Jochen Flebbe (ed.)

Holy Places in Biblical and Extrabiblical Traditions

Bonn University Press

V&R

V&R Academic

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Bonner Biblische Beiträge

Band 179

herausgegeben von
Ulrich Berges und Martin Ebner

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Jochen Flebbe (ed.)

Holy Places in Biblical and Extrabiblical Traditions

Proceedings of the Bonn-Leiden-Oxford Colloquium on Biblical Studies

V&R unipress

Bonn University Press

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

universitätbonn

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

ISSN 0520-5670
ISBN 978-3-8470-0591-9

Weitere Ausgaben und Online-Angebote sind erhältlich unter: www.v-r.de

Veröffentlichungen der Bonn University Press
erscheinen im Verlag V&R unipress GmbH.

Gedruckt mit freundlicher Unterstützung der Rheinischen Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Theologie e.V.

© 2016, V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen
ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Inhalt

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Vorwort

Der vorliegende Band basiert auf einem Colloquium über das Thema ‚Holy Places in Biblical and Extrabiblical Traditions', das vom 5. bis 7. Januar 2012 an der Universität Bonn stattfand. Dieses Colloquium war das siebente der biannuellen Colloquia von Bibelwissenschaftlern zunächst der Universitäten Oxford und Leiden und ab 2006 auch der Universität Bonn.

Mit diesem Band ist zugleich ein vielfacher und großer Dank verbunden, zunächst einmal an Prof. Dr. Ulrich Berges und Prof. Dr. Martin Ebner als Herausgeber der Reihe, die diesen Band nicht nur in die Reihe aufgenommen, sondern überhaupt sein Erscheinen engagiert und großzügig unterstützt haben.

Ein großer Dank geht auch an den Verein der Freunde der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät – Rheinische Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Theologie e.V. und seinen Vorsitzenden Dr. Klaus Graf, die nicht nur das Bonner Colloquium, sondern auch diesen Band mit einem namhaften Druckkostenzuschuss möglich gemacht haben. Sehr freundliche Unterstützung hat der Band auch von Seiten des Lehrstuhls von Professor Dr. Michael Wolter erfahren.

Nicht zuletzt gilt der Dank auch meiner studentischen Mitarbeiterin Rebecca Kluetsch, die hilfreich zur Erstellung der Druckvorlage beigetragen hat, und Oliver Kätsch und Anke Moseberg von V&R unipress, die diesen Band freundlich und zuverlässig betreut haben.

Bonn, am 8. März 2016 *Jochen Flebbe*

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Jochen Flebbe

Introduction

Religion is beyond doubt inseparably connected with questions about holy locations and places, even if that only means to negate them in the end. The Leiden – Oxford – Bonn Colloquium on Biblical Studies which took place in January 2012 in Bonn addressed this very topic with respect to biblical and extrabiblical traditions. This volume contains contributions developed during and after this colloquium. It focuses on a complex issue by shedding light on certain segments in the different contributions. Topics range from the Book of Exodus over Prophets and Psalms and over Philo to the Acts of the Apostles and the last book of the New Testament. Geographically speaking, the Arabian Peninsula and the Greek Isles, but also Mesopotamia are brought in as outmost areas, all of which could also contain places like mountains, temples, or even beds.

Accordingly, the first contribution starts out in Arabia. Based on Gal 4:25 *Axel Graupner* locates Mount Sinai. He therewith declares indications in Paul's writings as trustworthy. The volcanic elements connected with the Sinai in the Sinai theophany, the old connection between the JHWH name with the mountain and the one between Moses with the Midianites speak for the validity of locating Mount Sinai on the North-Western part of the Arabian Peninsula. At the same time, Sinai is a strange holy place, its holiness being frequently relativised right up to Deuteronomy. Here, the Mountain of God becomes Mount Horeb because for Deuteronomy there is only one holy place – Jerusalem – and thus everything else remains wasteland (חֹרֵב).

Dominik Markl then describes Sinai differently. He understands it as a fundamentally holy place, with its concept and hermeneutic role for the Torah as the medium required to sanctify Israel being developed throughout the Book of Exodus. Thus, the Sinai revelation serves to sanctify Israel while the holiness of Sinai accompanies Israel on its way into the country. The Tablets of the Law are made of Sinaitic stone. This outline is the most significant point of reference in the Deuteronomy as well. Even if Deuteronomy does not explicitly talk about the holiness of Sinai/Horeb it nevertheless stresses the importance of the Horeb experience and rewrites the Sinai Torah anew as Moses' doctrines of the Torah.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

On the other hand, at the same time significant changes such as the replacement of the concealed Book of the Covenant with Deut 6–26 are made. The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees, too, work with Sinai and its hermeneutic foundation and combine them with the authority of Deut. The Temple Scroll asserts the claim to be a more authentic version of the Deuteronomic law. Jub goes beyond the mere self-presentation of Deut and integrates the theophany of Deut 31 into God's speech to Moses at Sinai, and in its conception of an intimate knowledge of Moses' experience becomes more daring than the Temple Scroll. For Early Jewish writings and Rabbinic literature, Sinai with the transmission of the Torah remains the hermeneutic starting point. Provided that Moses' encounter with God in Christian tradition was understood in a monastic-mystical way, Sinai becomes a symbol not only in Jewish, but also in Christian perspective for the origin of the hallowing initiated by the encounter with God.

In accordance with Henri Lefebvre and Edward Soja, *Andrea Spans* emphasizes that space is more than a mere physical place, and that it is received, produced, and experienced – all of which stresses the importance of the meaning of space in and for society. She takes this thought into account when looking at Isa 60 and asks what ideas the text has to offer with regard to Jerusalem. What is remarkable in Isa 60 is that Zion appears as space as well as a person: Using the vertical and the horizontal axis, designed bigger than the limited place of the Temple and enhanced with connecting walls and open gates created by foreigners, Zion is constructed as space – this way depicted as a person at the same time.

Casey A. Strine shows that the Mesopotamian *Mīs Pî* Ritual of inserting a cult statue with its various stages, in which places function in a defined symbolic meaning, has to be understood as background for and key to Ezek 1–11. In reception, especially the liminal place of the reed huts is regarded as very important with its meaningful ascription as the place of the Exile, which is similarly to be understood as a liminal location and a place of purification for the new relationship between JHWH and the people. If the way of the statue to the Temple is considered a journey of sacralising this statue and the Temple, the journey of JHWH and the prophets to Jerusalem becomes a voyage of desacralization. A new sacred place is now the place of the Exile. The symbolic spaces of the *Mīs Pî* Ritual are thus used to interpret the places of Jerusalem and the Exile in Ezekiel and to attach a meaning to them.

In her contribution, *Megan Daffern* draws attention to the fact that the way places are described in the Psalms needs to be understood far less literally than it has been done traditionally, especially in form-critical perspective. Rather, the reader is often confronted with landscapes and places which rise in front of the mind's eye of the person praying, with inner and remembered places which thus become symbolic places. That way the voyage to the Temple can, at the same time, mean a journey to Israel's centre and to God. The matter includes public spaces as

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

well as the house as a place itself, and other related places. All of this involves individual and collective remembering. Understanding places as literary phenomena enables a possible way to access the spirituality of the Old Testament.

Till Magnus Steiner in his analysis of Ps 46 describes various aspects and elements in the way space is approached there. Space, for example, structures the text and thus gains a meaningful function. Eventually, the usage of space and the way in which the City of God is represented in the Psalm serves to visualise the confessorial notions the Psalm makes about God. Space is thus used to enhance meaning rather than to represent a place. Assertions about space are actually assertions about relationships. Nevertheless Jerusalem, though being an element of the representation of space, serves as a reference point to be experienced: the City of God in the Psalm read with Michel Foucault becomes a heterotopia, a real utopia, a counter-space, namely a heterotopia of compensation and crisis. The name Zion is left out on purpose because not the place itself has a meaning, but this very meaning emerges from the relationship of the place to God and God's relationship to it. Accordingly, God is designated as space, not Jerusalem, but God becomes the experiencable place of a stronghold.

Hywel Clifford examines the Philonic exegesis of Exod 24,10 which proceeds on the LXX version. This version speaks about the seeing of the place where God stood. For Philo, the place becomes a crucial factor which to him in his allegorical interpretation points to God's inalterability given that being at one place can be equated with being unalterable. Furthermore, the place can stand for the Logos and seeing the place can stand for the contemplative recognition of God. Philo in his interpretation points out elements of rabbinical interpretation as well as Greek philosophy.

Hildegard Scherer looks at the concept of space in regard to the kingdom of God as the central element of the early Jesus tradition. In doing so, she assumes that in this early Jesus tradition with the talk of an expanding basileia on the one hand and the access to a restricted basileia on the other, two apparently contradictory concepts of the basileia are used in parallel, without this contradiction being a problem for the tradition. The juxtaposition of the two concepts becomes plausible by looking at the occurrence and meaning of basileia in its political-historical significance in the listeners' social reality. In the light of the resulting common core, both concepts serve different *Sitze im Leben* by, for example, either working paraenetically or by explaining cognitive dissonances, ultimately, though, telling something about the human being as the actual place of the divine basileia.

The question of holy places in the Acts of the Apostles is central to *Nikolai Tischler's* contribution. In doing so, he firstly declares that Luke subsequent to the Old Testament and Judaism understands idols as manmade and thus corresponding places as not holy. Looking at Luke's view on the Temple in Jerusa-

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

lem, an astonishing image becomes apparent. Against the older opinion that Luke questions the Temple as a holy place in general, one apparently has to gain a more differentiated view on the matter given that in Lk 24:53; Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:12 Luke speaks quite positively about the Temple. Stephen's speech conveys that Luke is actually criticizing a wrong understanding of the Temple as a holy place. Just as Israel has always been worshipping tin gods, it has done it similarly in the Temple if it saw a causal relationship between cult and salvation. According to Exod 3,5 (Acts 7,33), for Luke a holy place is a place of immediate encounters between God and men as it especially takes place in prayers. Thus, even the – long destroyed – Temple of Jerusalem remains a holy place as a place of prayer.

Ian Boxall advocates the fact that also the Isle of Patmos in the Apocalypse means more than a mere geographical indication. Within the scope of symbolic meanings of place indications – whose literary and visionary character also leads to confusion and discussion among the interpreters – Patmos, too, gains a symbolic meaning. It turns from a special heathen place to a place for the Holy of Holies itself as a location and with borders which are either blurred or permeable for the visionary access to other places.

While these contributions may only cover some selective treatment of the topic, thus being only far-flung fragments of a due to its expansion hardly comprehensible mosaic, they nevertheless can in a clear manner be put together as a whole. What becomes apparent is that places as physical, geographical phenomena are completely under-determined and that their religious truth, their meaning for men unfolds itself in speaking about these places. Places are thus phenomena of experience and their attribution. Their meaning, therefore, is a human construction and accordingly, places or rather speaking of places become a very crucial and central tool for the construction of human, that is, especially religious truth. What is remarkable is that this basic assumption is put together of methodologically quite different contributions. Both a starting point with a theoretical foundation à la Lefebvre, Soja, and Foucault, as well as a strictly exegetical approach lead, to comparable results. How far, in reverse, the spectrum of diverse constructions reaches and how different, sometimes even opposed, the application of the different places turns out to be in constructing reality, can then be drawn from the contributions one by one which address widely diverging issues in very different ways. What, then again, all of them have in common is the enormous potential which inheres in this reality-constructing talk of places.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Axel Graupner

Ein Berg in Arabien (Gal 4,25). Sinai – Gottesberg – Horeb

I

Im Brief des Paulus an die ἐκκλεσίαι τῆς Γαλατίας findet sich in dem nach 3,6–18 zweiten Schriftbeweis 4,21–31 nach der Identifikation Hagars mit dem Sinaibund in V. 24 der Satz: τὸ δὲ Ἁγὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ (V. 25). Diese geographische Feststellung ist höchst bemerkenswert, zumal sie für die Argumentation des Paulus entbehrlich, mithin unverdächtig ist[1]: Der Sinai – ein Berg in Arabien? Seit dem 4. Jh. weiß die gesamte Christenheit, dass der Berg Sinai im Süden der gleichnamigen Halbinsel liegt und identisch ist mit dem *ǧebel mussa*.[2] And so we do. Do we? Seit der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jh. fehlt es nicht an Stimmen in der historisch-kritischen Forschung, die dem Apostel in seiner Verortung des Berges Sinai ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ Recht geben – mit guten Gründen.

II

Der erste Hauptgrund für die Lokalisierung des Sinai auf der Arabischen Halbinsel ist die Darstellung der Theophanie auf dem Berg in Ex 19,16–20a. Wenn die klassische Urkundenhypothese im Recht ist, besteht sie aus zwei ursprünglich selbständigen Versionen mit je eigener Anschauung vom Ereignis. V. 16aα$^{2.3}$βb vermittelt mit den Phänomenen קֹלֹת „Donner“, בְּרָקִים „Blitzen“ und עָנָן כָּבֵד „schweres Gewölk“ die Vorstellung eines Gewitters, V. 18 mit den Phänomenen „Rauchen (עשׁן)“ und „Beben (חרד)“ des Berges sowie אֵשׁ „Feuer“, außerdem durch den Vergleich des Berges mit einem כִּבְשָׁן „Schmelzofen“ die Vorstellung eines vulkanischen Ereignisses.[3] „Ein besserer Vergleich für einen Vulkan hätte

1 So Günther Röhser und Michael Wolter in der Diskussion dieses Beitrags. Anders J. Becker, Briefe, 72f.

2 Vgl. P. Maiberger, Untersuchungen, 11–14.

3 Vgl. M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte, 222; ders., Buch, 125f.; vgl. 128f.; J. Jeremias,

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

sich in der a[lt]o[rientalischen] Welt schwerlich finden lassen."[4] Außerdem wechselt der Gottesname. V. 17, der V. 16 weiterführt, und V. 19, der an V. 16 anknüpfend V. 17 weiterführt, reden von Elohim „Gott", V. 18.20a dagegen von Jahwe. Beide Phänomene, der Unterschied in der Darstellung der Theophanie und der Wechsel des Gottesnamens, koinzidieren.[5] Darum gewinnt man mit V. 16a*b.17.19 einerseits und V. 16a*.18.20a andererseits zwei parallele Versionen, die in sich lesbar sind.

> (16*) Da ereigneten sich Donner und Blitze und eine schwere Wolke auf dem Berg und ein sehr starker Hornschall. Und das ganze Volk, das im Lager war, erzitterte. (17) Da führte Mose das Volk Gott entgegen aus dem Lager heraus, und sie nahmen am Fuß des Berges Aufstellung. (19) Der Hornschall wurde immer stärker; Mose redete, und Gott antwortete ihm in einer Stimme[6].

> (16aα[1]) Am dritten Tag, als es Morgen wurde, (18) hatte der ganze Berg Sinai zu rauchen begonnen, weil Jahwe im Feuer auf ihn herabstieg; sein Rauch stieg auf wie der Rauch des Schmelzofens, und der ganze Berg bebte sehr, (20a) als Jahwe auf den Berg Sinai, auf den Gipfel des Berges herabstieg.

Die erste Version stammt aus der elohistischen, die zweite aus der jahwistischen Darstellung.[7] Dabei scheint die jahwistische Darstellung in überlieferungsgeschichtlicher Perspektive älter zu sein: Vulkanische Phänomene sind „von dem späteren Wohnsitz in Palästina aus viel ungewöhnlicher" und „notwendig an einen Berg gebunden, während Gewitter überall auftreten. So könnte man vor-

Theophanie, 104.207; J.M. Schmidt, Erwägungen, 16; W.H. Schmidt, Exodus, 79–82; ders., Glaube, 58f. – *G* bietet als Subjekt anstelle von ההר „der Berg" העם „das Volk" und wird darin von neun hebräischen Handschriften unterstützt. Angesichts des graphischen Unterschieds ist ein Irrtum ausgeschlossen. Die Übersetzer suchen die Darstellung zu vereinheitlichen, indem sie V. 18b in eine V. 16b; 20,18f entsprechende Reaktion des Volkes auf die Theophanie umwandeln. Außerdem mag der Umstand, daß חרד „erbeben" im Alten Testament nur von Menschen ausgesagt wird, bei der Änderung eine Rolle gespielt haben. Lectio difficilior ist aber gerade darum *M*.

4 O. Keel, Welt, 197b mit Abb. 298; vgl. außerdem den auf Ex 19,18 vorausweisenden Vergleich mit einem תנור „Backofen" Gen 15,17 und dazu Abb. 299 auf S. 198b. Anders P. Maiberger, Art סִינַי, 827f. Zum Verhältnis von Gen 15,17 R^{JE} und Ex 19,18 J vgl. A. Graupner, Exodus, 135.

5 Der mögliche Einwand, dass bei einer plinianischen Eruption gewitterähnliche Phänomene auftreten (Plinius minor VI,16 und VI,20), greift darum zu kurz.

