind to engage with this raw data. Philo continues, regarding the four-part river which proceeds from Eden: "These have sprung from the Divine word as from a single root; and that word is likened to a river by reason of the unbroken flow of the constant stream of words and doctrines ever sweet and fresh, by which it brings nourishment and growth to souls that love God".[1074] In comparison to this, Philo returns to the example of Hagar who provides only "imperfect training" or μέση παιδεία, which when "having come to the depths of knowledge, which is called a well, draws from it into the soul as into a vessel the doctrines and speculations of which it is in quest, and thinks fit to feed the child with that on which it has itself been fed".[1075] This, then, is a repudiation of *paideia'*s ability to provide sufficient knowledge without the active involvement of virtue. Philo gives some credit to Hagar's efforts in *Post.*137, crediting παιδεύμασι τοῖς ἐγκλίοις with the necessary instruments of sense-perceptions, but the general statement is to qualify and limit the effects of *paideia*. Again, we see also the necessity of God's involvement for the proper use of *paideia*; here, however, Philo has analyzed the scenario in much greater detail. Whereas in the *Leg.* passage Philo considers the role played by the

[1074] *Post*. 129.
[1075] *Post*. 130.

motivation of the human agent, in *Ebr.* and *Post.* Philo considers the general role of God-imparted virtue in the action of *paideia*, apart from any person's specific circumstances. This is extended into the realm of mysticism by Sami Yli-Karjanmaa: "The Mosaic legislation contributes to virtue and trains the individual even for the highest virtue. Yet Philo extols personal mystical experience that enables one to leave behind all human teaching, including everything written".[1076]

It is also in the context of the Sarah/Hagar allegory that Philo explores the following question: what happens when someone *without paideia* tries to perceive God? In *Somn.*1.238-241, Hagar, the "education of the schools" (ἐγκυκίον παιδείαν), confuses an angelic messenger for God himself. Philo explains: "For just as those who are unable to see the sun itself see the gleam of the parhelion and take it for the sun, and take the halo round the moon for that luminary itself, so some regard the image of God, His angel the Word, as His very self".[1077] Hagar is one of these who mistake the Word of God for God in actuality, whom Philo contrasts with the Jacob narrative of Gen. 28:1-22 in which "the mind is beginning, as the result of improvement, to form a mental image of the sovereign Ruler of all such Potencies".[1078] Again, we find the failure to recognize God's presence associated with a negatively connotated view of *paideia*.

In *Mut.*252-260, Philo compares the offspring of teaching, or *paideia*, with naturally imparted virtue. *Paideia* is compared to Hagar, bearing the son of *paideia* or the result of instruction, while Sarah bears the son of virtue, or those who are imbued with virtue by God.[1079] It is notable that in this instance, Philo is not comparing two examples who obtain virtue in

[1076] Sami Yli-Karjanmaa, "Individualism, Universalism, and Mysticism: Observations on Philo's Views of Virtue", *SPhiloA* 35 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2023): 66.
[1077] *Somn.* 239.
[1078] *Somn.* 241.
[1079] This son is Ishmael, who in *Fug.*211, *Her.*246, and *Det.*72 is characterized as a sophist who abuses the *enkuklia*. See Sean A. Adams, "Philo of Alexandria on the Difference between Philosophers and Sophists", *SPhiloA* 35 (2023): 2-3.

different ways, as can be seen in the anecdote of the Stoic Apollodorus concerning Diogenes. Here, we find that the Cynic who is able to attain a virtuous life by means of self-deprecating practices such as the avoidance of luxuries and artificial societal customs has no need of *paideia*, since the real use of *paideia* is to impart this virtue.[1080] But the idea that the divine would directly impart virtue is not present here. Rather, if you are able to attain virtue as the Cynics characterized it, you have also satisfied the Stoic conception of a virtuous life, "and you have done so without spending years of study in logic, physics, or ethics".[1081] The Epicureans contribute their own version of this principle, as Epicurus suggests that the aspirant "flee from every form of *paideia*" and rely instead upon the *Tetrapharmakos*, Epicurus's own manual for right living and attainment of happiness.[1082] But in both the instances of Stoic and Epicurean thought, the substitute for *paideia* is not direct divine inspiration, but a substitute philosophical method. Philo can therefore be seen here to depart from Hellenistic traditions and instead to draw his conclusions from the biblical text.[1083]