6 Das Substantiv קול hat zwar in Theophanieschilderungen in aller Regel die Bedeutung „Donner". Vgl. V. 16; außerdem Am 1,2; Jer 10,13; Ps 18,14; 29,3–9; 46,7; 68,34; 77,19; 104,7; ferner Jes 29,6; 30,30. Die Verbindung mit dem Verb ענה „antworten" wie der Singular gegenüber dem Plural in V. 16 legen jedoch die Übersetzung „in einer Stimme", d.h. in verständlicher Rede nahe. Vgl. auch die Wiedergabe von קול mit φωνή und *voce* in *G* und *V* und J. Jeremias, Theophanie, 108; B.S. Childs, Book, 343. Die von W. Oswald (Israel, 257.98.229f) vorgeschlagene Abtrennung von V. 19b ist unbegründet und ohne Sinn für die Intention des Halbverses im Zusammenhang von V. 16*.17. S.u. in diesem Abschnitt.

7 Vgl. A. Graupner, Elohist, 122–125.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

sichtig vermuten: Die vulkanischen Züge sind Überlieferungen aus älterer Zeit, während die Gewittererscheinungen erst im Kulturland hinzugekommen sind."[8]

Tatsächlich sind Donner, Blitze und Wolken im Alten Orient übliche Begleitphänomene einer Theophanie[9]. In kanaanäischer Religion sind sie vorzugsweise mit Baal-Hadad als Wettergott verbunden[10]. Dagegen sind vulkanische Phänomene als Begleitumstände einer Theophanie in Israels unmittelbarer Umwelt bislang nicht bezeugt[11]. Außerdem lässt sich die Vorstellung, dass der Berg in Rauch gehüllt war und Feuer Gottes Herabsteigen auf seinen Gipfel begleitete, kaum von Intentionen des Jahwisten ableiten[12]. Dagegen lässt sich leicht erklären, warum der Elohist die von der Überlieferung vorgegebenen vulkanischen Begleitphänomene durch Gewitterphänomene ersetzt. Die Vorstellung, dass der Ort der Theophanie ein Vulkan ist, würde die Szene auf dem Berg 24,9–11 ausschließen, die nach Moses Deutung der Theophanie 20,18b.20 die elohistische Darstellung der Ereignisse am Gottesberg fortsetzt.[13] Auf einem Vulkan kann man kein Mahl halten.

Mit der Abwandlung der Überlieferung verfolgt der Elohist allerdings noch eine andere, weitergehende Intention. Mit der Darstellung der Theophanie als Gewitter überträgt er Züge des Königtums Baals auf den „Gott Israels" (24,10 E). Wie Baal als siegreicher Krieger Blitze und Donner schleudernd auf dem Berg Zafon erscheint, der als sein königlicher Thron gilt[14], so erscheint Gott auf dem Berg. Wie Baal lässt Gott bei seiner Epiphanie seine Stimme erschallen.[15] Dabei wandelt der Elohist die fremde Vorstellung bewusst ab. An die Stelle des Gegenübers von Gottheit und Natur tritt die Zuwendung Gottes zum Menschen in der Antwort auf seine Fragen.

Trifft es zu, dass die Verbindung der Theophanie mit vulkanischen Phänomenen zum Urgestein der Sinaitradition gehört, hat man den Sinai im Nordwesten der Arabischen Halbinsel, genauer: dem Vulkangebiet südlich von Tebuk zu suchen; denn nur dort, im *ḥeğāz*, gab es in historischer Zeit in Israels Umwelt aktive Vulkane.[16]

8 W.H. Schmidt, Glaube, 59; vgl. ders., Exodus, 79f.
9 J. Jeremias, Theophanie, 73ff.
10 J. Jeremias, Theophanie, 85–87; K. Jaroš, Stellung, 53–55.
11 Einzige, zudem entfernte Parallele, auf die O. Keel (Welt, 198) hinweist, bildet ein Inana-Hymnus. Die Göttin prädiziert sich als „loderndes Feuer, das inmitten des Berglandes angezündet wird" und als die, „die Feuer und Asche auf das aufsässige Land regnen läßt" (SAHG 46,47f [230]).
12 „Das feurige Rauchen des Sinai ist … ein von bewusster erzählerischer Gestaltung unableitbarer Zug" (J. Jeremias, Theophanie, 207).
13 A. Graupner, Elohist, 126ff.129ff.
14 KTU 1.101 Z. 1–4.
15 CTA 4.7.29f; KTU 1.4,VII,29f.
16 M. Neumann van Padang, Catalogue.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Der zweite Hauptgrund für die Lokalisierung des Sinai auf der Arabischen Halbinsel ist die enge Verbindung zwischen dem Gottesberg und den Midianitern. Folgt man der kurzen Exposition der Erzählung von Moses Berufung Ex 3,1, muss der Gottesberg in ihrem Einzugsbereich liegen. Andernfalls wäre der Weg zum Berg und zurück nach Midian (vgl. 4,18) mit צון „Kleinvieh", Schafen und Ziegen, kaum möglich.

Dass der Gottesberg im Einzugsbereich der Midianiter liegt, ist auch die Voraussetzung von Ex 18. Moses Schwiegervater sucht seinen Schwiegersohn in der Wüste auf, um ihm Frau und Söhne wieder zuzuführen, die er bei seinem Aufbruch nach Ägypten in Midian zurückgelassen hatte (Ex 4,18.20b E). Dabei lokalisiert V. 5 Moses und Israels Lager am Gottesberg.

Die Nachbarschaft zwischen dem Gottesberg und dem Siedlungsgebiet der Midianiter weist ebenfalls in den Nordwesten der Arabischen Halbinsel, denn nach allem, was wir über die Midianiter wissen – allzu viel ist es nicht –, siedelten sie am Ende der Spätbronze- und zu Beginn der Eisen I A-Zeit im nördlichen *ḥeǧāz.*[17]

Der dritte Hauptgrund dafür, dass man den Sinai im Nordwesten der Arabischen Halbinsel zu suchen hat, ist die enge Verbindung Jahwes mit dem Sinai.

a) Jahwe ist זֶה סִינַי „Der vom Sinai" (Ri 5,5; vgl. Dtn 33,2; Ps 68,8f; Hab 3,3), der Sinai ursprünglich der Berg, auf dem Jahwe wohnt.[18] Von dort bricht er auf, um den Seinen zu helfen. Die vorpriesterschriftliche Fassung der Gründungsgeschichte Israels reflektiert diese ältere Vorstellung noch, wie Ex 19,3a zeigt: „Mose war zu Gott hinaufgestiegen", allerdings nicht ohne Korrekturen.[19]
b) Ortslisten aus der Zeit Amenophis III. aus Soleb[20] und Ramses II. aus 'Amara-West[21] erwähnen *t3 š3św y-h-w3* „das Land (der) *Š3św-Yhw3*" in unmittelbarer Nachbarschaft zum „Land der Seir-Nomaden (*š3św Sᶜrr*)" und weisen damit in denselben Raum wie Ri 5,4f. und Dtn 33,2 mit den Angaben „aus Seir / dem Gefilde Edoms" bzw. „aus Seir / vom Gebirge Paran", nämlich den nordwestlichen Teil der Arabischen Halbinsel.[22]

Paulus dürfte darum Recht haben: Der Berg Sinai ist ein Berg in Arabien. Lässt er sich noch genauer lokalisieren? Prominent ist der Vorschlag von Alois Musil, den

17 E.A. Knauf, Midian, 1–6; T. Staubli, Image, 168f.
18 Anders W. Oswald, Israel, 241ff. Vgl. dazu A. Graupner, Elohist, 25f. mit Anm. 42. Zur Kritik an H. Pfeiffer, Kommen, vgl. die Rez. von S. Beyerle, Rezension, und M. Leuenberger, Gott, 7–33.
19 S.u. im Abschnitt III.
20 R. Giveon, Bédouins, doc. 6a.
21 R. Giveon, Bédouins, doc. 16a; vgl. E. Edel, Ortsnamenslisten, 68.
22 R. Giveon, Schasu, 533.535; W. Helck, Seᶜir, 828f.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Berg Sinai mit dem Vulkan (*ḥalā*) *'l-Badr* südsüdöstlich von Tebūk im nördlichen Teil des *ḥeǧāz* zu identifizieren.[23] Eine Überprüfung dieser und anderer Optionen[24] ist leider nicht möglich, da die Region militärisches Sperrgebiet ist.

III

Ohne Zweifel: der Sinai – der Gottesberg, der Horeb – ist eine heilige Stätte.[25] Der Sinai ist ursprünglich der Berg, auf dem Jahwe wohnt (Ex 19,3a). Folgt man der jahwistischen Darstellung, ist er tabu:

> (12) „Grenze das Volk ringsum ein mit den Worten: ‚Hütet euch, auf den Berg hinaufzusteigen oder seinen Rand zu berühren! Jeder, der den Berg berührt, muss getötet werden! (13a) Niemand soll ihn berühren, sonst wird er unweigerlich gesteinigt oder erschossen werden. Tier wie Mensch darf nicht am Leben bleiben.'" (Ex 19,12.13a; vgl. V. 21.23; ferner 24,2)

Außerdem enthält die vorpriesterschriftliche Beschreibung der Theophanie Elemente kultischer Begehung. In der jahwistischen Darstellung soll Mose das Volk „heiligen": Die Israeliten sollen ihre Gewänder wie für eine Wallfahrt waschen (V. 10f.; vgl. Gen 35,2f.) und sich für einen bestimmten, den dritten Tag bereithalten (Ex 19,11a.15), dabei sexuelle Enthaltsamkeit üben (V. 15). In der elohistischen Fassung wird das Volk durch „einen sehr starken Hornschall", wie zu einer kultischen Versammlung zum Berg gerufen (V. 16; vgl. Lev 25,9; Jes 27,13; Joel 2,15; Ps 81,4). Zitternd folgt es dem Aufruf, indem es unter Moses Führung wie in einer Prozession zum Berg zieht und dort Aufstellung nimmt (Ex 19,17b), während der Hornschall, der das Geschehen begleitet, immer lauter wird (V. 19a).[26]

Ohne Zweifel: Der Sinai – der Gottesberg, der Horeb – ist eine heilige Stätte, aber die merkwürdigste heilige Stätte, die man sich denken kann: Mose baut zwar einen Altar am Fuße des Berges (24,4). Dieser Altar verliert aber nach dem Bundeschluss seine Funktion. Ein Heiligtum wird nicht gestiftet. Darum erzählt

23 Vorbericht 154. Musil hat seinen Vorschlag, den er 1911 unterbreitete, später nicht wiederholt, stattdessen den *Šaʿīb al-Ḫrob* ins Gespräch gebracht (Ḥeǧâz 297).

24 M. Neumann van Padang, Catalogue, 1–12.

25 Zur mittlerweile nicht mehr umstrittenen Identität von Sinai (J), Gottesberg (E) und Horeb (R^{dtr}) vgl. W.H. Schmidt, Exodus, 122–124.

26 Dagegen ist die Szene auf dem Berg Ex 24,9–11 kein „Festgottesdienst". So E. Ruprecht, Stellung, 140; vgl. F.-L. Hossfeld, Dekalog, 199. Im Unterschied zur Szene am Fuße des Berges fehlt ihr jeder kultisch-rituelle Charakter. Von „ein(em) Gemeinschaftsmahl (זבח), wie es bei der תודה üblich ist" (J.M. Vincent, Auge, 27[f.]), ist kaum zufällig gerade nicht die Rede.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

das Alte Testament auch nichts von Wallfahrten zum Sinai.[27] Erst recht kennt es kein Fest, das die Vergegenwärtigung der Theophanie am Sinai zum Inhalt hätte.[28] Der Sinai ist eine heilige Stätte, die als solche – physikalisch – für die Überlieferung keine Bedeutung hat.

Tatsächlich lösen bereits Jahwist und Elohist die enge Verbindung Jahwes mit dem Ort. Der Berg – in der Tradition Jahwes Wohnstätte (19,3a E) – ist nurmehr der Ort, auf den Jahwe herabsteigt (ירד 19,18.20a J; vgl. V. 11b R^{JE}), zu dem Gott kommt (בוא 20,20 E). Jahwe wohnt nicht auf einem Berg, sondern im Himmel (24,10f E). Außerdem vermeidet der Elohist den Ortsnamen סיני und spricht nur noch vom הר האלהים, dem Gottesberg (Ex 3,1bβ*; 18,5; sekundär aufgenommen in 4,27; 24,13). Auf diese Weise entzieht der Elohist den Ort der Theophanie jeder geographischen Festlegung. Der Ort der Theophanie lässt sich ebenso wenig fixieren wie Gott selbst. Auf diese Weise hebt der Elohist – typisch für ihn – Gottes Transzendenz in seiner Kondeszendenz hervor.[29]

Außerdem verleiht der Elohist mit der Bezeichnung der Stätte der Theophanie als „Gottesberg" dem Gott Israels königliche Züge. Da Elohim in der Verbindung „Gottesberg" (3,1*; 18,5) den Gottesnamen vertritt, ist die engste Parallele die Bezeichnung des Zaphon, auf dem Baal als König thront, als *ġr bʿl*, als „Baalsberg"[30].

Noch einen Schritt weiter gehen die Bearbeiter des Deuteronomium, die für den Sinai die Bezeichnung חֹרֵב „Horeb" kreierten.[31] Wie Lothar Perlitt herausgearbeitet hat, ist חֹרֵב „Horeb" kein Ortsname, sondern eine *qotel*-Form der

27 Der einzige Text, der von eine „Rückkehr" zum Sinai, genauer: „an den Berg Gottes, den Horeb" (1 Kön 19,8; vgl. Ex 3,1) erzählt, verwendet die Wurzel עלה, die die speziellere Bedeutung „wallfahren" annehmen kann (Ex 34,24; 1 Sam 1,3; 10,3; Jes 2,3; Jer 31,6; vgl. Ps 122,4; 47,6 u. a.), kaum zufällig nicht. „Die geläufige Rede von einer ‚Wallfahrt' Elias ist dem Text ganz und gar unangemessen." J. Jeremias, Anfänge, 491 Anm. 32.

28 Zu älteren, gescheiterten Versuchen einer kultgeschichtlichen Deutung der Sinaiperikope vgl. zusammenfassend W.H. Schmidt, Exodus, 71–73. Die kultischen Züge der Darstellung sind unspezifisch, lassen darum keine Rückschlüsse zu und haben wohl nur die Funktion, das Schauspiel in der Natur zu transzendieren. 1 Kön 19 nimmt diese Intention auf und verstärkt sie mit der Feststellung: Weder im Sturm noch im Erdbeben noch im Feuer war Jahwe. Selbst die anschließende Windstille, die als Kontrastbild zu den traditionellen Begleitphänomenen der Theophanie Gottes Unweltlichkeit andeutet, ist nur Hinweis auf Gottes Gegenwart. Sie selbst wird erst in der Stimme (קול) erfahrbar, die Elija anredet. Vgl. J. Jeremias, Anfänge, 486–491, bes. 489; M. Oeming, Testament, 299–325.

29 Verbirgt sich dieselbe Intention bereits hinter der im Alten Testament singulären Formulierung אחר המדבר Ex 3,1a* J? Mose treibt das Kleinvieh seines Schwiegervaters „hinter die Wüste", d. h. in einen Raum jenseits der bekannten Welt.

30 KTU 1.16,I,6; II,45. Vgl. auch die Bezeichnung des Zaphon als „Berg meines (Baals) Besitzes" (KTU 1.3,III,29f; IV,19f).

31 Dtn 1,2.6.19; 4,10.15; 5,2; 9,8; 18,16; 28,69; vgl. 1 Kön 8,9; 19,8; als Zusätze im Tetrateuch: Ex 3,1; 17,6; 33,6; ferner 2 Chr 5,10; Ps 106,19; Mal 3,22.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Wurzel חרב *ḥrb* und bedeutet „Ödland, Wüstengebiet".[32] Durch die Ersetzung des Ortsnamens Sinai durch das Nomen Horeb qualifizieren dtr Bearbeiter den Berg der Theophanie als einen Ort im Nirgendwo, als place of nowhere. Warum? Lothar Perlitt selbst vermutete, dass die Ersetzung des nomen locale סִינַי „Sinai" durch die Bezeichnung חֹרֵב „Horeb" Edoms Rolle während des Falls Juda / Jerusalems 587 v. Chr. widerspiegelt. „Weil einerseits Sinai und Seir nicht trennbar waren, weil andererseits Seir das Land oder Hinterland jener signalisierte, die von Judas Unglück profitierten, war der bloße Name Sinai in ein geographisches Wortfeld geraten, das seine Vermeidung zumindest verständlich macht."[33]

Möglicherweise gibt es zwei weitere, stärker theologische Gründe für die Qualifizierung des Sinai als Horeb.

Der erste Grund könnte in der Konkurrenz zwischen Tetrateuch und Deuteronomium liegen: Welche Willenskundgabe Jahwes ist für Israel gültig – die am Sinai oder die im Lande Moab?[34] In der Perspektive dieser Fundamentalfrage kann man die Bezeichnung des Sinai als Horeb auch als Abwertung des Sinai lesen, die den Anspruch des Deuteronomium unterstreichen soll, Zeugnis der allein wahren Promulgation des Gotteswillens zu sein.

Der zweite Grund für die Ersetzung des nomen locale Sinai durch die Bezeichnung Horeb könnte das zentrale Anliegen des Deuteronomium, seine regulative Idee sein: die Einheit des Kultortes als Spiegel der Einheit Jahwes (Dtn 6,4). Mit den Worten der vermutlich ältesten Schicht in Dtn 12[35]:

> (13) Hüte dich davor, deine Brandopfer an jeder Stätte darzubringen, die du siehst, (14) sondern an der Stätte, die Jahwe in einem deiner Stämme erwählen wird, dort sollst du deine Brandopfer darbringen und dort sollst du alles tun, was ich dir gebiete.

Wenn es nur eine heilige Stätte gibt, die Jahwe erwählen wird – und für deuteronomistische Theologen ist diese heilige Stätte fraglos der Tempel in Jerusalem –, dann sind alle anderen heiligen Stätten „Ödland". Unter stärkerer Berücksichtigung der exilischen oder frühnachexilischen Situation derer, die Horeb als neue Bezeichnung für den Sinai kreierten: Der Tempel in Jerusalem ist zwar zerstört, aber es gibt keinen Weg zurück zum Sinai. Alles was man dabei finden könnte, wäre „Wüste".

32 L. Perlitt, Sinai, 315–318. Als Analogon verweist Perlitt zu Recht auf die Bildung שֹׁמֵם von der Wurzel שׁמם.

33 L. Perlitt, Sinai, 314.

34 Das Kapitel Dtn 5, das bereits einen Ausgleich zwischen den widerstreitenden Konzeptionen herzustellen sucht, indem es die im Lande Moab durch Mose promulgierte Tora an den Sinai rückbindet, setzt – zumindest in seiner gegenwärtigen Gestalt – bereits die Priesterschrift voraus, ist mithin jünger. Vgl. dazu A. Graupner, Sinai, 96f.

35 U. Rüterswörden, Deuteronomium, 29f.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

IV

Zum Schluss zurück zur paulinischen Lokalisierung des Sinai ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ. Wie konnte Paulus (noch) wissen, dass man den Sinai in Arabien zu suchen hat? Vor gut 40 Jahren hat Hartmut Gese vermutet, dass sich Paulus, der selbst in Arabien war – ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν (Gal 1,17) –, mit dem Satz τὸ δὲ Ἁγὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβία auf eine ältere jüdische Lokaltradition bezieht, die Hagar mit Arabien, namentlich mit der im südöstlichen *ḥeğaz* gelegenen Stadt Εγρα, lateinisch H(a)egra, nabatäisch-aramäisch חגרא, arabisch *el-ḥeğr*, das heutige *madā'in Ṣāliḥ* bezieht.[36] Tatsächlich finden sich in der Targum-Überlieferung Hinweise darauf, dass es in der jüdischen Antike eine enge Verbindung der Gestalt der Hagar mit der nabatäischen Stadt Hegra gab. So ersetzen das Targum Onkelos und das Targum Pseudo-Jonathan in der Ortsangabe Gen 16,7 על־העין בדרך שׁור den Ortsnamen Schur durch חגרא: „an der Quelle auf dem Weg nach Ḥegra". Außerdem loziert das Targum Onkelos den Brunnen Beer Lahaj-Roi Gen 16,14 nicht wie *M* „zwischen Kadesch und Bered", sondern „zwischen Petra und Ḥegra" und führt damit den Leser auch an dieser Stelle nach Arabien, mit dem Stadtnamen Ḥegra sogar denkbar nahe an das Vulkanfeld, in dem man nach allem, was sich dem Alten Testament noch über die Lage des Sinai entnehmen lässt, den Berg zu suchen hat, allerdings – folgt man der Intention der im Pentateuch vereinten theologischen Stimmen – nicht zu suchen braucht.

Bibliographie

Becker, J. / Lutz, U., Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser (ATD 8/1), Göttingen 1998.

Beyerle, S., Rez. von: Pfeiffer, Hendrik, Jahwes Kommen vom Süden (s. u.), in: RBL 3 (2007).

Childs, B.S., The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary (OTL), Philadelphia ^{2}1975.

Edel, E., Die Ortsnamenslisten in den Tempeln von Aksha, Amarah und Soleb im Sudan, in: BN 11 (1980) 63–79.

Gese, H., Τὸ δὲ Ἁγὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβία, in: Das ferne und nahe Wort. FS L. Rost (BZAW 105), Berlin 1967, 81–94 [= ders., Vom Sinai zum Zion. Alttestamentliche Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie (BEvTh 64), München 1974.^{3}1990, 49–62].

Giveon, R., Les bédouins Shosou des documents égyptiens (DMOA 122), Leiden 1971.

– Schasu, in: LÄ V (1984) 533–535.

36 H. Gese, Ἁγάρ, 91f.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Graupner, A., Der Elohist. Gegenwart und Wirksamkeit des transzendenten Gottes in der Geschichte (WMANT 97), Neukirchen-Vluyn 2002.
– Vom Sinai zum Horeb oder vom Horeb zum Sinai? Zur Intention der Doppelüberlieferung des Dekalogs, in: Verbindungslinien. FS W.H. Schmidt, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000, 85–101.
– Exodus 24 und die Frage nach dem Ursprung der Bundestheologie im Alten Testament mit einem Ausblick auf die Herrenmahlsüberlieferung im Neuen Testament, in: W. Kraus (Hg.), Beiträge zur urchristlichen Theologiegeschichte (BZNW 163), Berlin / New York 2009, 129–148.
Helck, W., Seᶜir, in: LÄ V (1984) 828f.
Hossfeld, F.-L., Der Dekalog (OBO 45), Freiburg (Schweiz) / Göttingen 1982.
Jaroš, K., Die Stellung des Elohisten zur kanaanäischen Religion (OBO 4), Freiburg (Schweiz) / Göttingen ²1982.
Jeremias, J., Theophanie. Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung (WMANT 10), Neukirchen-Vluyn ²1977.
– Die Anfänge der Schriftprophetie, in: ZThK 93 (1996) 481–499.
Keel, O., Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik und das Alte Testament. Am Beispiel der Psalmen, Darmstadt ³1984.
Knauf, E.A., Midian. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Palästinas und Nordarabiens am Ende des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. (ADPV), Wiesbaden 1988.
Leuenberger, M., Gott in Bewegung. Religions- und theologiegeschichtliche Beiträge zu Gottesvorstellungen im Alten Israel (FAT 76), Tübingen 2011.
Maiberger, P., Topographische und historische Untersuchungen zum Sinaiproblem. Worauf beruht die Identifizierung des Ǧabal Mūsār mit dem Sinai? (OBO 54), Freiburg (Schweiz) / Göttingen 1984.
– Art. סִינַי *sînaj*, in: ThWAT V (1986) 819–838.
Musil, R., (Vorbericht über seine jüngste Reise nach Arabien), in: AAWW.PH 48 (1911) 139–159.
– The Northern Ḥeğâz. A Topographical Itinerary (American Geographical Society. Oriental Explorations and Studies 1), New York 1926.
Neumann van Padang, M., Catalogue of the Active Volcanoes and Solfatara Fields of Arabia and the Indian Ocean (Catalogue of the Active Volcanoes of the World XVI), Rom 1963.
Noth, M., Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, Darmstadt ²1960.
– Das zweite Buch Mose. Exodus (ATD 5), Göttingen ⁶1978.
Oeming, M., Das Alte Testament als Buch der Kirche? Exegetische und hermeneutische Erwägungen am Beispiel der Erzählung von Elija am Horeb (I Kön 19), alttestamentlicher Predigttext am Sonntag Okkuli, in: ThZ 52 (1996) 299–325.
Oswald, W., Israel am Gottesberg. Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19–24 und deren historischem Hintergrund (OBO 159), Freiburg (Schweiz) / Göttingen 1998.
Perlitt, L., Sinai und Horeb, in: Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli, Göttingen 1972, 302–322.
Pfeiffer, H., Jahwes Kommen von Süden. Jdc 5; Hab 3; Dtn 33 und Ps 68 in ihrem literatur- und theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld (FRLANT 211), Göttingen 2005.
Rüterswörden, U., Deuteronomium (BK V/3,1), Neukirchen-Vluyn 2011.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Ruprecht, U., Stellung und Bedeutung der Erzählung vom Mannawunder (Ex 16) im Aufbau der Priesterschrift: ZAW 86 (1974) 269–307.

Schmidt, J.M., Erwägungen zum Verhältnis von Auszugs- und Sinaitradition, in: ZAW 82 (1970) 1–31.

Schmidt, W.H., Exodus, Sinai und Mose (EdF 191), Darmstadt ^{3}1995.

– Alttestamentlicher Glaube, Neukirchen-Vluyn ^{11}2011.

Staubli, T., Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn (OBO 107), Freiburg (Schweiz) / Göttingen 1991.

Vincent, J.M., Das Auge hört. Die Erfahrbarkeit Gottes im Alten Testament (BThSt 34), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1998.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Dominik Markl

Sinai: The Origin of Holiness and Revelation in Exodus, Deuteronomy, the Temple Scroll, and Jubilees

The theme of holy places explicitly comes on stage in the Pentateuch at Exodus 3, when God makes Moses aware at Horeb that he is standing on 'holy ground' (אדמת־קדשׁ; v5).[1] Sinai's holiness is most elaborately unfolded in Yhwh's great theophany and covenant with Israel (Exod 19–24). Since Yhwh's presence moves with Israel and the Ark of the Covenant from Sinai to Jerusalem, even Zion's holiness is portrayed as originating at Sinai. Sinai, therefore, is a pre-eminent and original place of holiness in the Bible.

At Sinai, Israel is to become a 'holy nation' (גוי קדושׁ, Exod 19:6). Israel's holiness is based on its obedience to God's voice and covenant from Sinai (Exod 19:5).[2] Its holiness, originality and antiquity give the highest authority to God's revelation at Sinai. Sinai's 'sacred' authority is, as usual, ambivalent. On the one hand, it grants a solid foundation for Israel's religious and legal identity that is founded in the 'utopian' realm of Sinai. On the other, it makes the challenge of legal reform difficult. 'What is your position on the Sinai Torah?' becomes the decisive question for anybody who claims to belong to 'Israel' as it is presented in the Pentateuch.

Sinai's hermeneutical role in early Jewish literature has attracted considerable interest in recent scholarship.[3] The inner-biblical relationship between Sinaitic law and Deuteronomy has triggered a discussion about legal hermeneutics in the Pentateuch.[4] Against the backdrop of these discussions, in this paper I will at-

1 Implicitly, the theme already appears in Gen 13:4; 22:3f, 9, 14; 28:11, 16f, 19; 32:31; 35:7, 13–15; on the use of 'place' (מקום) in cultic contexts see J. Gamberoni, Art. מָקוֹם, 532–544. – I wish to express my sincere gratitude to John Endres, S.J. and David Gill, S.J. (both Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley, CA) for their helpful comments on this paper.

2 Cf. B.M. Levinson, Covenant, 48–51.

3 See esp. H. Najman, Sinai; J.J. Collins, Changing; G.J. Brooke / H. Najman / L.T. Stuckenbruck, Significance; E. Otto, Rechtshermeneutik; idem, Scroll; S. Paganini, Rezeption; S.W. Crawford, Temple; eadem, Scripture; H. Debel, Anchoring; A. Feldman, Revelation; C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, 4Q374.

4 See, e.g., E. Otto, Deuteronomium, esp. 263–274; N. Lohfink, Prolegomena; D. Markl, Rechtshermeneutik; idem, Volk, esp. 297–300; idem, Words, 23f.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

tempt to show how both Jubilees and the Temple Scroll derive their authority from their reception of Exodus and Deuteronomy, if in clearly different ways. The article will unfold in three phases, moving from the staging of Sinai / Horeb as the origin of law in Exodus and Deuteronomy to hermeneutical transformations of its role in the Temple Scroll and Jubilees before arriving at a conclusion.

1. Sinai / Horeb as Origin of Holiness and Revelation in Exodus and Deuteronomy

In Exodus and Deuteronomy, Sinai and Horeb play a decisive role for each book's literary construction and legal hermeneutics. While Exodus presents Sinai as the scene of Israel's formation as God's holy nation, Deuteronomy is shaped as a re-enactment of the Horeb covenant, using this symbolic place as an authoritative basis, but in a subversive way. The following analysis presents essential aspects of the hermeneutical significance of Sinai / Horeb in Exodus and Deuteronomy respectively. Although these different conceptions originate in diachronic developments, they are brought together in a narrative rationale in the Pentateuch, from which starting point the Temple Scroll and Jubilees constructed their setting on Sinai.

1.1. Sinai as the Origin of Israel's Holiness in Exodus

The narrative of the first half of the book of Exodus (chaps. 1–18) moves geographically from Egypt to Sinai. Thus, Yhwh's speech summarizes on Israel's arrival at Sinai: 'You have seen what I did to Egypt, and how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself' (19:4).[5] The second half, Exod 19–40, is staged at Sinai. Yet, since the call of Moses in Exod 3–4 already takes place at the 'mountain of God',[6] Sinai is primarily introduced as the place of theophany that leads to Israel's rescue from Egypt. Not until Exod 19 does Sinai become the place of covenant, revelation and worship. The geographical staging of the mountain of God within the narrative of Exodus, therefore, prefigures the idea that is made explicit in the Prologue of the Decalogue. Just as the mountain is first the origin of

5 Yhwh's speech in Exod 19:3–6 is seen as a narrative focal point of the whole book: G. Fischer / D. Markl, Exodus, 212–213.

6 While the mountain is called 'Horeb' in Exod 3:1, the expression 'mountain of God' (הר־האלהים, Exod 3:1; 4:27; 18:5; 24:13) relates 'Horeb' closely with 'Mount Sinai' (Exod 19:11, 18, 20, 23; 24:16; 31:18; 34:4, 29, 32) and 'Mount Horeb' (Exod 33:6). For a synchronic analysis of the relationship between the two toponyms see B. Jacob, Buch, 1044–1050.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

liberation (Exod 3 f) and secondly the origin of Torah (Exod 20 to Num 11), the liberation from Egypt is the prerequisite and hermeneutical key to the law, which is to serve to protect freedom: 'I am Yhwh your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery' (Exod 20:2).[7]

Sinai's holiness is most elaborately expounded in Exod 19.[8] God commands Moses to set strict limits around the mountain (19:12 f), which is equivalent to sanctifying it (cf. וקדשתו, 19:23). Similarly, the people have to be sanctified in preparation for the theophany (וקדשתם, 19:10). Just as Sinai's sanctification resembles the sanctification of the people, the mountain's reaction before the theophany mirrors the people's reaction: 'and all the people trembled' (19:16); 'and all the mountain trembled' (19:18).[9] Sinai is thus portrayed as a cosmic counterpart of Israel's perception of the theophany. At the same time, the sight of the mountain's eruptions (20:18) is meant to shape Israel's religious and moral attitude: 'God has come to test you and to put the fear of him upon your faces so that you do not sin' (20:20).[10]

While the immediate experience of the Sinai theophany is meant to strengthen Israel's religious attitude, God's revelations from Sinai (20:1–17; 20:21–23:33) are to shape their moral behaviour. The Sinai theophany is the hermeneutical perspective and the emotional state in which the revelation is to be encountered and perceived. Within Exodus, further revelations are staged in much quieter scenes. Moses receives the laws of the Book of the Covenant in 'thick darkness' (20:21). And the appearance of God's glory on Mount Sinai, in which Moses is shown the vision of the sanctuary, is portrayed in mystical silence (Exod 24:15–18), which the people contemplate: 'Now the appearance of the glory of Yhwh was like a devouring fire on the top of the mountain in the sight of the people of Israel' (24:17).

It is in Sinai's atmosphere of holiness, where Israel is meant to become a 'holy nation' (גוי קדוש, 19:6). During 'forty days and forty nights on the mountain' (24:18), Moses is shown the sanctuary (Exod 25–31),[11] which is meant to accompany Israel as a 'Sinaitic' place of holiness towards the Promised Land. Indeed, Sinaitic stone is to form the centre of the Holy of Holies – the stone

7 C. Houtman, Exodus, 16 f.; D. Markl, Dekalog, 98–102 and 166.

8 For recent views on the diacrony of Exod 19–24 cf. W. Oswald, Lawgiving, 175–182.

9 Strictly parallel in the Hebrew wording: ויחרד כל־העם and ויחרד כל־ההר.

10 20:18 plays with the similar verbs 'to see' (ראה) and 'to fear' (ירא); this word play is transformed into 'his fear upon your faces' (יראתו על־פניכם) in 20:20.