In *Det.* 9-12, Philo uses *paideia* to describe a certain kind of conviction regarding "the good". This is prefaced by an establishment of "the plain" in *Det*. 2 as representing a place of struggle and undesirable affections, as seen in the account of Cain and Abel as well as a comparison of Laban (the devotee of the sensory objects) and Jacob (the holder of excellent reason who devalues sensory objects) in Gen 31.4-5. In *Det*.9-12, Joseph views "the good" as a

---

[1080] A. A. Long, "The Socratic Legacy", in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfield, and Malcolm Schofield, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 628.
[1081] Long, "The Socratic Legacy", 628.
[1082] Diogenes Laertius 10.5; Michael Erler and Malcolm Schofield, "Epicurean Ethics", in in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfield, and Malcolm Schofield, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 644.
[1083] Innate virtue is not considered by Philo here, in contrast to Stoic trends: see Brad Inwood, "Stoic Ethics", in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfield, and Malcolm Schofield, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 682, 685; also the attestation of Diogenes Laertius concerning Zeno, Chrysippus, and Cleanthes on virtue as a goal attained by adhering to the divinity within, but not necessarily at the divinity's behest (Diogenes Laertius 7.87-88).

composite product which is constructed from several subordinate components, none of which are "good" on their own.[1084] Philo writes that these components allegorically correspond to the colors of Joseph's coat (*Det*.7-8), and continues to compare this view to the common conception that the ultimate good results from a conglomeration of components, none of which on their own should be considered excellent or vile. But this is an incorrect conviction, Philo argues, and he supports his argument by noting that Joseph has gone to a plain, which according to Philo is the allegorical location of struggle leading to self-betterment as is made clear through the accounts of Cain, Abel, Jacob, and Laban (*Det*.1-5). It is this conviction of Joseph that Philo criticizes, and he interprets the Gen 37:13 statement, "Come then let me send thee to them", as inviting Joseph to submit to a new kind of *paideia*, for as Philo writes of Joseph, "Up to the present time thou deludest thyself with the idea that thou hast welcomed the true *education* (*paideian*)". Although Philo is not explicit here as to the exact nature of the true education, he is however clear that Joseph cannot reach it on his own. Even Joseph's apparent readiness for instruction is not sufficient and, indeed, not to be trusted, since his profession "'Here am I' seems ... to convict ... of rash and reckless compliance, rather than to indicate readiness to learn".[1085]

Therefore, in *Leg*.3.135-137 and 166-168, *Mut*.224-232, *Post*.125-126 and 137, *Somn*.1.238-241, *Mut*.252-260, and *Det*.9-12, Philo advocates for a conception of virtue which is unattainable by means of unassisted human effort. *Paideia*, both in the unqualified sense and as the *enkuklia*, while a good and worthy pursuit, is not virtue in the sense that Philo speaks of virtue, as it is not granted by God. God must act for *paideia* to emerge, as it is dependent upon a foundation of wisdom, which is in turn provided by God; but while both wisdom and virtue are

[1084] This is not unique to Philo but is an important part of Stoic thought. On the Stoic views of parts and wholes in virtue see Inwood, "Ethics", 681, 717-718. The tripartite doctrine of goods is linked by Colson (Philo, LCL 227, 493, §7) to Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.8.2 (LCL 73) and *Politics* 7.1.2 (LCL 264).
[1085] *Det*. 10.

granted by God, as necessary foundations for *paideia*, as well as (presumably in greater degree) the end results of *paideia*, the practice and acquisition of *paideia* is entirely subject to human determination, and therefore lesser in spiritual value despite its important mediatory role.