11 The semantic field of holiness (the root קדש) appears in Exod 25–31; 35–40 more intensely than in any other part of the book. On the relationship between Exod 19:5 f and the sanctuary texts see D. Markl, Funktion, 61–65.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

tablets that are to be laid into the Ark of the Covenant (cf. Exod 24:12; 25:16, 21; 31:19; 40:20).[12]

However, Sinai's silence is disrupted by noise and shouting (32:17f), and the solemnly presented tablets (32:15f) are smashed by Moses' fury (32:19). Sinai is not only an utopian concept of an ideally constituted Israel as God's people (Exod 19–31),[13] it also becomes the scene of the paradigmatic sin with the Golden Calf and the struggle that leads to reconciliation (Exod 32–34), which is the prerequisite for finally building the sanctuary (Exod 35–40). When God fills the sanctuary with his glory (Exod 40:34), this is the starting point of his presence in fire and cloud 'in the sight of all the house of Israel in all their departures' (40:38) – the last words of Exodus. Thus, the vision of the glory of God on Sinai (24:17) is continued in the vision of his glory in the sanctuary (40:34–38).[14] Sinai becomes the origin of Israel's continued sanctification, which is mediated through the sanctuary, in which Yhwh's Sinaitic theophany and revelation is to accompany Israel into their future. His Sinaitic glory, finally, is destined to reappear at the inauguration of Solomon's temple (1 Kgs 8:10–11).[15]

Sinai, therefore, is a paradigmatic and symbolical starting point for the history of Israel as God's people. The mountain of God is a multi-layered symbol of the foundational experiences of Israel as the people of God – the place of the making, breaking and renewal of the covenant, the place of receiving Torah in awe-inspiring theophany – which is to shape Israel's ethical attitude and moral behaviour. Sinai's sanctity accompanies Israel through the desert in the sanctuary. Sinai is the holy place at which God wishes to shape Israel's holiness according to his own holiness: 'You shall be holy, for I, Yhwh your God, am holy' (Lev 19:2). Thus, the pre-priestly and the priestly traditions that are combined in the Sinai texts together portray Sinai as the political, legal and religious origin of Israel's unique constitution.

12 On the relationship between the 'tablets' (24:12; 31:18 etc.) and the 'testimony' (25:16, 21 etc.) and the structuring function of these motifs see D. Markl, Words, 18–19. On 'graded holiness' in the spatial dimension of the sanctuary see P.P. Jenson, Holiness, 89–114.

13 See D. Markl, Dekalog, 163–169.

14 Both passages are clearly linked with each other through the expressions 'glory' (כבוד, 24:16f; 40:34f), 'cloud' (ענן, 24:15f, 18; 40:34–38), 'to dwell' (שׁכן, 24:16; 40:35) and 'in the sight' of 'Israel' (לעיני + ישׂראל, 24:17; 40:38). On the wider context of the motif of God's shekinah see B. Janowski, Einwohnung, esp. 19–24; on its later history K. Bieberstein, Wanderung.

15 The priestly sanctuary is programmatically conceived as the origin of a cultic continuity that is maintained in both the pre- and the post-exilic temple of Jerusalem. Cf. D. Markl, Wilderness Sanctuary.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

1.2. Horeb as the Origin of Law in Deuteronomy

Deuteronomy's markedly different conception of the holy mountain is already apparent in its use of the toponym 'Horeb' instead of 'Sinai'.[16] Although Deuteronomy is staged forty years after Israel's departure from Horeb in the land of Moab (Deut 1:1–5), Horeb is a decisive geographical point of reference for its literary structure. Horeb appears at four starting points within Deuteronomy. It is used twice in introductions by the narrator (Deut 1:2; 28:69) and twice at the beginnings of Moses' longest speeches (1:6; 5:2). Moses introduces his first speech by saying: 'Yhwh our God spoke to us at Horeb, saying, "You have stayed long enough at this mountain"' (1:6). He thus introduces his retelling of the wilderness stories in Deut 1–3 in order to return to the theme of Horeb in Deut 4. And Moses begins his longest speech (Deut 5–26) with a programmatic reference to Horeb: 'Yhwh our God made a covenant with us at Horeb' (5:2). Finally, Moses refers to God's mountain using the name 'Sinai' (only once in Deut) at the beginning of the last speech of his life – his blessing: 'Yhwh came from Sinai, and dawned from Seir upon us; he shone forth from Mount Paran' (33:2). Thus, the events at the mountain of God form the starting point of four most significant literary sections of Deuteronomy (Deut 1–4; 5–26; 29f; 33).[17]

This observation shows on a structural level that Horeb is of the utmost conceptual significance for Deuteronomy as its fundamental geographical point of reference. In contrast to the priestly texts, Deuteronomy does not attribute the concept of holiness to Horeb, while the idea of Israel as a 'holy people' is emphasised (עם קדוש, Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21; 26:19; 28:9). Moses expounds the theophany and covenant at Horeb as Israel's foundational experience (4:9–20, 32–39; 5:2–31). Recalling the narrative of Exodus, Moses also reminds Israel of its paradigmatic sin at the mountain (Deut 9:1–10:11).[18] Not only is divine authority related to Horeb, but also Moses' authority (Deut 5:31) and even future prophetic

16 On the relationship between the two names see L. Perlitt, Sinai. Perlitt especially considers the possible avoidance of the name "Sinai" in Deuteronomy because of its closeness to the name of the moon god Sîn, which could have become problematic because of its role in Neo-assyrian succession treaties or during the Babylonian exile (ibid. 39–40).

17 These four speeches are accentuated by formal introductions (1:1–5; 4:44–5:1a; 28:69–29:1a; 33:1–2a), which have been described as a 'system of headings'. Cf. N. Lohfink, Absageformel, 49–77. For a critical review of this theory and an alternative interpretation of the function of these introductions see D. Markl, Volk, 19–24; on frameworks in the structure of Deut compare idem, Frameworks, 271–283.

18 On Horeb as a place of divine presence see M. Geiger, Gottesräume, 295–298. Israel's sin at Horeb foreshadows their future breaking of the covenant, which the connections between 9:1–10:11 and 31:24–29 make clear: J.-P. Sonnet, Book, 165, 168–170; G. Braulik, Deuteronomium 4; D. Markl, Volk, 202–205. On the relationship between Exod 32–34 and Deut 9:1–10:11 see N. Lohfink, Deuteronomium.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

mission originates there – unfolded at a structurally central point of the Deuteronomic legislation (18:15–18).[19]

Moreover, Deuteronomy as a whole can be seen as a transformed re-enactment of the Sinai covenant.[20] Firstly, Moses sets the 'historical' (Deut 1–3) and theological (4:1–40) stage for this re-enactment.[21] Secondly, he declares the Horeb covenant valid for 'today,' for the new generation (5:2f); he quotes the Decalogue in a modified form (5:6–21) and presents the Horeb theophany (5:22–31) as the origin of his following exposition of 'the commandment, the statutes and the ordinances' (Deut 6–26).[22] Thirdly, Deut 28:69 introduces Moses' speech in Deut 29f as a covenant 'in addition to the covenant that he had made with them at Horeb.'

Regarding the hermeneutics of Torah in Deuteronomy, it is most significant that Moses claims that his exposition of Deut 6–26 is rooted in God's revelation at Horeb (compare 'the commandment, the statutes and the ordinances' in Deut 5:31; 6:1). By avoiding any reference to the Book of the Covenant, Moses' teaching in Deut 6–26 *de facto* replaces it.[23] Therefore, Deuteronomy assumes the authority of Horeb in a subversive way. It claims to present an authentic rendering of God's Torah from Horeb, whereas it neglects and revises the Book of the Covenant, which readers of the canonical Pentateuch must understand as the 'original' law from Sinai.

Thus, Deuteronomy sets a precedent for further hermeneutical developments that will be seen in the Temple Scroll and Jubilees. For the analysis of these writings it is important to note that Deuteronomy, according to its own self-presentation, goes beyond the revelation from Horeb. Deuteronomy does not claim that Moses' speeches of Deut 27f; 29f originate in God's communication at Horeb. Most significantly, Yhwh reveals to Moses Israel's future breaking of the covenant in a new theophany (Deut 31:16–21), which is to be communicated to Israel through the Song in Deut 32. The following analysis will show that the Temple Scroll and Jubilees both integrate ideas that originate in Deuteronomy, yet, in clearly distinct ways.

19 Cf. D. Markl, Moses Prophetenrolle.

20 See D. Markl, Volk, esp. 123–125; idem, God's Covenants.

21 Cf. G. Braulik, Deuteronomium 1–4.

22 Cf. D. Markl, Dekalog, 249–251; idem, Words, 19–21. This concept is prefigured *in nuce* already in Deut 4:9–14.

23 Within the conception of Deuteronomy itself, the Book of the Covenant is replaced. For a wider discussion of their hermeneutical relationship see J.J. Collins, Changing, 38f.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

2. Rewriting God's Torah from Sinai in the Temple Scroll and Jubilees

The Pentateuch was redacted in Persian times to provide a foundational document for what was emerging as early Judaism,[24] and it gained a highly authoritative role in Hellenistic times.[25] The Dead Sea Scrolls bear witness to the importance that was attributed to both Sinai and Deuteronomy for the sectarian communities. It is widely recognised that Deuteronomy, alongside the Psalms, is the most intensely copied, rewritten and received book in Qumran.[26]

It may be less commonly recognised how intensely the sectarian community conceived itself as God's people founded at Sinai.[27] The community rule shows that the Qumran-*yahad* was 'modelling itself after the Israel of the wilderness period, and more particularly after the likeness of Israel as it encamped at the foot of Mount Sinai, with Exodus 19–20 and 24 being the key scriptural foundations.'[28] They most probably celebrated their covenant renewal at the reconstructed date of the Sinai covenant during the Festival of Weeks.[29] They probably derived their name '*yahad*' from Exod 19:8 (יחדו, 'together, as one').[30] And their idealistic organisation in 'thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens' probably originates in Exod 18.[31]

Against this backdrop it is not surprising that in both the Temple Scroll and Jubilees, which are closely related to the *yahad*,[32] Sinai and Deuteronomy play a significant role. The following observations will show that the legal hermeneutics of the Pentateuch was treated by their authors in a sophisticated way.[33]

24 D. Markl, Volk, 291–303.
25 See, e.g., J.L. Ska, Writing.
26 See esp. U. Dahmen, Deuteronomium; S.W. Crawford, Deuteronomy; J.A. Duncan, Deuteronomy.
27 See J.C. VanderKam, Sinai; D.C. Timmer, Sinai; M. Tso, Giving, 122–126. An early contribution on this theme was O. Betz, Interpretation. The orientation of the sectarian scrolls of Qumran towards Zion is accentuated by G. Brooke, Moving.
28 J.C. VanderKam, Sinai, 48.
29 J.C. VanderKam, Sinai, 48–51. On the Sinai Covenant in Qumran see L.H. Schiffman, Concept, esp. 243–247.
30 J.C. VanderKam, Sinai, 51f.
31 J.C. VanderKam, Sinai, 56.
32 While Jubilees is not secterian, it clearly belongs to the pre-history of the Qumran community: M. Knibb, Jubilees.
33 On 'Torah' in Qumran see G.J. Brooke, Torah; H.-J., Fabry, Umgang.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

2.1. The Temple Scroll – a 'More Original' Version of Moses' Rendering of Torah from Horeb

The whole extant text of the Temple Scroll (TS) is a speech of God. Since about one column at the beginning and one at the very end of the scroll are not preserved,[34] its narrative setting is lost. Yet, it is possible to reconstruct that setting as a divine speech conveyed to Moses at Sinai, for two reasons. Firstly, 11Q19 51,6f reads in a parenthetical clause: 'which I tell you on this mountain' (אשר אני מגיד לכה בהר הזה).[35] And secondly, col. 2 begins with a passage from Exod 34, which underlines that its starting point is at Sinai.[36]

While it is clear that the whole divine speech of TS is staged at Sinai, the speech not only presents revelations 'from Sinai' related to the sanctuary, but also material from the Deuteronomic law. The final portion of the text (TS 48–66) contains rewritten material from Deut 12–25. The main tendencies of the rewriting are harmonisation with other legal corpora of the Torah and clarification of imprecise regulations.[37] The first person singular pronoun (אנכי), which Moses frequently uses in his speeches in Deuteronomy, now refers to God himself.[38]

TS's relationship with Deuteronomy is ambivalent. On the one hand, it presupposes and uses Deuteronomy's authority. On the other hand, it undermines it.[39] Yet, TS undermines Deuteronomy's authority in a way that does not necessarily contradict the Pentateuch's inner legal hermeneutics.[40] As Moses claims in Deuteronomy that his teaching is based on the revelation from Sinai, the Sinaitic setting of TS within the framework of Exodus allows it to give a 'more original' version of God's revelation than Deuteronomy (which presents 'just' Moses' retelling of it). Therefore, despite rewriting Deuteronomy, TS respects the Pentateuch's concept of revelation.[41] Indeed, it claims no less and no more than

34 On the state of preservation see the *editio princeps* by Y. Yadin, Scroll, esp. 1:5 and 2:1; E. Qimron, Scroll, 1–8, does not further explore the issue of the lost beginning and end. On the scroll's dating see B.A. Levine, Scroll.

35 Another explicit reference to Sinai (and eventually to Moses) should be expected in col. LXI, the passage that rewrote the content of Deut 18:14–22. However, the decisive passage is not preserved. Compare Y. Yadin, Scroll, 2:275f.

36 E. Otto, Scroll, 62, suggests that the theophany of Exod 34 was precisely the narrative situation into which the divine speech of TS is spoken. However, it cannot be ruled out that another moment in the Sinai theophanies, such as Exod 19 or Exod 24, formed the narrative starting point, into which the diverse content of the divine speeches was embedded.

37 S. Paganini, Rezeption, esp. 279–296; B.M. Levinson, *Torah, esp. 19–34;* on harmonisation in TS see also M.J. Bernstein / S.A. Koyfman, Interpretation, 68–70.

38 Cf. D. Markl, אנוכי, 240f.

39 See M.M. Zahn, Voices; S. Paganini, Gesetz, 259–262.

40 See E. Otto, Scroll.

41 This hermeneutical process has recently been described by R.G. Kratz, Law, 119: 'The Temple Scroll understands itself as part of the Torah outside the Torah.' Thus, 'the Temple

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

to have immediate knowledge of God's direct revelation at Sinai that Moses interprets freely in Deuteronomy.

2.2. Jubilees – Revelations from Deuteronomy Transferred to Sinai

The book of Jubilees (Jub),[42] just like TS, mainly consists of revelation conveyed to Moses on Mount Sinai.[43] More precisely, Jub is set within Moses' first sojourn on Mount Sinai for forty days and nights, as recounted in Exod 24:12–18.[44] This passage is referred to in the prologue and in Jub 1:1–4 (for the following comparisons see below the appendix of this article). God tells Moses to come to the mountain (Jub 1:1), precisely according to Exod 24:12: 'Come up to me on the mountain. I will give you the two stone tablets of the law and the commandments which I have written so that you may teach them.' A 'trigger for adopting a setting modeled after Exod 24 might have been that Exod 24:12 apparently suggests that Moses was given more laws than merely the ten commandments'.[45]

Sinai, upon which Jub is staged, plays a prominent role in the book's idea of holy places.[46] Sinai is one of 'four places on earth that belong to the Lord', together with the Garden of Eden, the mountain of the east and Mount Zion (4:26).[47] Moreover, Eden, Zion and Sinai form a triad of holy places (Jub 8:19).

Scroll … continues the literary and conceptual development of law and narrative in Deuteronomy more or less consistently' (ibid. 121).

42 Only a small percentage of the Hebrew text of Jub can be reconstructed from the fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls – they contain words or letters from 215 of the 1307 verses of the book. However, the extant Hebrew text shows that the Ethiopic translation, in which the complete text is preserved, is surprisingly accurate. The following textual comparisons are based on the translation of J.C. VanderKam (ed.), Book. The Hebrew text is used wherever it is preserved. For the textual history of Jub see J.C. VanderKam, Book, 13–17. The fragments of the Hebrew text of Jub, which were published in several volumes of DSD, are compiled in J. Stökl, List. On Jub 1 see G. Brooke, Strategies; J.C.VanderKam, Studies; idem, Setting.

43 While clearly drawing its own authority from this setting, Jub can be understood as an interpretative book that 'may enhance the authority of Scripture by demonstrating how its inspired retelling of the first law can address people of a different era': J.C. Endres, Scriptural Authority, 188. At the same time, it is true that '*Jubilees* suggests that even as a book of law the Torah has limitations. Not only had other books already revealed some of its contents (the same is true for *Jubilees* itself), but there are laws engraved on the heavenly tablets that are not to be found in the Torah': M. Himmelfarb, Torah, 58.

44 On the narrative setting compared to Exod 24 cf. B. Halpern-Amaru, Perspective, 14–19; L. Doering, Reception, 486–490; J. van Ruiten, Rewriting.