A5. Paideia and Reason

In the following examples, Philo identifies *paideia* with the faculty of reason, or as we might better think of it, the intelligence present in scholarship and study which prevents the *enkuklia* from degenerating into lists of facts and the parroting of traditions. This equivalence is expressed most concretely in *Ebr*.151-153. Here, *logos* is given as a kind of sobriety, contrasted with the inebriation of passion (πάθους). This allegorical treatment of Hannah in 1 Samuel (LXX 1 Kings) continues to characterize Hannah's sobriety as "a libation in its whole being, a libation which is poured out to God" but concludes with: "This, then, is the company of the sober who have set before them instruction (παιδείαν) as their head, while the former was the company of the drunken, whose leader was indiscipline (ἀπαιδευσία)".[1086] By using drunkenness and sobriety as a bifurcated metaphor for reason and passion, Philo implies the same for instruction/discipline and lack of instruction/indiscipline.

Philo also writes that reason, like other virtues, originates with God. In *Post.*68 he also depicts *paideia* as a type of discipline, but in this instance the discipline is not practiced by humanity but by God, or at the very least a divine agent. Here, we find Philo showing that the Divine may implement *paideia*, in addition to the wisdom which Philo elsewhere claims is also

[1086] *Ebr*.152-153. For other views see Courtney J. P. Friesen, "Hannah's 'Hard Day' and Hesiod's 'Two Roads': Poetic Wisdom in Philo's *De ebrietate*", *JSJ* 46 (2015): 44-64, and Scott D. Mackie, "The Passion of Eve and the Ecstasy of Hannah: Sense Perception, Passion, Mysticism, and Misogyny in Philo of Alexandria, *De ebrietate*", *JBL* 133:1 (2014): 143-152.

granted by the Divine.[1087] It is necessary for Philo to introduce a separate agent in this discussion, as he is considering those who have acknowledged "mind" as a sovereign ruler notwithstanding that mind is "incapable of beholding its own nature".[1088] Rather, "right reason" (ὀρθός λόγος) is needed to govern - and possibly remove - these "irrational faculties".[1089] Philo is interpreting Num 27:16, in which Moses prays that Israel will be provided with a shepherd, as the need of the irrational person to be shepherded by a guardian of the herd, providing "admonishment and discipline". Philo identifies this guardian: "For when the protector, or governor, or father, or whatever we like to call him, namely *right reason*, has gone off ...the irrational and unprotected creature, bereft of a guardian of the herd to admonish and discipline it, finds itself banished to a great distance from rational and immortal life".[1090] Once again, the relationship between *logos* and *paideia* is consistently interpreted. Without *logos*, *paideia* is of little value, consistent with our other findings. Finally, *paideia* is interpreted as a shepherding quality that originates with God.[1091]

Philo makes the same argument by considering the situation in reverse. In *Somn.*1.238-241, Hagar, the "education of the schools" (ἐγκυκίον παιδείαν), confuses an angelic messenger for God himself. Philo explains: "For just as those who are unable to see the sun itself see the gleam of the parhelion and take it for the sun, and take the halo round the moon for that luminary itself, so some regard the image of God, His angel the Word, as His very self".[1092] Hagar is one of these who mistake the Word (*logos*) for God in actuality, whom Philo contrasts with the Jacob narrative of Genesis 28:1-22 in which "the mind is beginning, as the result of improvement, to

[1087] I will examine the disciplinary nature of *paideia* more closely in a following section.
[1088] *Post.*68.
[1089] *Post.*68.
[1090] *Post.*66-67.
[1091] This is seen in Middle Platonism, but with a sense of the soul's identity with God. See John Whittaker, "The Terminology of the Rational Soul in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria", *SPhiloA* 8 (1996): 3.
[1092] *Somn.*239.

form a mental image of the sovereign Ruler of all such Potencies".[1093] Again, we find the failure to recognize God's presence associated with a negatively connotated view of *paideia*.