45 L. Doering, Reception, 488; cf. J.L. Kugel, Walk, 19f.

46 J.C. VanderKam, Studies, 267: 'The author does not allow readers to forget the Sinaitic setting; on the contrary, he has inserted periodic reminders throughout (e. g. 2:26, 29; 6:11, 13, 19, 20, 32; etc.) so that it is never far from mind.'

47 On the passage and its connection with Isa 65 see J.M. Scott, Earth, 124f. and 186; on the holy mountains in Jub J. Frey, Weltbild, esp. 272f.; A. Geist / J.C. VanderKam, Four Places.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

While the covenant from Mount Sinai concerns Israel (Jub 1:5), 'Mount Zion will be sanctified in the new creation for the sanctification of the whole earth' (Jub 4:26). What Moses is to write on the holy mountain is meant to make Israel a holy people (33:18–20).[48] Thus, Sinai's holiness is, as in Exodus, clearly linked with the idea of Israel's sanctification.

The greatest portion of the book (Jub 2–50) presents a rewriting of Gen 1 to Exod 19, from creation to the theophany at Sinai, enriched with Halachic contents.[49] According to the narrative introduction of Jub 1:27–2:1, it is the angel of the presence who dictates to Moses the revelation inscribed on the heavenly tablets.[50] The only direct speeches of God appear in the opening narrative of Jub 1. After the scene of Moses' ascent (Jub 1:1–4) there follows a dialogue between God and Moses, including two speeches of God (Jub 1:5–16, 22–26) and one speech of Moses (Jub 1:19–21).[51]

God commands Moses to write the revelations of Jub as a message for future generations of Israel, as a witness for God's justice and Israel's sin (Jub 1:5–16). The main idea of this speech derives from Deut 31:16–21.[52] Just as God commissions Moses there to write down the Song (Deut 32:1–43) as a witness against Israel in the future, God commissions Moses in Jub 1 to write down the revelation of Jub for the same purpose.[53] In order to underline this message, the divine speeches in Jub 1:5–18, 22–26 employ several allusions to God's theophany in Deut 31:16–21. Furthermore, they integrate and slightly reword specific formulations concerning Israel's future from Deut 4:25–31; 28; 30:1–10.

The following table shows a selection of the most striking parallels:

48 The promise of Exod 19:5–6, that Israel shall become God's special possession, a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, is first integrated into God's promise to Abraham in Jub 16:18. Also Isaac's blessing for Jacob contains the idea of the holy people (Jub 22:12). However, only through the revelation to Moses on Mount Sinai, this idea can be fulfilled (Jub 33:18–20).

49 Cf., e.g., J.C.VanderKam, Exegesis.

50 These tablets are not identical with the tablets of the Decalogue: F. García Martínez, Tablets. On the role of angels in Jub see H. Najman, Angels.

51 On Moses' intercession and an analysis of his role in Jub compared to his portrayal in the Pentateuch see D. Markl, Moses in the Book of Jubilees.

52 Cf. O.H. Steck, Zeugen, 458.

53 B.Z. Wacholder, Jubilees, esp. 205, makes the most of the double account of Moses' handing over the Torah first to the Levitical priests and the elders (Deut 31:9) and then, after the addition of the Song, to the Levites (Deut 31:25–26). According to Wacholder, Jubilees interprets the first as the public 'Torah-Commandment' (the official Torah), while the second stored and hidden 'Torah-Admonition' is represented by Jubilees. This is a possible, but not an inevitable, interpretation of Jubilees' hermeneutical procedure.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Jubilees		Deuteronomy	
1:6	When *all these things befall* them בבוא עליהם כל הדברים	When *all these things* will *befall* you כי־יבאו עליך כל־הדברים האלה	30:1
1:7	Now you *write down* this entire message which I am telling you today, *because I know* their defiance and their stubbornness even *before I have brought them to the land which I have promised*	And now, *write down* this poem and teach it to the children of Israel … *because I know* what they are inclined to do even now, *before I have brought them into the land which I have promised them.*	31:19 31:21
1:7 1:8	by oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: 'To your posterity I will give the *land flowing with milk and honey*'. When *they eat and are full* ואכלו ושׂבעו, they will *turn to other gods*, אחר אלהים אחר[ים]	When I bring them into the *land flowing with milk and honey* that I promised on oath to their fathers, and *he eats and will be full* ואכל ושׂבע *and grow fat* and *turn to other gods* אל־אלהים אחרים	31:20
1:8	to ones which will not save them from any of their afflictions. Then this testimony[54] will serve as evidence.	And when many terrible afflictions come upon them, this song will confront them as a witness.	31:21
1:13	*I will hide my face* from them. אסתי[ר פנ]י מהם	And I, *I will* certainly *hide my face.* ואנכי הסתר אסתיר פני	31:18
1:13	I will remove them *from the land* and *disperse* them *among the nations.* אפיצם בכל הגוי[ם]	You will soon utterly perish *from the land* … Yhwh will *disperse* you *among the peoples.* והפיץ יהוה אתכם בעמים	4:26 4:27
1:15	After this they *will return* to me from among the nations *with all* their *minds, all* their *souls*, and all their strength.	Because you *will return* to Yhwh your God *with all* your *heart and with all* your *soul.*	30:10
1:15	I *will gather* them *from all the nations.* מתוך הגוי[ם]	He *will gather* you *from all the peoples…* מכל־העמים	30:3
1:15	They will *search for* me so that I may be *found* by them when they have *searched for me with all* their *minds and with all* their *souls.*	From there you will *seek* Yhwh your God, and you will *find* him if you *search after him with all* your *heart and with all* your *soul.*	4:29
1:16	They will become *the head, not the tail.*	Yhwh will make you *the head, not the tail.*	28:13
1:22	*I know* their contrary nature, *their way of thinking*, and their *stubbornness*	*I know their way of thinking* … *I know* your *stubbornness* and your stiff neck.	31:21 31:27
1:23	I will cut away the foreskins of their minds.	Yhwh your God will circumcise your heart.	30:6

54 On the meaning of 'testimony' (תעודה) in Jub see J.C. VanderKam, Studies, 269–273.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Jub draws on very specific ideas and formulations from Deut, which must ring in the ears of every reader who is well acquainted with the book.[55] The divine speech starts from the problem of Israel's future breaking of the covenant (Jub 1:5; compare Deut 31:20). The very purpose of God's revelation to Moses is to prove God's faithfulness through the written message of Jub. Jub 1:7f unfolds this idea, rearranging the awkward sequence of ideas in Deut 31:19–21. Several further allusions to decisive passages of Moses' speeches about Israel's future (from Deut 4:26f, 29; 28:13; 30:1, 3, 6, 10) adapt Moses' direct address to Israel about God ('he – you') to God's private revelation to Moses about Israel ('I – they').

Jub 1:7–18 basically outlines Israel's future according to Deut's scheme: its breaking of the covenant; its loss of the land and dispersion among the nations; its repentance[56] among the nations; and its re-gathering from the nations by God. While many details are freely added, the allusions to Deut 4:26–29; 30:1–10 are integrated where they fit the chronological sequence. God's reaction to Israel's sin is interpreted as 'hiding the face' according to Deut 31:17f; 32:20. However, Jub 1:18 claims that God would not abandon Israel, thus contradicting Deut 31:17.

Moses' intercession (Jub 1:19–21) triggers God's answer (1:22–26). God assures Moses of Israel's stubborn nature (Jub 1:22) in accordance with the divine speech in Deut 31:21 and Moses' reflection in Deut 31:27. However, God concedes the circumcision of Israel's mind (Jub 1:23), an idea which originates in Moses' speech of Deut 30:6,[57] combining it with the motif of the gift of a holy spirit (Ps 51:12f).

The narrative and conceptual staging of Jub, which sets the hermeneutical perspective for the whole revelation, therefore, combines the scene of Exod 24 within the first stages of the Sinai theophany with the last theophany of the Pentateuch, that is the dramatic message of Deut 31. According to Jub, knowledge about Israel's entire future was revealed to Moses already on Sinai. Jub may claim, within the framework of the Pentateuch's portrayal of revelation, that Moses' references to Israel's future in Deut 4; 28; 30 originate in the revelation given to him on Mount Sinai, which Jub unfolds more openly.

However, the theophany of Deut 31:16–21 and the Song of Moses (Deut 32:1–43) are, within the Pentateuch, presented as a new and surprising revelation in Moab. Although Moses already refers to Israel's future earlier in the book (esp.

55 Some wordings of the Hebrew original may have been even closer to Deut than can be proved from the Ethiopic version.

56 It is important to note, as D. Lambert has pointed out, that Israel's repentance is thought of as a result of double – divine and human – agency, since Jub 1:23 draws on the idea of God's circumcision of the heart from Deut 30:6. Cf. D. Lambert, Israel, esp. 637–639.

57 On the importance of the circumcision of the heart for the covenant theology of the Pentateuch see E. Ehrenreich, Leben, 183 and 196f.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Deut 4; 28–30), these speeches are all designed in a parenetical mode and introduced by clauses which indicate that Israel's future depends on its own behaviour.[58] Only God's renewed theophany in Deut 31 reveals the certainty of Israel's future sin ('I know,' Deut 31:21, 27, 29). Therefore, Jub's concept of revelation is not entirely reconcilable with the self-presentation of Deuteronomy within the Pentateuch.[59] Jub, therefore shows considerably greater creative freedom in its assumption of revelatory authority than TS.

3. Conclusions: Sinai as the Holy Origin of Revelation and Sanctification

The conclusions that can be drawn from the foregoing observations are twofold. They concern both the concept of the holiness of Sinai as related to the sanctification of Israel, and Sinai's hermeneutical role for the medium of Israel's sanctification – God's revelation of Torah.

Exodus explicitly presents Sinai as a holy space of theophany (Exod 3:5; 19:23). In the decisive theophany of Exod 19 f, Sinai is portrayed as a cosmic counterpart of Israel (Exod 19:16, 18), which is to teach Israel fear of God (Exod 20:20). Sinaitic revelation serves Israel's sanctification (Exod 19:5 f) and Sinaitic holiness accompanies Israel on its way to the Promised Land in the form of the sanctuary. Deut does not draw on Horeb's sanctity, but Moses warns the people not to forget their awareness of the Horeb experience (Deut 4; 5). While the decisive passages of the Temple Scroll, which contained its concept of Sinai, are not preserved, Jubilees conveys a clear understanding of Sinai as a holy place at which Israel's sanctification originates.

The symbolic hermeneutical significance of Sinai that is developed in Exodus, appears in Deuteronomy as a foundational point of reference. Yet Deuteronomy rewrites Sinaitic Torah as Moses' teaching of Torah in its specific rhetorical style. Deuteronomy avoids any reference to the Book of the Covenant (Exod 20:22–23:33) and its commandments (Deut 6–26) de facto replace the Book of the Covenant.

Both the Temple Scroll and Jubilees combine the authority of Sinai with that of Deuteronomy. Yet, their hermeneutical approaches are different.[60] The Temple

58 Compare 'if' (כי) in Deut 4:25; 'if' (אם) in 28:1, 15 and 'lest' (פן) in 29:17.

59 For a reconstruction of the hermeneutical procedure which the author of Jub undertook see J.C. VanderKam, Moses. Ibid., 28: The author 'neither ignored the Pentateuch nor tried to replace it. Rather, he worked with it and with the other traditional literature to convey the truth about them as he understood it.'

60 In addition, both documents share similar halakhic material: S.W. Crawford, Scroll, 78; on the relationship between the two texts see L.H. Schiffman, Jubilees. On the historical context

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Scroll claims to present a more authentic version of Deuteronomic law within the framework of the legal hermeneutics of the Pentateuch. Jubilees, however, clearly goes beyond the self-presentation of Deuteronomy within the Pentateuch. It integrates the theophany of Deut 31:16–21 into the divine speech to Moses on Sinai, which is hardly reconcilable with the self-presentation of Deut 31 within the Pentateuch. Jub's claims of intimate knowledge of Moses' experience of revelation on Mount Sinai are far more audacious than those of the Temple Scroll.

As Sinai is introduced as the origin of Torah in Exodus and diachronically transformed by both the priestly and the deuteronomistic traditions, further developments and rewritings of Torah in Early Jewish and Rabbinic literature go back to Sinai as their hermeneutical point of reference.[61] The tensions and developments that are already visible within the Pentateuch are thus ambivalently both harmonized and complicated even more by their transformations in the Temple Scroll and Jubilees.[62] Sinai did not become irrelevant to Christianity, but attracted fascination as the place of Moses' encounter with God in monastic mysticism.[63] Sinai, therefore, became, for both Judaism and Christianity, a symbol of the origin of sanctification through the encounter with God.

Appendix: The Narrative Staging of Jubilees

The following rendering of the prologue of Jub and parts of Jub 1 uses the translation by J.C.VanderKam (CSCO 511). The additions in square brackets refer to prominent Biblical pre-texts.

These are the words [cf. Deut 1:1] regarding the divisions of the times of the law and of the testimony, of the events of the years, of the weeks of their jubilees throughout all the years of eternity as he related (them) to Moses on Mt. Sinai when he went up to receive the stone tablets – the law and the commandments – on the Lord's orders as he had told him that he should come up to the summit of the mountain [cf. Exod 24:12–15].

(1:1) During the first year of the Israelites' exodus from Egypt, in the third month – on the sixteenth of the month [cf. Exod 19:1] – the Lord said to Moses: "Come up to me on the mountain. I will give you the two stone tablets of the law and the commandments which I have written so that you may teach them"

of both documents in the 2nd c. BCE and the rise of sectarianism in the Hasmonean period see J.J. Collins, Transformation.

61 See, e.g., J.C. VanderKam, Studies, 271–273.

62 Cf., reflecting on P, H. Debel, Revelations, esp. 488–492.

63 S. Heid, Sinai.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

[← Exod 24:12]. (2) So Moses went up the mountain of the Lord. The glory of the Lord took up residence on Mt. Sinai, and a cloud covered it for six days. (3) When he summoned Moses into the cloud on the seventh day, he saw the glory of the Lord like a fire blazing on the summit of the mountain. (4) Moses remained on the mountain for 40 days and 40 nights [cf. Exod 24:15–18] while the Lord showed him what (had happened) beforehand as well as what was to come. He related to him the divisions of all the times – both of the law and of the testimony.

(5) He said to him: "Pay attention to all the words which I tell you on this mountain. Write (them) [cf. Deut 31:19] in a book so that their offspring may see that I have not abandoned them because of all the evil they have done in straying from the covenant between me and you which I am making today on Mt. Sinai for their offspring. (6) So it will be that when all of these things befall them [← Deut 30:1] they will recognize that I have been more faithful than they in all their judgments and in all their actions. They will recognize that I have indeed been with them [cf. Deut 31:17]. (7) Now you write this entire message which I am telling you today, because I know their defiance and their stubbornness (even) before I bring them into the land which I promised by oath [← Deut 31:19, 21] to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: 'To your posterity I will give the land which flows with milk and honey'. When they eat and are full, (8) they will turn to foreign gods [← Deut 31:20] – to ones which will not save them from any of their afflictions. Then this testimony will serve as evidence [← Deut 31:19, 21].

[1:9–12 Israel's future sin] (13) Then I will hide my face from them [← Deut 31:18]. I will deliver them into the control of the nations for captivity, for booty, and for being devoured. I will remove them from the land and disperse them among the nations [← Deut 4:26f]. (14) They will forget all my law, all my commandments, and all my verdicts. They will err regarding the beginning of the month, the sabbath, the festival, the jubilee, and the decree. (15) After this they will return to me from among the nations with all their minds, all their souls [← Deut 30:10], and all their strength. Then I will gather them from among all the nations [← Deut 30:3], and they will search for me so that I may be found by them when they have searched for me with all their minds and with all their souls [← Deut 4:29]. I will rightly disclose to them abundant peace. (16) I will transform them into a righteous plant with all my mind and with all my soul. They will become a blessing, not a curse; they will become the head, not the tail [← Deut 28:13]. (17) I will build my temple among them and will live with them; I will become their God and they will become my true and righteous people. (18) I will neither abandon them [cf. Deut 31:6, 17!] nor become alienated from them, for I am the Lord their God."

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

1:19–21: Moses' intercession on behalf of the people
(22) Then the Lord said to Moses: "I know their contrary nature, their way of thinking, and their stubbornness [← Deut 31:21, 27]. They will not listen until they acknowledge their sins and the sins of their ancestors. (23) After this they will return to me in a fully upright manner and with all (their) minds and all (their) souls. I will cut away the foreskins of their minds and the foreskins of their descendents' minds [← Deut 30:6]. I will create a holy spirit for them [← Ps 51:12 f] and will purify them in order that they may not turn away from me from that time forever. (24) Their souls will adhere to me and to all my commandments. They will perform my commandments. I will become their father and they will become my children. (25) All of them will be called children of the living God. Every angel and every spirit will know them. They will know that they are my children and that I am their father in a just and proper way and that I love them. (26) Now you write all these words which I will tell you on this mountain [← cf. Exod 24:12 ff; Deut 31:19] what is first and what is last and what is to come during all the divisions of time which are in the law and which are in the testimony and in the weeks of their jubilees until eternity – until the time when I descend and live with them throughout all the ages of eternity."

1:27–2:1: The angel of the presence is summoned and starts to dictate.

Bibliography

Bernstein, M.J. / Koyfman, S.A., The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Forms and Methods, in: M. Henze (ed.), Biblical Interpretation at Qumran (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature), Grand Rapids 2005, 61–87.

Betz, O., The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament, in: idem, Jesus. Der Herr der Kirche. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie II (WUNT 52), Tübingen 1990, 66–90 [cf. Revue de Qumran 6 (1967) 89–108].

Bieberstein, K., Die Wanderung der Wohnungen Gottes. Vom Sinai zur Westmauer in Jerusalem, in: S. Wimmer / G. Gafus (eds.), "Vom Leben umfangen". Ägypten, das Alte Testament und das Gespräch der Religionen. Gedenkschrift für Manfred Görg (ÄAT 80), Münster 2014, 13–26.

Braulik, G., Deuteronomium 1–4 als Sprechakt, in: idem, Studien zu den Methoden der Deuteronomiumsexegese (SBAB 42), Stuttgart 2006, 39–48 [= Bib 83 (2002) 249–257].

– Deuteronomium 4 und das gegossene Kalb, in: J. Pakkala / M. Nissinen (eds.), Houses Full of All Good Things. Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola (SESJ 95), Göttingen / Helsinki 2008, 11–26.

Brooke, G.J., Exegetical Strategies in Jubilees 1–2. New Light from 4QJubilees[a], in: M. Albani / J. Frey / A. Lange (eds.), Studies in the Book of Jubilees (TSAJ 65), Tübingen 1997, 39–57.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

– Moving Mountains. From Sinai to Jerusalem, in: G.J. Brooke / H. Najman / L.T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity (Themes in Biblical Narrative 12), Leiden 2008, 73–89.
– Torah in the Qumran Scrolls, in: H. Merklein et al. (eds.), Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition. FS J. Maier (BBB 88), Frankfurt a.M. 1993, 97–120.

Brooke, G.J / Najman, H. / Stuckenbruck, L.T. (eds.), The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity (Themes in Biblical Narrative 12), Leiden 2008.

Collins, J.J., Changing Scripture, in: idem, Scriptures and Sectarianism. Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls (WUNT 332), Tübingen 2014, 35–50 [= H. von Weissenberg / J. Pakkala / M. Marttila (eds.), Changes in Scripture. Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period (BZAW 419), Berlin 2011, 23–45].
– The Transformation of the Torah in Second Temple Judaism, in: idem, Scriptures and Sectarianism. Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls (WUNT 332), Tübingen 2014, 19–34 [= JSJ 43 (2012) 455–474].

Crawford, S.W., Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period, in: K. de Troyer / A. Lange (eds.), Reading the Present in the Qumran Library. The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations, Leiden 2005, 127–140.
– Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature), Grand Rapids 2008.
– The Temple Scroll and Related Texts (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 2), Sheffield 2000.

Dahmen, U., Das Deuteronomium in Qumran als umgeschriebene Bibel, in: G. Braulik (ed.), Das Deuteronomium (ÖBS 23); Frankfurt a.M., 2003, 269–309.

Debel, H., Anchoring Revelations in the Authority of Sinai: A Comparison of the Rewritings of "Scripture" in *Jubilees* and in the P stratum of Exodus, in: JSJ 45 (2014) 471–492.

Doering, L., The Reception of the Book of Exodus in the *Book of Jubilees*, in: T.B. Dozeman / C.A. Evans / J.N. Lohr (eds.), The Book of Exodus. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation (VT.S 164), Leiden 2014, 485–510.

Duncan, J.A., Art. "Deuteronomy, Book of", in: L.H. Schiffman / J.C. VanderKam (eds.), Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1 (2000) 198–202.

Ehrenreich, E., Wähle das Leben! Deuteronomium 30 als hermeneutischer Schlüssel zur Tora (BZAR 14), Wiesbaden 2011.

Endres, J.C., Scriptural Authority in the Book of Jubilees, in: I. Kalimi, T. Nicklas and G.G. Xeravits (eds.), Scriptural Authority in Early Judaism and Ancient Christianity (DCLS 16), Berlin 2013, 185–205.

Fabry, H.-J., Der Umgang mit der kanonisierten Tora in Qumran, in: E. Zenger (ed.), Die Tora als Kanon für Juden und Christen (HBS 19), Freiburg i.Brsg. 2006, 293–327.

Feldman, A., The Sinai Revelation according to 4Q377 (Apocryphal Pentateuch B), in: DSD 18 (2011) 155–172.

Fischer, G. / Markl, D., Das Buch Exodus (NSK.AT 2), Stuttgart 2009.

Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T., 4Q374. A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition. The Deification of Moses and Early Christology, in: DSD 3 (1996) 236–252.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Frey, J., Zum Weltbild im Jubiläenbuch, in: M. Albani / J. Frey / A. Lange (eds.), Studies in the Book of Jubilees (TSAJ 65) Tübingen 1997, 261–292.

Gamberoni, J., Art. מָקוֹם *māqôm*, in: TDOT 8 (1997) 532–544.

García Martínez, F., The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees, in: M. Albani / J. Frey / A. Lange (eds.), Studies in the Book of Jubilees (TSAJ 65), Tübingen 1997, 243–260.

Geiger, M., Gottesräume. Die literarische und theologische Konzeption von Raum im Deuteronomium (BWANT 183), Stuttgart 2010.

Geist, A. / VanderKam, J.C., The Four Places That Belong to the Lord (Jubilees 4.26), in: *JSPE* 22 (2012) 146–162.

Halpern-Amaru, B., The Perspective from Mt. Sinai: The Book of Jubilees and Exodus (JAJ.S 21), Göttingen 2015.

Heid, S., Der Sinai – Berg der Gottesschau in frühkirchlicher Tradition, in: Rivista di archeologia cristiana 79 (2003) 313–358.

Himmelfarb, M., Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets: The Claim to Authority of the *Book of Jubilees*, in: eadem, Between Temple and Torah. Essays on Priests, Scribes, and Visionaries in the Second Temple Period and Beyond (TSAJ 151, Tübingen 2013, 49–59 [repr. from B.G. Wright (ed.), A Multiform Heritage: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft, Atlanta 1999, 19–30].

Houtman, C., Exodus. Vol. 3. Chapters 20–40 (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament), Leuven 2000.

Jacob, B., Das Buch Exodus, ed. S. Mayer, Stuttgart 1997.

Janowski, B., Die Einwohnung Gottes in Israel. Eine religions- und theologiegeschichtliche Skizze zur biblischen *Schekina*-Theologie, in: idem / E. E. Popkes (eds.), Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Gottes. Zur Schechina-Vorstellung in Judentum und Christentum (WUNT 318), Tübingen 2014, 3–40.

Jenson, P.P., Graded Holiness. A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World (JSOT.S 106), Sheffield 1992.

Knibb, M., Jubilees and the Origins of the Qumran Community (Inaugural Lecture; London 1989).

Kratz, R.G., Law and Narrative in Deuteronomy and the Temple Scroll, in: C. Berner / H. Samuel (eds.), The Reception of Biblical War Legislation in Narrative Contexts (BZAW 460), Berlin 2015, 109–122.

Kugel, J.L., A Walk through *Jubilees:* Studies in the *Book of Jubilees* and the World of its Creation (JSJ.S 156), Leiden 2012.

Lambert, D., Did Israel Believe That Redemption Awaited Its Repentance? The Case of *Jubilees* 1, in: CBQ 68 (2006) 631–650.

Levine, B.A., The Temple Scroll. Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character, in: BASOR 232 (1978) 5–23.

Levinson, B.M., A More Perfect Torah: At the Intersection of Philology and Hermeneutics in Deuteronomy and the Temple Scroll (Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible 1), Winona Lake, 2013.

– The Sinai Covenant. The Argument of Revelation, in: idem, "The Right Chorale". Studies in Biblical Law and Interpretation (FAT 54) Tübingen 2008, 48–51.

Lohfink, N., Die An- und Absageformel in der hebräischen Bibel. Zum Hintergrund des deuteronomischen Vierüberschriftensystems, in: A. Gianto (ed.), Biblical and Oriental Essays in Memory of William L. Moran (BibOr 48), Roma 2005, 49–77.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

– Deuteronomium 9,1–10,11 und Exodus 32–34. Zu Endtextstruktur, Intertextualität, Schichtung und Abhängigkeiten, in: idem, Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V (SBAB 38), Stuttgart 2005, 131–180 [= M. Köckert / E. Blum (eds.), Gottes Volk am Sinai. Untersuchungen zu Exod 32–34 und Dtn 9–10 (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 18), Gütersloh 2001, 41–87].
– Prolegomena zu einer Rechtshermeneutik des Pentateuch, in: idem, Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V (SBAB 38), Stuttgart 2005, 181–231 [= G. Braulik (ed.), Das Deuteronomium (ÖBS 23); Frankfurt a.M. 2003, 11–55].

Markl, D., Art. אנוכי *'ānôkî*, in: ThWQ 1 (2011) 237–241.

– Der Dekalog als Verfassung des Gottesvolkes. Die Brennpunkte einer Rechtshermeneutik des Pentateuch in Exodus 19–24 und Deuteronomium 5 (HBS 49), Freiburg i.Br. 2007.
– Deuteronomy's Frameworks in Service of the Law (Deut 1–11; 26–34), in: G. Fischer / D. Markl / S. Paganini (eds.), Deuteronomium – Tora für eine neue Generation (BZAR 17), Wiesbaden 2011, 271–283.
– God's Covenants with Humanity and Israel, in: J. Barton (ed.), The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Companion, Princeton (forthcoming).
– Gottes Volk im Deuteronomium (BZAR 18), Wiesbaden 2012.
– Moses in the Book of Jubilees, in: D. Human et al. (ed.), Moses in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity (forthcoming).
– Moses Prophetenrolle in Dtn 5; 18; 34. Strukturelle Wendepunkte von rechtshermeneutischem Gewicht, in: G. Fischer / D. Markl / S. Paganini (eds.), Deuteronomium – Tora für eine neue Generation (BZAR 17), Wiesbaden 2011, 51–68.
– Narrative Rechtshermeneutik als methodische Herausforderung des Pentateuch, in: ZAR 11 (2005) 107–121.
– The Ten Words Revealed and Revised. The Origins of Law and Legal Hermeneutics in the Pentateuch, in: idem (ed.), The Decalogue and its Cultural Influence (Hebrew Bible Monographs 58), Sheffield 2013, 13–27.
– The Wilderness Sanctuary as the Archetype of Continuity Between the Pre- and the Postexilic Temples of Jerusalem in: P. Dubovský / D. Markl / J.-P. Sonnet (eds.), The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of the Torah (FAT), Tübingen (forthcoming).
– Zur literarischen und theologischen Funktion der Heiligtumstexte im Buch Exodus, in: M. Hopf / W. Oswald / S. Seiler (eds.), Heiliger Raum. Exegese und Rezeption der Heiligtumstexte in Ex 24–40. Beiträge des Symposiums zu Ehren von Helmut Utzschneider, 27.–29. Juni 2014 (Theologische Akzente 8), Stuttgart 2016, 57–87.

Najman, H., Angels at Sinai. Exegesis, Theology and Interpretative Authority, in: eadem, Past Renewals. Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation, and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity (JSJ.S 53), Leiden 2010, 121–142 [= DSD 7 (2000) 313–333].

– Seconding Sinai. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism (JSJ.S 77), Leiden 2003.

Oswald, W., Lawgiving at the Mountain of God (Exodus 19–24), in: T.B. Dozeman / C.A. Evans / J.N. Lohr (eds.), The Book of Exodus. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation (VT.S 164), Leiden 2014, 169–192.

Otto, E., Deuteronomium 1–4 (HThK.AT), Freiburg i.Br. 2012.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

– Die Rechtshermeneutik der Tempelrolle (11QTa), in: idem, Altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte. Gesammelte Studien (BZAR 8), Wiesbaden 2008, 547–563 [= ZAR 13 (2007) 159–175].
– Temple Scroll and Pentateuch. A Priestly Debate about the Interpretation of the Torah, in: K. de Troyer / A. Lange (eds.), The Qumran Legal Texts Between the Hebrew Bible and its Interpretation, Leuven 2011, 59–74.

Paganini, S., Das biblische Gesetz und seine Interpretation am Beispiel der qumranischen Tempelrolle, in: ZKTh 131 (2009) 256–279, 259–262.

– "Nicht darfst du zu diesen Wörtern etwas hinzufügen". Die Rezeption des Deuteronomiums in der Tempelrolle. Sprache, Autoren, Hermeneutik (BZAR 11), Wiesbaden 2009.

Perlitt, L., Sinai und Horeb, in: idem, Deuteronomium-Studien (FAT 8), Tübingen 1994, 32–49 [= H. Donner et al. (eds.), Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli, Göttingen 1977, 302–322].

Qimron, E. (ed.), The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions, Beer Sheva / Jerusalem 1996.

Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. van, The Rewriting of Exodus 24:12–18 in Jubilees 1:1–4, in: BN 79 (1995) 25–29.

Schiffman, L.H., The Book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll, in G. Boccaccini / G. Ibba (eds.), Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees, Grand Rapids 2009, 99–115.

– The Concept of Covenant in the Qumran Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature, in: idem, Qumran and Jerusalem. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature), Grand Rapids 2010, 235–255.

Scott, J. M., On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees (JSJ.S 91), Leiden / Boston 2005.

Ska, J.L., From History Writing to Library Building. The End of History and the Birth of the Book, in: G.N. Knoppers / B.M. Levinson (eds.), The Pentateuch as Torah. New Models for Understanding its Promulgation and Acceptance, Winona Lake 2007, 145–169.

Sonnet, J.-P., The Book within the Book. Writing in Deuteronomy (Biblical Interpretation Series 14), Leiden 1997.

Steck, O.H., Die getöteten »Zeugen« und die verfolgten »Tora-Sucher« in Jub 1,12. Ein Beitrag zur Zeugnis-Terminologie des Jubiläenbuches (I), in: ZAW 107 (1995) 445–465.

Stökl, J., A List of the Extant Hebrew Text of the Book of Jubilees, their Relation to the Hebrew Bible and Some Preliminary Comments, in: Henoch 28/1 (2006) 97–124.

Timmer, D.C., Sinai 'Revisited' Again. Further Reflections on the Appropriation of Exodus 19-Numbers 10 in 1QS, in: RevBib 115 (2008) 481–498.

Tso, M., The Giving of the Torah at Sinai and the Ethics of the Qumran Community, in: G.J. Brooke / H. Najman / L.T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity (Themes in Biblical Narrative 12) Leiden 2008, 117–127.

VanderKam, J.C. (ed.), The Book of Jubilees (CSCO 511), Leuven 1989.

– The Book of Jubilees (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha), Sheffield 2001, 13–17.
– Exegesis of Pentateuchal Legislation in Jubilees and Related Texts Found at Qumran, in: A. Moriya / G. Hata (eds.), Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period:

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28–31, 2007 (JSJ.S 158), Leiden 2012, 177–200.
– Moses trumping Moses. Making the Book of Jubilees, in: S. Metso / H. Najman / E. Schuller (eds.), The Dead Sea Scrolls. Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts (StTDJ 92), Leiden 2010, 25–44.
– The Scriptural Setting of the Book of Jubilees, in: DSD 13 (2006) 61–72.
– Sinai Revisited, in: M. Henze (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature), Grand Rapids 2005, 44–60.
– Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1, in: R.A. Argall / B.A. Bow / R.A. Werline (eds.), For a Later Generation. The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity. FS G.W.E. Nickelsburg, Harrisburg 2000, 266–279.

Wacholder, B.Z., Jubilees as Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment, in: M. Bernstein / F. García Martínez / J. Kampen (eds.), Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten (STDJ 23), Leiden 1997, 195–211.

Yadin, Y., The Temple Scroll. 3 vols., Jerusalem 1977–1983.

Zahn, M.M., New Voices, Ancient Words: The Temple Scroll's Reuse of the Bible, in: J. Day (ed.), Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel (LHB 422), London 2005, 435–458.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Andrea Spans

Construction of Space for Personified Zion. Space and Figure in Isa 60[1]

1. Introductory Remarks and Questions

In analysing spatiality in Isa 60, I need to, first and foremost, clarify my points of departure. As is evident at the beginning of Isa 60 (Isa 60:1–3), the chapter creates a concept of space by describing the different motions of various characters, both on the vertical (v. 1–2) and horizontal axes (v. 3): because 'your light' [Zion's light] has come and 'the glory of Yhwh' has *risen over* you [Zion], personified Zion has to '*arise*' and 'shine' (v. 1). And because she is arising, nations and kings *come to* 'the brightness of your dawn/rising' (v. 3).[2] Therefore, from within the text, it is necessary to analyse closely how space is conceived not only in Isa 60:1–3 (cf. 2.1), but in the following verses, Isa 60:4–22, as well (cf. 2.2; 2.3).