But it is not always easy to separate Philo's thoughts on reason from his speculations concerning wisdom. In *Ebr*.56-67, Philo describes Sarah as the epitome of "male" reason, as she is "without a mother, and to have inherited her kinship only on the father's side and not on the mother's, and thus to have no part in female parentage".[1094] This protects her from the "customs of women", which Philo both criticizes in the earlier section and identifies as temptations to all men; riches, luxury, public esteem; "For the customs of women still prevail among us, and we cannot as yet cleanse ourselves from them, or flee to the dwelling-place where the men are quartered, as we are told that it was with the virtue-loving mind, named Sarah."[1095] Philo then *differentiates* this quality of Sarah from wisdom, calling her the "virtue-loving mind" or φιλάρετον διάνοιαν; "She is *not born of that material substance perceptible to our senses*, ever in a state of formation and dissolution, the material which is called mother or foster-mother or nurse of created things by those in whom first *the young plant of wisdom* (σοφίας) grew; she is born of the Father and Cause of all things".[1096] Sarah is fortunate, Philo implies; the rest of us are not so lucky and are often "still under the sway of ... unmanly and womanish habit ... cannot stand up against phenomena ... Yet if our battalion be unable to do service to the father's commands and thus suffer defeat, it will none the less have an ally in the mother, the lower education (παιδείαν

[1093] *Somn*.241.
[1094] *Ebr*.61. Philo's views of female inferiority are well-documented; see Dorothy Sly, *Philo's Perception of Women* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 154; also Judith Romney Wegner, "Philo's Portrayal of Women—Hebraic or Hellenic" in *"Women Like This": New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*, Amy-Jill Levine, ed. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 55; see also Maren R. Niehoff, "Mother and Maiden, Sister and Spouse: Sarah in Philonic Midrash", *HTR* 97:4 (2004): 413-444. For Athena as an inspiration to Philo's depiction of Sarah see Niehoff, "Mother and Maiden", 438-443.
[1095] *Ebr*.59.
[1096] *Ebr*.61.

μέσην) who enacts (that) which custom and opinion approve".[1097] By depicting Sarah as the result of virtue, but not virtue itself, as well as sharply contrasted with *paideia*, Philo again shows the separation of wisdom from both virtue and *paideia*, as well as the necessity of divine intervention for wisdom to emerge as born from τοῦ πάντων αἰτίου καὶ πατρός, "the cause of all and father". So we find that Philo has assigned reason a place among the virtues, of which wisdom is one, but while Sarah is in possession of reason and virtue, the exact relationship between them remains unclear. Wisdom allows the correct understanding of Sarah, as well as being itself possessed by Sarah as Philo tells us in *Ebr.*61 and *Congr.* (see above).[1098]

This relationship will be made more transparent once we examine Philo's closer focus on how *paideia* is created. First, we will see that Philo characterizes *logos* as a regulator of *paideia*, preventing it from degenerating into petty squabbles. Then, we will note that Philo defines *paideia* in relational terms, using the metaphor of trade to describe the activity of *paideia*. Philo will continue to nuance this idea, linking *paideia* to the parental relationship. By specifying *paideia*'s parentage as not merely undifferentiated Wisdom, but a cooperative effort between wisdom and reason, we will find that Philo has indeed assigned reason a place among the virtues as an engenderer of *paideia*. But there is more. Given that we have already seen the compatibility of Philo's conception of *logos* as a Power with his understanding of *logos*'s role in *paideia*, the expansion of the parental metaphor will provide for the understanding of Wisdom as a mother or personified woman, which connects Philo to Proverbs and the pre-existent wisdom tradition.

[1097] *Ebr.*63-64.

[1098] Abraham P. Bos also mentions Philo's treatment of knowledge that is not gained through conventional means, as characterized by Stoic epistemology, and considers Philo a Gnostic; however, it is Aristotle that, for Bos, serves as a primary influence on Philo's methods. See Abraham P. Bos, "Hagar and the *Enkyklios Paideia* in Philo of Alexandria", in *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham*, TBN 13, Martin Goodman, George H. van Kooten, and Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 163-175. See also Borgen, *Philo*, 164, for the identity of Sarah and virtue; but also Kang, "Wisdom Mythology and Hellenistic *Paideia*", 275, for the identity of Sarah and wisdom.

In *Somn*.1.105-114, Philo presents *paideia* as a representative of reasonable discourse, contrasted with "low and illiberal sciences" which are presumably preoccupied with tradition and needless detail. Philo uses *logos* throughout this passage, translated as "reason", and describes those who hate *logos*, as *logos* is "bent with an irresistible impulse on education (παιδεία)".[1099] It is in the pursuit of *paideia* that *logos* prevents "hair-splittings and plausible inventions for the overthrow of truth".[1100] Further, *logos* is a man's "only cloak" or "only garment"; "For who is there that in so fair a fashion removes from sight what might cause shame or entail reproach in man's life, as does reason? For ignorance, the kin of the irrational nature, is a matter of shame, while *culture*, near akin to reason, is his proper adornment...".[1101] The "only garment" is now ascribed not only to *logos* but also to *paideia*. Philo here introduces the idea that *logos* enables *paideia*, perhaps serving as one of the underlying tools which form a foundation to *paideia*, tools to which Philo has alluded earlier. This does not discredit the idea that God remains the provider and enabler of the process; in fact it meshes neatly with the idea that the *logos* or "Cutter", as one of the Powers, proceeds from God.

Philo continues in *Somn*.2.85-92, implying that the "enemies of reason" are much like wild, ravenous beasts and uncontrollable storms at sea; dangers which cannot be directly and combatively faced, but must be soothed, charmed, or avoided altogether. These "enemies of reason ... remove instruction (παιδεία), the true coinage of the soul, and change it into petty coins and waste it miserably".[1102] This allusion to coinage further reveals Philo's attitude towards *paideia* and *logos*; *paideia*, specifically, is a tool by which the possessors engage in mutual benefit through interaction (in Philo's allusion/metaphor, trade). This coinage can be used

[1099] *Somn*.1.107.
[1100] *Somn*.1.107.
[1101] *Somn*.1.109.
[1102] *Somn*.2.90.

profitably through enlightened discourse; but in this discourse, this "economic exchange" requires that both parties recognize and accept the coinage of *paideia*. The "petty coins" which the enemies of *logos* and *paideia* prefer are only wasted, as they are no longer fit for commerce of value. Again a separation is inferred between, on the one hand, the life and interaction of those with *logos* and *paideia*, and on the other, the enemies of *logos* and *paideia* who are so estranged from reason and education that they require a different currency in their place of origin.

We have previously seen the parental metaphor used to describe the relationship between Wisdom (σοφία) and *paideia*; in that context, Wisdom served as both mother and father to *paideia*, engendering the seed of *paideia* in a masculine manner, while assisting the Divine as a sort of handmaiden or feminine aspect.[1103] In *Ebr*.27-33, Philo continues this metaphor but with some alteration; *paideia*, that which the mother/father Wisdom created, now becomes a "mother" in its own right with reason as the "father". Reason is also viewed as a father in *Spec*.2.29-31, engendering virtue with the assistance of *paideia;* reason "acts as a father because its nature is to beget good intentions and noble and worthy actions, and then to foster its offspring with the water of the truths which education (παιδεία) and wisdom (σοφία) abundantly supply".[1104] Philo continues to discuss *paideia* as mother in *Ebr*.80-84, in which *paideia* is now not only a mother but a path of progress, linked to hearing, while reason (λόγος) is now not only the father but linked to perfection via an allegorical treatment of Gen.32:28. *Paideia* is also treated as a mother in *Ebr*.56-67; in this excerpt, the analogy of reason as father and *paideia* as mother is retained, but the mother is presented as a sort of "failsafe" which, through the institution of ordinances and customs, provides a safeguard for those who heed the teachings of the father, or

[1103] See above and *Fug*. 51-52.
[1104] *Spec*. 2.29.

right reason (ὀρθός λόγος).[1105] What can be seen from the above is that, in all cases, the ultimate source of betterment resides with the divine, either as God or as personified Wisdom. Wisdom and the Divine cooperate to create *paideia*; this metaphor is elaborated in *Ebr*. as, ideally, the parents of those who would wisely obey them. In *Spec*.2.29-31, *Ebr*.80-84, and *Ebr*.56-67, this emphasis is still continued, but it is in *Ebr*.56-67 where we find *paideia* differentiated from reason, so that Philo may incorporate wisdom, as a mother, as a partner alongside reason in the engendering of *paideia*. We may also infer that *paideia* may be more easily attained than wisdom since, should *paideia* require the same level of attainment as wisdom, it would be likely unavailable as a failsafe should the practitioner experience a lapse in wisdom.