In 1998, Sara Japhet dealt with 'Some Biblical Concepts of Sacred Place,' especially referring to the tabernacle and its wanderings in the Pentateuch. Although she did not explore the sanctity of Jerusalem, a 'later development of biblical thought'[3], it is useful to summarize her findings here briefly (1.1) for two reasons:

1) She points out that sanctity is not only indicated by the epithet קדוש, but can also be implicitly characterised by 'attributes, meaning, and rules.'[4] It will become apparent in my inquiry that Zion is definitely considered to be a holy place in Isa 60, even though it does not receive the epithet קדוש. This provokes a few interesting questions: How does the city become a sacred place in Isa 60, and what kind of sacred place is this?
2) With regard to the tabernacle, Sara Japhet demonstrates that sanctity is not only characterised in local terms, but can be 'described in hierarchical terms'[5]

1 Cf. A. Spans, Stadtfrau, 63–198. I owe great thanks to Michael S. Chen for proofreading this paper and correcting my English.
2 The quoted verses are from the NRSV.
3 S. Japhet, Concepts, 70.
4 Ibid., 57.
5 Ibid., 62.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

as well. Even though she explicitly leaves out sociological theories in her analysis,[6] she comes close to what critical spatiality highlights – space and society are inseparably linked. According to critical spatiality, Jerusalem is neither simply the city where a certain society lives at a certain time, nor 'the neutral medium in which biblical and related narratives and events took place.'[7] What can thus be concluded about the society that is producing this concept of space from the way that space is constructed in Isa 60?

Spatiality in Isa 60, consequently, can only be sufficiently explained when Zion is considered as what she is in biblical thought: space and figure simultaneously. Odil H. Steck and Christl M. Maier have already explored this twofold dimension in great detail.[8] As their findings fundamentally affect the understanding of Isa 60, their ideas will be presented below (1.2). Moreover, a brief sketch of the archaeological evidence of the fifth century B.C.E.'s Jerusalem will be provided to clearly mark the distinction between the archaeological record and the textual ideas about Jerusalem in postexilic times.

1.1 Becoming a Sacred Place

'Any place can *become* sacred, but no place *is* sacred.'[9] Sara Japhet is correct in emphasizing that sanctity is not an intrinsic quality of places, but is actually something that is attributed to them. There is no material, i. e. physical evidence, of holiness, and considering a place to be holy rests on the belief that there is a connection with God: 'At the most basic level […] the sanctity of a place is determined exclusively by the existence of a direct and immediate link between that place and God.'[10] On the one hand, this link can be thought of as static: God's dwelling place is a holy place.[11] On the other hand, this link can be thought of as

6 Cf. Ibid., 55. Although she does focus on Mircea Eliade, she concludes that the sacred is defined differently in biblical thought, cf. ibid. 56.

7 M.K. George, 29. George refers to Henri Lefebvre's theory, cf. ibid. 24–28. At the same time, he notices ibid. 25, that according to Durkheim, 'space is an abstraction of the concept of society.' Although biblical scholars have explored this idea, they primarily relied on Lefebvre's theory.

8 Cf. O.H. Steck, Zion, C.M. Maier, Daughter. On the reception history of Zion being a city and a female figure in texts from the 3rd century B.C.E. to the 2nd century C.E. cf. M. Häusl, Tochter.

9 S. Japhet, Concepts, 64 [emphasis in the original text].

10 Ibid., 57; cf. also R.J.Z. Werblowsky, Introduction, 11.

11 S. Japhet, Concepts, 59.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

dynamic: sanctity can be established through revelation.[12] God's presence is not restricted locally but can take place at different places and in different modes.

Mindscape and landscape are thus intrinsically connected[13]: locating a holy place in the material landscape means locating what one has in mind about a holy place. 'Map is not territory,' as Jonathan Z. Smith argues in his monograph of the same title.[14] Conversely, territory always mirrors an act of mapping by a group or society. Therefore, critical spatiality 'understands space as [a] thoroughly social project and product. Central to the critical work biblical scholars are undertaking on space, then, is the understanding of space as a social, cultural creation and product. Analysis of the space or spaces produced by a society thus offers another means of studying and understanding the society and culture that produced it.'[15]

Although Sara Japhet neither mentions critical spatiality nor makes explicit the social dimension of space, her findings, strictly taken from within the Bible, do resemble the basic assumption of critical spatiality – space is produced by society and therefore mirrors social relations and interactions. By highlighting four attributes of the sanctity of the tabernacle,[16] she hints at the fact that a holy place not only has to be seen in connection with God, but in connection with society as well: since a holy place is limited to a certain area, it is differentiated and set apart from the profane world. Establishing a binary opposition between sacred and profane space, therefore, 'means breaking up the homogeneity of space.'[17] According to this spatial division, sanctity also conveys social hierarchy, because only priests are allowed to enter the holy place. Thus, establishing a binary opposition between sacred and profane space implies breaking up the homogeneity of society as well.

As mentioned above, these findings are closely connected with the aim of critical spatiality and provide a good starting point from which I will analyze the concept of space in Isa 60 and the certain concept of society that it implies.

12 Ibid., 59.

13 Cf. R.J.Z. Werblowsky, Introduction. Werblowsky refers to Allan Grapard and Jonathan Z. Smith.

14 Cf. J.Z. Smith, Map.

15 M.K. George, Space, 15. Cf. also J. Assmann, Gedächtnis, 39, but from the more general point of view of cultural sciences: 'Every group that wants to reassure themselves, strives to create and control places, which are not only the setting of their interaction, but symbols of their identity and reference point of their remembrance.' [translation A.S.].

16 Cf. S. Japhet, Concepts, 61–63.

17 R.J.Z. Werblowsky, Introduction, 12.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

1.2 The Archaeology of Jerusalem and the Representation of Zion in Biblical Texts

The archaeological evidence from the fifth century B.C.E. is rather meagre.[18] Jerusalem became the capital of the Persian province Juda during this period; thus, Jerusalem held a central position compared to the agriculturally based hinterland. However, the archaeological data show that Jerusalem was not a place of central importance to anyone outside the province. In fact, results from archaeological research hint at the fact that Persian Period Jerusalem had a moderate townscape quality. The city comprised an area of about 5–6 ha, and approximately 1500 inhabitants[19] lived there. The city wall seems to have been too insignificant to fortify the city properly,[20] and there is no archaeological evidence that the Second Temple was a magnificent building. Although Persian Period Jerusalem was a capital, the archaeological data give witness to its decreasing importance when compared to the city during the eighth and seventh century B.C.E.; there is little to say about Zion/Jerusalem, because there is little archaeological evidence. Contrary to these facts, which are traceable archaeologically, the authors[21] of Isa 60 envisioned the glorified city becoming the navel of the earth. They promoted a concept of space that is profoundly based on the aforementioned twofold dimension of Zion/Jerusalem.

Odil H. Steck points out that, when seen diachronically, the preexilic notion of (divine) kingship *in* Zion is transferred to the female figure Zion becoming a queen in postexilic times (Second and Third Isaiah).[22] Odil H. Steck, however, does not ask if perhaps these dimensions are linked: Is the female figure embedded into a certain construction of space? What could the female figure possibly add to the spatial image of a holy place? What does the construction of space add to the personification?

In contrast, Christl M. Maier explicitly analyses the twofold dimension of Zion by using the analytical tool that Henri Lefebvre developed. In the history of

18 The following reconstruction traces back to O. Keel, Geschichte, 953.

19 In contrast, I. Finkelstein, Jerusalem, 514 comes to a different conclusion: 'a few hundred people.'

20 What is disputed is whether settlement at that time did extend the area in the south-east, cf. D. Ussishkin, Borders, 147.

21 Talking about a group of authors has to do with the literary character of Isa 60: As this text substantially refers to the second part of the book of Isaiah, it would be an erroneous reception to hastily suppose an individual prophet, whose sayings could be found in Isa 60 and Isa 56–66, respectively. The texts, however, do not show evidence of a prophet. Rather, the connections within the book substantiate the claim that scribes wrote the prophecies in Isa 56–66 in order to shape their identity – by (re-)shaping the book of Isaiah; cf. O.H. Steck; Tritojesaja; O.H. Steck, Prophetenbücher with regard to the prophetic books in general.

22 Cf. O.H. Steck, Zion.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

critical spatiality, both Henri Lefebvre and Edward Soja developed significant ideas.[23] Both of them presuppose a tripartite division of space as analytical tool: first of all, to investigate physical space (l'espace perçu [Lefebvre] = Firstspace [Soja]) means to ask how space is arranged physically – how material space can be perceived. By analysing mental spaces (l'espace conçu [Lefebvre] = Secondspace [Soja]), scholars deal with ideological concepts that 'map space'; thus they explore how space can be conceived of mentally. Finally, both Henri Lefebvre and Edward Soja set a third concept alongside materiality (l'espace perçu [Lefebvre] = Firstspace [Soja]) on the one hand and representation on the other hand (l'espace conçu [Lefebvre] = Secondspace [Soja]). This third dimension of space refers to experience (Henri Lefebvre [l'espace vécu]); more precisely, according to Edward Soja (Thirdspace), it refers to an experience that allows for resistance.[24]

Christl M. Maier argues that in certain texts (Isa 49:22–23; 60; 66:7–14) 'the gendered image of the mother is analogous to the spatial image of the pilgrimage site.'[25] First (and physically), Zion is a rebuilt city in Isa 60; second (and mentally), this city belongs to Yhwh being present in the city (cf. 60:14); third, this vision refers to the experience of Mother Zion who 'has to be persuaded to believe in these promises and live up to her new role.'[26] As will become apparent, however, Isa 60 does not primarily focus on Zion's motherly role with regard to her children, but reflects upon Yhwh's and the nations' role regarding Zion. That being the case, what insight does Maier's thesis offer in thinking about the way that space and figure are intertwined throughout Isa 60?

My interpretation of Isa 60 aims at unfolding the spatial image drawn by the authors. They, first and foremost, generated a spatial image of the city *by* introducing personified Zion and *by* transferring principles of spatial arrangement on a physical level – the notion of 'place'; border; centrality; periphery[27] – to a mental construction; according to them, space and figure cannot be separated. As a result, the authors of Isa 60 promoted a concept of space not only to envision the city of God, but also the society living there.

23 Cf. J.L. Berquist, Introduction, 3–5; cf. also H. Lefebvre, Production; E.W. Soja, Geographies.

24 Constructions are produced within certain power relations; investigating constructions of space means examining and altering these power relations. Therefore, the tripartite division is a tool to analyse spatiality that can have a deconstructive impact, cf. J.L. Berquist, Introduction, 8 [on the impact of Marxism on Henri Lefebvre and Edward Soja cf. C.V. Camp, Introduction, 9].

25 C.M. Maier, Daughter, 197.

26 Ibid., 195.

27 Cf. R. Gehlen, Art. Raum, 391–396.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

2. Space and Society in Isa 60

2.1 How Space and Figure are Introduced and Intertwined in Isa 60:1–3

Isa 60:1–3 introduce a mental picture of Zion/Jerusalem. Here, female figure and space are already intrinsically connected. First of all, the feminine imperatives relate back to the portrait of personified Jerusalem first described in Isa 51:17 and Isa 52:2; strikingly, the imperative used, קומי ('arise!'), is exactly the same one used in 51:17 and 52:2.[28] There is no doubt that, once again, Zion is being addressed;[29] after getting up to dress herself like a queen (cf. Isa 52:1), she now has to arise and shine. However, the city is not explicitly named until Isa 60:14: 'The descendants of those who oppressed you shall come bending low to you, and all who despised you shall bow down at your feet; they shall call you the City of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel.' This 'delayed identification'[30] is of great significance for the spatial image, because instead of making explicit who the addressee is at the beginning of Isa 60[31], the authors primarily drew a mental picture of the city through references to known texts and by describing what is happening in and around Jerusalem. In the first instance, movement shapes the city mentally and, according to Isa 60, Zion/Jerusalem can neither be named nor called a city until the whole world eventually moves into the city (cf. Isa 60:4–14). Before being given a name, the מקום itself has to be designed, although the imperative קומי actually does imply a place from which Zion can arise.[32] Besides, as the 'delayed identification' in v. 14 makes poignantly clear, Zion is considered to be a holy place. The city itself does not receive the epithet קדוש, but belongs to the קדוש ישׂראל, the Holy One of Israel.

In particular, Isa 60:1–3 draw a vivid portrait of the city that can be described as follows: first, Zion's bodily experience provides a vertical orientation.[33] Thus, it

28 Zillessen mentioned these verses in 1906, cf. A. Zillessen, Tritojesaja, 240.

29 Cf. W. Lau, Prophetie, 26; against C.J. Dempsey, Desolation, 219: 'The antecedent is not clear.' The evident need to trace back the portrait in Isa 60 to Isa 40–55 can be substantiated by the fact that there are no feminine imperatives in Isa 56–59.63–66 at all! In general grammatical forms of the second-person feminine singular dominate in Isa 60.

30 G.J. Polan, Zion, 66. W.A.M. Beuken, Jesaja.

31 Tg and LXX, however, fill the gap by adding 'Jerusalem.' W.A.M. Beuken, Jesaja,163 rightly notes that this gap is also important with regard to a synchronic reading of Isa 56–66: 'Jerusalem' has not yet been mentioned; according to Beuken Isa 59:20, containing the statement of place 'Zion,' was later added and can therefore be neglected here.

32 Vgl. O.H. Steck, Lumen, 82 (n. 4); W. Lau, Prophetie, 25. Moreover, the noun מקום derives from the verb קום, cf. J. Gamberoni, Art. מָקוֹם, 1115.

33 Cf. C.M. Maier, Daughter, 19. In general, spatial orientation rests on the bodily experience of human beings as can be deduced from how space is rendered in different zones: top/down, right/left, front/back refer to their upright walk, cf. R. Gehlen, Art. Raum, 385. This idea is

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

is the female figure that promotes the particular concept of space. What 'קומי' actually means can also be explained within the framework of the second part of the book Isaiah, especially regarding personified Babylon in Isa 47:1[34]: while she 'has to come down (ירד) and sit in the dust,' Zion has to move the other way round, 'arise (קום) and shine'; thus, according to the book of Isaiah, Babylon's fall *is* Zion's rise in a way! However, Zion's arising cannot be fully understood without taking into account the second imperative used – אורי ('shine!'). Becoming a shining figure, the figure of personified Zion also shares features of the servant of God in Isa 42:6 and 49:6, who was appointed as 'a light to the nations' (אור גוים).[35] Consequently, Zion has to undertake the servant's task and transform into a mediator for the nations (cf. Isa 60:3). But in relation to servanthood in Isa 40–55, there is one considerable difference in Isa 60:1–3: the Servant turns towards the nations in order to fulfil his task of being their light in Isa 42:6; in Isa 60:1, however, they turn towards the figure Zion who has undertaken the Servant's task.[36]

Second, the spatial image is based on the notion of divine presence. Zion *becomes* a holy place (that is not designated as holy explicitly!), because 'the divine *became* manifest there'[37]: 'your light has come (בוא), and Yhwh's glory has risen (זרח) upon you (עליך).' Again, there is a vertical orientation, especially as indicated by the preposition על ('upon'). Because of verbatim agreements (see below), the spatial image of Isa 60:1–3 can be traced back to pentateuchal texts talking about Yhwh's theophany (cf. Dtn 33:2;[38] Lev 9:6.23; Num 14:10; 20:6[39]). The authors of Isa 60, however, did not simply copy these traditions, but they emphasised the vertical movements by repeatedly employing the preposition על in v. 1–2 ('the glory of the Lord has risen upon you [עליך],' cf. v. 1; 'the Lord will arise upon you [עליך] and his glory will appear over you [עליך],' cf. v. 2). What is particularly interesting about the spatial image in Isa 60:1–3 is that Yhwh is compared to the rising sun, because the verb זרח ('to rise') always refers to the rising sun when used with the preposition על, just as is the case in Isa 60:1–2.[40] Besides, the verbs in Isa 60:1–2 show a so-called 'pictorial movement'[41]: 'there comes the daybreak (בוא), and then the sun starts rising (זרח), finally the full glory

also traceable in the Old Testament language, cf. A. Grund / B. Janowski, Erfahrung, 490–491.

34 Cf. U. Berges, Buch, 436.

35 Cf. O.H. Steck, Lumen.

36 Cf. B. Langer, Gott, 143; O.H. Steck, Lumen, 91.

37 R.J.Z. Werblowsky, Introduction, 11 [emphasis A.S.].

38 Cf. B. Langer, Gott, 42–43.

39 Cf. ibid., 77–79.

40 Cf. ibid., 42–43; T.B. Osborne, Lumière, 139.

41 J.T. Tsoi, Parallelism, 31.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

of the sun appears (ראה).'[42] Thus, the authors clearly evoked an image of the rising sun, while deliberately avoiding the term שֶׁמֶשׁ ('sun'). How can this be explained?