So in conclusion, reason or *logos*, in conjunction with wisdom, produces *paideia*. *Logos* regulates *paideia* and ensures its continuous operation as a useful faculty. We have seen earlier that *paideia* should not be confused with wisdom and virtue in a broad sense, as these proceed from God, but also that their presence must precede the exercise of *paideia*. Now Philo differentiates reason, or *logos*, a virtue of its own, and *equates* this virtue with reason, so much so that when God imposes *paideia* upon a people as discipline, he does so by means of the exercise of reason. Using an economic metaphor, Philo places *logos* and *paideia* on one side of a line drawn in the sand, with the enemies of *paideia* on the other. Finally, *logos* does not produce *paideia* alone, but in conjunction with wisdom. As Philo has also substantially demonstrated *logos* to beget *paideia*, having previously shown the same for wisdom and *paideia*, he may now invoke a parental metaphor, with *logos* as father and wisdom as mother.[1106]

[1105] See Jean Daniélou, *Philo of Alexandria*, trans. James G. Colbert (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2014), 91.

[1106] These philosophical conclusions should not be thought to have originated with Philo, but are attributable to Hellenistic philosophies which Philo knew to some degree. See E.R. Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), 96-97, and especially 103, where he states that *sophia, logos,* and virtue are interchangeable concepts for Philo, driven as much by poetic and emotional imagination as by philosophical analysis. Goodneough claims that these equivalences are enabled by Philo's insistence "that these Powers are not independent realities ... they are formulations merely for our convenience ... Mercy and law appear

A6. *Paideia* and Discipline

So far we have examined how Philo treats the subject of *paideia* in connection with several philosophical constructs, namely reason, wisdom, and virtue. Thus far, Philo has also emphasized the interaction between intangible qualities of human personality (reason, virtue, wisdom) and the divine. Philo has also depicted this relationship between philosophical constructs, individuals, and the divine as occurring within a personal, psychological, and interior arena. But unlike the Hellenic models, Philo also asserts that these qualities originate with the divine and rely solely upon divine favor to exist.

Philo also departs from his Hellenistic peers when he explores *paideia* in the context of practical discipline. As might be expected, when *paideia* is the controlling metaphor for intangible qualities, the interiority of the personal arena allows for self-reflection and improvement without concomitant observable action. But Philo also expounds *paideia* in connection with external practices, and when he does, he often does so in the context of the Jewish priesthood. In two excerpts, *Leg*.2.89-90 and *Mut*.136, Philo grounds his exposition in a narrative sequence which could be viewed as merely tangential to Philo's immediate discussion. *Leg*.2.89-90 compares *paideia* to the metamorphic episode of Exodus 4:1, and *Mut*.136 references Tamar's strategem involving rod, ring, and cord by which Judah is held to account. It is questionable whether or not *paideia* is relevant to these stories; what really drives Philo's exegesis in these passages is the mention of *rhabdos*, or "rod". *Rhabdos* is a controlling metaphor for *paideia*, a constant motif Philo employs during passages in which *paideia* emerges

---

from the human level to be distinct, antithetical ... But these aspects or forms of divine manifestation are two, or six, or seven, only from our human point of view" (Goodenough, *Introduction*, 110). David Winston, however, holds that unlike Seneca and Cleanthes, Philo differentiates between the *attainment* of wisdom and virtue, and possession of the one does not necessitate the presence of the other; D. Winston, "Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden Tensions in Philo's Thought", *SPhA* 2 (1990): 8.

much more naturally, as a type of "discipline" or "self-control".[1107] In the remaining examples in which Philo uses *paideia* to describe physical practices of self-control and self-denial, we find constant references to priestly practice, through allusions to actual rituals (i.e. Passover) and the number ten as representing both the priestly tithe and disciplinary *paideia* itself. Further, by linking *paideia* to physical discipline, Philo makes an important connection to *mûsar*.[1108]

In *Mut*.130-136, Philo continues his discussion of *rhabdos* In *Leg*.2.89-2.93, Philo retells the account of God and Moses found in Exod 4:1. Here, God tells Moses to seize a serpent, which in Moses's hand becomes a rod or *rhabdos*. God requires that Moses do this to show him how he might authenticate himself and his message to the Israelites. Even Philo's allegorical exegesis does not admit the presence of *paideia*, as he writes, "How should one come to believe God? By learning that all other things change but He is unchangeable".[1109] But Philo immediately adds his own contribution to the conversation: "Therefore God asks the wise man what there is in his hand or in the active life of his soul, for the hand represents activity; and he answers, *paideia*, giving it the name of a rod".[1110] Why has Philo suddenly made this interpretive move? Either he has experienced a flash of exegetical insight, or he wishes to harmonize this appearance of the *rhabdos* with his interpretations elsewhere. I argue that it is the latter which we see here.by interpreting the narrative of Judah and Tamar from Genesis 38. Here he asserts that *paideia* is solely the possession of God; "Whose is the staff, that is the firmly planted, the unshaken, the unbending; the admonition, the chastening, the discipline (*paideia*); the sceptre, the kingship! whose are they? Are they not God's alone?".[1111] Hence, Judah rejoices

---

[1107] In the passages discussed, Colson translates *paideia* as "discipline" throughout. See *Leg*.2.90, 93; *Sacr*.63; *Post*.96; *Congr*.94, 177; *Mut*.136.
[1108] See Jason M. Zurawski, "Education", 275; also Pouchelle, "Prayers for Being Disciplined", 131.
[1110] *Leg*.2.89.
[1110] *Leg*.2.89.
[1111] *Mut*.135. It should be noted that the attribution of *paideia* to the staff (*rhabdos*) in this excerpt does not appear in the original Gen passage.

that Tamar does not surrender the pledges, for this represents her virtuous retention of that which belongs only to God. But as Philo makes clear in the earlier portion of the passage, "the giver of anything in the proper sense of the word must necessarily give something which belongs to himself", and that Tamar "closely scanned the symbols and tokens, and judging in her heart that these were gifts of no mortal she cried aloud, "To whomsoever these belong, he it is by whom I am with child".[1112] This quotation concerning gifts and the giver is presented alongside an interpretation of Isaac as divinely conceived; this is, according to Philo, what is meant by the opening of the womb (Gen 29:31), for "It were a monstrous thing that one should be a husband, and another the parent, parent therefore of bastards born in adultery, and yet Moses writes of God as the husband of the virtue-loving mind when he says, "The Lord seeing that Leah was hated opened her womb".[1113] Tamar's child, then, is also suggested to be from God, as are the gifts which Tamar refuses to surrender. The result is the suggestion that *paideia*, like other abstract gifts of God, and even certain children, are God's to give or withhold.

This is not inconsistent with what we have seen earlier, however; the exhortatory mode of Philo's exclamation suggests that Philo wants to emphasize the necessity of surrendering all gifts to God, including the *paideia* which serves no purpose if it is not allied with God. But it also demonstrates that Philo is willing to describe *paideia* in terms of admonition and discipline while simultaneously using the metaphor of the *rhabdos*. In this passage, unlike the previous example, we see Philo attributing *paideia* to the *rhabdos* in a narrative situation that does not immediately suggest its equivalence. So in this passage, we find not only a consistent interpretation of *paideia* which is congruent with what we have seen earlier, namely, that Philo views both varieties of *paideia* as proceeding from God if they are to have value. We also find Philo using

[1112] *Mut.*131, 134.
[1113] *Mut.*132.

allegorical exegesis to support an interpretation that is nearly impossible to justify from the narrative, unlike many of his other interpretations.[1114]

Philo also aligns the practice of the priesthood with *paideia* and *rhabdos*. In *Congr*.89-94, *paideia* enters the example in connection with the number ten, the "decad", a perfect number which is symbolized within the text as the ten years Abraham spends in Canaan before he creates a child with Hagar.[1115] The decad has obvious connections to the physical action of the tithe, and the perfection of the decad is subsequently described in wholly physical terms; the physical transactions of the priesthood, the military activity of Abraham, and the means by which animals are tamed, the "rod of discipline" (παιδείαν) and the animals as "under the rod".[1116] In *Sacr*.63, Philo examines the rod of travel mentioned in the Exodus Passover narrative, characterizing it as a staff of discipline (*paideia*) "to the end that we may walk without stumbling through all the business of life".[1117] It should be noted that in both of these examples *paideia* is used solely to describe visible practices, not abstract concepts. Whatever abstraction is to be found in these excerpts is numerological, and in the excerpt where numerology may be found (*Congr*.94), *paideia* is used only to describe the physical discipline that tames animals. The salient characteristic in these examples is the strict limitation of *paideia* to visible and even quantifiable activities; the abstraction of Philo's engagement with virtue and reason is not to be found.[1118]

This emphasis on priestly discipline is also seen in *Ebr*.138-143. The surface concern of the passage is with the priesthood, as it describes the necessity of providing offerings by a sober

---

[1114] See also the interpretation Philo gives to the oak at Shechem, noting its rod-like traits of hardness and inflexibility (*Mig*.223).
[1115] *Congr*.88.
[1116] *Congr*.89-94.
[1117] *Sacr*.63.
[1118] It is important to note that the *rhabdos* is compared to *paideia* to show not that the animals are being educated as humans (i.e., the *enkuklia*) but are trained and disciplined, yet another indication that Philo is influenced by the Jewish interpretation of *musar* as *paideia*. See Sean A. Adams, "Philo's Education Language and Didactic Metaphor", 2; cf. Philo's use of *enkuklia* to differentiate educative *paideia* with discipline (*QG* 4.35, *QE* 2.103), as in Adams, "Education", 4.

priest; as Philo makes clear, "In these words he speaks not so much by way of prohibition as stating what he thinks will happen".[1119] Philo continues, asserting that "indiscipline" would never afflict the priesthood. But it should be noted that here Philo is not celebrating priestly laws, or any laws at all, as worthy of inherent value; rather he is noting the quality of discipline as imparting a certain character to the person, and differentiating between the laws themselves and the effect which they have upon the person, in this case the priest. Philo continues in 140, asserting that *paideia* produces immortality, and in this case equating the health which *paideia* provides to the eternal nature of an eternal law. So while in this excerpt the priesthood is the tenor of the allegory/metaphor, it is not the usual business of the priesthood with which Philo is chiefly concerned, but the effect of *paideia* /instruction/discipline upon them. This *may* be associated with priestly codes, but Philo does not explicitly do this; instead, here he equates *paideia* to natural law, saying that "a deathless law (νόμον ἀθάνατον) engraved in the nature of the universe (παντὸς φύσει) ... lays down this truth, that instruction is a thing which gives health and safety, while its absence is the cause of disease and destruction".[1120] The important matter is that Philo departs from his usual depictions of *paideia* when he considers it in connection with the priesthood. Here, he divests *paideia* of the spiritual connotations with which he has earlier imbued it. Now that the priestly rituals are under consideration, Philo again attributes *paideia* to a passage where the concept of discipline is present but not the *enkuklia paideia* itself.

A7. Conclusion

In summary, we have seen Philo stressing that *paideia* should be primarily viewed as an intellectual preparation, not as a goal in and of itself. It is a teaching tool and a practice which

[1119] *Ebr*.138.
[1120] *Ebr.* 141.

may be successfully used towards the assimilation of more essential ideas. As in Deut 1-11, the training process should not be overly valued as such, but as a routine of regular reinforcement and correction when needed, so that the lessons which the *paideia* seeks to instill might successfully find a permanent home within the learner. This is emphasized in contrast to ritualistic and priestly concerns.

We have also seen that Philo considers God to be the ultimate source for not only wisdom, but virtue considered generally. It is God who instills wisdom before *paideia* begins, and this wisdom allows the process of *paideia* to produce greater results. Philo is alone in the Hellenistic corpus in making this assertion. Further, virtue in the general case arrives by means of the *paideia* process, again as superintended by God. However, Philo conceives of reason, or *logos*, as providing *paideia* when the *paideia* is given by God rather than practiced by a specific person. *Logos* then assumes a male role in conjunction with wisdom, or *sophia*, now conceptualized as female, in a separate set of metaphors describing the origins of *paideia*. Lastly, we saw Philo using the image of the *rhabdos*, or "rod" to describe *paideia* not as a training program meant to inculcate spiritual, intangible qualities, but strictly as a physical discipline and in priestly contexts.