On the one hand, by applying solar language, the authors of Isa 60 associated everything that was traditionally connected to the sun according to everyday experience in the Ancient Near East to Yhwh: visible manifestation of the sun deity at daybreak, preservation of creation, and providing for peace and justice.[43] Yet by appointing Yhwh as אורך, Zion's light, they related divine presence not only to the Servant's task to become a light for the nations, but, first and foremost, to personified Zion arising and shining; Zion's shining (אורי) and Yhwh's light (אור) intertwine, too, so that even Zion obtains solar characteristics.[44] In this way, solar language becomes an integral part of the mental portrait of Zion/Jerusalem – according to Isa 60:1–3, the visible manifestation of the sun deity at daybreak, preservation of creation, and providing for peace and justice are all mediated by the personified city. Thus, the spatial idea of becoming a shining centre of attraction for the nations rests on Zion's personification and has a religious quality: 'The glory which the Lord shows through Jerusalem *and works in her as deeds of righteousness*, attracts the nations.'[45] Consequently, nations will indeed come to Zion, as Isa 60:3 states.

As already mentioned above, this symbolical design relies on pentateuchal traditions that, however, promote a rather different concept of space. Nevertheless, Dtn 33:2 and Lev 9:6.23, Num 14:10, and Num 20:6 can deliver insight into the way the notion of divine presence is embedded within the construction of space in Isa 60:1–2.

Dtn 33:2 and Isa 60:1 both use בוא ('to come') and זרח ('to rise') to express the idea of divine presence.[46] Likewise, Lev 9:6.23, Num 14:10, and Num 20:6, like Isa 60:2, all use a preposition to introduce the group of addressees:[47] while Yhwh's glory appears *to* the people of Israel in the Pentateuch (אל [*Nifal*] כבוד ראה), the authors of Isa 60 envisioned Yhwh as appearing '*over* you' (על [*Nifal*] כבוד ראה) – referring to Zion. As any deliberate connection between these texts seems to be highly plausible, the difference comes to the fore perfectly, too: within the ref-

42 Ibid., 31.

43 Cf. B. Janowski, Sonnengott, 229.

44 Cf. M. Leuenberger, Gott, 61.

45 I.J. De Hulster, Iconographic Exegesis, 222 [emphasis A.S.]; cf. B. Langer, Gott, 21. Isa 58:1–12 confirms this reading, though probably on a redactional level at a later stage. Therefore, Isa 60 sheds light on Isa 58 – not the other way round; against ibid., 44–50. B. Janowski, Sonnengott, 236 also refers to Isa 58 in order to explain how solar language can be applied to the people of Israel in postexilic times, but unfortunately does not take into account Isa 60 to substantiate this claim.

46 B. Langer, Gott, 43; U. Berges, Buch, 436. Only in these two instances in the Hebrew Bible the roots בוא and זרח occur together in the context of a theophany.

47 B. Langer, Gott, 77.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

erence frame of the pentateuchal ideology of divine presence, the authors of Isa 60 clearly highlighted movement on the vertical axis. In this way, as already discussed, they succeeded in drawing a portrait of Yhwh resembling the rising sun.

Furthermore, by using the term כבוד ('glory') at the same time, they shape a holy place, which is remarkably different than the site that the priestly theologians have in mind. Ez 43:4 has to be considered here, because in contrast to the idea that Yhwh's glory 'enters the temple' (בא אל־הבית), Yhwh's glory has come and now rises over Zion (עליך ['over you']). Thus, according to Isa 60:1, divine presence is not restricted locally to the temple building and its area, but can be experienced in the city of Zion and through Zion in the world.[48] As sanctity is established through God's revelation that is not geographically limited, nations and kings come to Zion, cf. v. 3.

Finally, vertical and horizontal dimension are intertwined within the spatial image: 'The vertical dimension is the secret of the horizontal one. Zion becomes the light of the world because the Great light raises upon her.'[49] The authors of Isa 60:1–3 activated the readers' spatial sense on both the horizontal and vertical axis hardly by chance, rather, they seemed to consciously adopt a symbolical design that had already achieved prominence within the preexilic Jerusalem cultic tradition. Relating vertical ('elevation'; v. 1–2) and horizontal dimension ('centrality'; v. 3) with regard to Zion evokes a traditional concept of space[50]: The sanctuary on Mount Zion is the mediating point between heaven and earth where the vertical axis and the horizontal axis coincide.[51] Yhwh, the heavenly king, sits on his throne whose footstool is in the sanctuary where the divine presence manifests and can be experienced. The authors of Isa 60 made use of this tradition by synthesizing 'elevation' and 'centrality' into a larger symbolic framework: v. 1–3 do not describe a sanctuary on Mount Zion as the elevated mediating point, but, according to servanthood in Second Isaiah, the personified city becomes a mediator of divine presence so that the nations become attracted.

By elaborating a spatial design of Zion in this way, the authors shaped a holy place, which they do not set apart. As their concept of space rests on the Servant's task being a 'light' (אור) to the nations and on Yhwh's presence in terms of a rising 'light' (אור), their symbolic design of the city of God has a universal scope. But this would certainly not be possible if Zion did not become a shining light (אורי ['shine!']), meaning that if Zion did not turn into a mediator, on one side, and into a mediating point, on the other. Strictly speaking, based on the idea of divine

48 Cf. M. Albani, Schöpfung, 44; against T.B. Osborne, Lumière, 140.144–145: "[…] Ez 43 et Es 60 semblent s'éclairer mutuellement."

49 J.L. Koole, Jes 56–66, 217.

50 Cf. M. Weinfeld, Zion, 108 (n. 64).

51 Cf. F. Hartenstein, Unzugänglichkeit, 22–23.218.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

presence, space and figure are intertwined to express Zion's epiphany within the world. 'It is not merely a theophany; indeed one can almost say that Jerusalem becomes the means of God's appearing.'[52] The point is that the personification 'does not merely illustrate but actually produces [a] concept of space'[53] which rests on movement and implies an enlargement of the holy place.

2.2 Designing the Holy Place. Isa 60:4–16

Isa 60:1–3 serve as an introduction. These verses set the stage for further shaping the holy place in v. 4–16; again, these verses cannot be described correctly without considering the Old Testament background or without carefully analysing how old ideas are conceptualised anew. The following question emerges: what do v. 4–16 add to the presentation of the female figure being embedded into the aforementioned construction of space? In particular, my reading of Isa 60 aims at emphasizing these verses, which implicitly deal with a certain idea of topography and where physical arrangements of a city are explicitly mirrored in the text.

From v. 4 onwards, however, Lady Zion does not seem to play an important role anymore. Obviously, the authors decided to shift focus. This can be initially inferred from the two motifs being introduced in v. 5 and then being subsequently explored in v. 6–7[54]: 'the abundance of the sea' (המון ים) and 'the wealth of the nations' (חיל גוים). Here, basically, a topographical image comes to the fore: first, v. 6–7 mention animals and gifts that illustrate what is meant by חיל גוים in v. 5. Besides, it can be concluded from the place names that the animals from the East[55] will be on their way to the city of God. Second, 'coastlands' and 'ships' in v. 9 refer back to המון ים in v. 5. As is the case in v. 6–7, toponyms are used to express that they will come to Zion from the Western regions, too.[56] Finally, the expression 'the glory of Lebanon' in v. 13 adds a northward orientation to the topographical image.[57] By envisioning that almost the entire '*terra cognita*' (Burkard Zapff) and its riches will gather at the site of Zion, the authors of Isa 60 promoted the idea of Zion becoming the centre of the universe. Therefore, one wonders if there still is a need to analyse the relationship of space and figure. Nevertheless, as the text indicates itself, to neglect this question would be fatally

52 I.J. De Hulster, Iconographic Exegesis, 222.
53 C.V. Camp, Introduction, 11.
54 W.A.M. Beuken, Jesaja deel III/A, 167; O.H. Steck, Grundtext, 62; B.M. Zapff, Jes 56–66, 383.
55 K. Koenen, Ethik, 140 (n. 488) extensively discusses why it is plausible to assume a provenance from the East here.
56 Cf. B.M. Zapff, Jes 56–66, 382.
57 Cf. ibid., 382.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

misleading, because the actions of personified Zion frame this topographical design: She will attentively observe what is going on and not be afraid (cf. v. 5) – she will become a spectator.[58] Eventually, she 'shall know I, the Lord, am your Savior and your Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob' (cf. v. 16). As she has seen that riches from all over the world will supply her with what a child absolutely needs – milk to suck – she will personally know her God; the unique expression חלב גוים ('the milk of the nations') is a reference back to חיל גוים ('the wealth of the nations') in v. 5. Therefore, the nations' contribution becomes a means of divine knowledge. Again, the point is that the centrality here indeed refers to a concept of space, but it depends on the idea of personified Zion to point out the city's religious quality.

As discussed earlier in this inquiry, the emphasis on centrality derives from how space is mapped within the Jerusalem cultic tradition. But interestingly, in Isa 60, there is no difference made between the sanctuary and the (personified) city;[59] in fact, the city itself fulfils the function of the temple and is the only site of God's presence. Therefore, gathering at Zion is inseparably linked to cultic veneration. V. 7, especially, sheds light on how the authors imagined the cult; it is no surprise that this verse perfectly resonates with Zion's symbolical design in v. 1–3. First of all, there do not seem to be any restrictions concerning access to the holy place: 'All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered to you, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister to you; they shall be acceptable on my altar, and I will glorify my glorious house.' (Isa 60:7). Nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible do flocks and rams are said to carry out a cultic ministry (שׁרת);[60] similarly, a ministry 'to you', i. e. Zion, is a unique expression. Thus, religious practices are directed towards Zion in a way. Second, there are no priests[61] and the animals sacrifice themselves[62]. The animals not only bring riches to Zion, they praise Yhwh (Isa 60:6), and they ascend the altar voluntarily and independently. Finally, the parallelism in v. 7 calls attention to the authors' focus: while the expression אילי נביות ('the rams of Nebaioth') makes explicit the more general term צאן קדר ('the flocks of Kedar'), the latter half of the verse mentions conversely the altar in the first and the more general phrase 'my glorious house' in the second place.[63] This slightly modified order in the second half of the verse urges the reader to recognize that, according

58 Cf. W.A.M. Beuken, Jesaja, 165.

59 In my opinion, passages about the city and the temple are not to be distinguished diachronically, because, according to Isa 60, the city has in fact become a sanctuary; against K. Koenen, Ethik, 151–152.

60 Cf. K. Engelken, Art. שׁרת, 502; and already B. DUHM, Jes, 420; against S.S. TUELL, Priesthood, 275.

61 Against L.-S. Tiemeyer, Rites, 275.

62 Cf. J.L. Koole, Jes 56–66, 233: 'self-sacrifice.'

63 Vgl. J.T. Tsoi, Parallelism, 36.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

to the universal scope of Isa 60, cult practices are not restricted locally. A city without sanctuary would be inconceivable in postexilic times, but at the same time, reshaping a holy place comes along with reshaping practices at that place. If the authors had a sanctuary in mind when mentioning 'my glorious house,' they themselves create a unique expression. Nevertheless, they used a term they frequently related to Zion being glorified (פאר). Thus, it is Zion who will become 'my glorious house' (בית תפארתי).

'Centrality' cannot be thought of as having no boundaries, which mark the difference between the centre *inside* and the periphery *outside*.[64] In the case of a city, the city walls border the inner territory so that the city can provide shelter for its inhabitants. The transitory character of the city wall is especially traceable at the city gates, where the access to the city can be controlled.[65] Mentioning both the city walls (v. 10: חמתיך) and the city gates (v. 11: שעריך) suggests that the authors of Isa 60 had a similar spatial arrangement in mind, and they clearly adapted it to their own perception of a holy place. Although the notion of 'centrality' corresponds to bordering in Isa 60 as well – Zion's walls are built up (v. 10) –, the spatial antagonism does not imply a social difference between the inhabitants of the city and those outside of it (that is foreigners).[66] First, this can be inferred from how the authors used the phrase 'to build up walls.' There is actually nothing extraordinary about this expression, but the idea that בני נכר ('strangers') build up Zion's walls is unique in the Hebrew Bible. Isa 60 probably contains the vision that those who had formerly devastated the city are now considered to be responsible for its restoration.[67] This view, however, cannot sufficiently explain why it is just said that Zion's *walls* are built up. In my opinion, it can be plausibly assumed that Isa 60:10 is an integral part of the spatial image drawn in Isa 60.[68] Strangers do not only gain access to the city, but by building its walls, they contribute greatly to making the city a city, and thereby the centre a centre. Second, the open gates in Isa 60:11 make poignantly clear that there is no imminent danger for Zion; on the contrary: as 'your gates shall always be open,' all the riches being nutritious milk can come to Zion continually.[69] Therefore, it

64 Cf. R. Gehlen, Art. Raum, 395.

65 Cf. E. Otto, Art. שַׁעַר, 390: "Das Tor ist der gefährdetste Punkt in der Befestigung einer Stadt, so daß die militärisch-defensiven Funktionen gegenüber den symbolisch-proleptischen und identitätsstiftenden im Vordergrund stehen."

66 Though, in general, a social difference can be observed very often in case of spatial borders, cf. P. Bolte, Art. Grenze, 50: "Räumliche Trennungen sind nicht selten Ausdruck sozialer Differenzierungen."

67 Cf. B. Duhm, Jes, 420.

68 Therefore, Isa 60:10–11 cannot be called an 'interlude,' as R.D. Wells, History, 210 does; against O.H. Steck, Grundtext, 66–67, who discerns a contradiction ("Widerspruchskonstellation") and therefore assumes Isa 60:10–11 to be a later addition.

69 Cf. J. Blenkinsopp, Jes 56–66, 215.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

can be plausibly assumed that the walls and gates are not a means of social control as is the case in the Book of Nehemiah,[70] but a means of integration. My reading is confirmed by a change in preposition: From v. 11 on, the authors preferred אל ('into') instead of ל ('to')[71] to indicate that the nations and their riches no longer come to you (לך), but do gain access to the city (אליך). Thus, the spatial concept is closely interwoven with ideas about society that are neither integrationist nor xenophobic.[72]

Finally, Isa 60:13 mentions the place (מקום). As already adumbrated above, Zion is not called a place and a city until the nations and their riches arrive at Jerusalem. What is happening has priority over the designation as a city! In Isa 60:13, the authors again shaped a city of God on common paradigms: in general, 'place' (מקום) very often refers to the sanctuary.[73] For example, Isa 60:13 can be compared with Ez 43:7 and Jer 17:12.[74] What Ez 43:7 and Isa 60:13 have in common is that they talk about the מקום רגלי, though the Hebrew phrase is slightly different in Ez 43:7: מקום כפות רגלי ('the place for the soles of my feet'). Moreover, in Ez 43:7, מקום is repeated twice, too. Therefore, it seems to be highly plausible that there is a deliberate connection between these two verses, but only Ez 43:7 mentions God's כסא ('throne') (Isa 60 does not mention this at all).[75] In order to understand this gap correctly, one also has to pay attention to Jer 17:12, because this is the only other place in the Hebrew Bible where מקום is combined with מקדש: 'O glorious throne, exalted from the beginning, shrine (מקום) of our sanctuary!' But again, the authors of Isa 60 made use of a known expression while clearly refusing to integrate the throne into their spatial concept. Once more, the Jerusalem cultic tradition served as a reference frame in the constitution of space: the terms מקום and מקדש suggest that God sits on his throne whose footstool is in the sanctuary on Mount Zion. But as there is no throne in Isa 60:13, this verse provides a significantly different ideology of space. The city itself is God's throne! This symbolical design can also be deduced from Isa 60:9; in this verse, how the destination of nations and riches is reformulated relies on Jer 3:17: 'At that time Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord, and all nations shall gather to it, to the presence of the Lord in Jerusalem, and they shall no longer stubbornly

70 Cf. L.L. Grabbe, Settlement, 121.

71 Cf. J.L. Koole, Jes 56–66, 240 and R. Lack, Symbolique, 203.

72 J. Blenkinsopp, Jes 56–66, 214, however, uses these adjectives to characterize the tone in Isa 60:4–7.

73 Cf. J. Gamberoni, Art. מָקוֹם, 1124.

74 Cf. W. Lau, Prophetie, 55; U. BERGES, Gottesgarten, 85.

75 O.H. Steck, Schulter, 98 and M. Metzger, Wohnstatt, n. 41 rightly note that there is a connection with Ez 43:7, but do not (Steck) or only tentatively (Metzger) discuss the missing throne in Isa 60:13.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

follow their own evil will.' As the ark no longer exists, Jerusalem is to be understood as a symbol of divine presence.

2.3 From the Navel of the Earth to 'your people.' Isa 60:17–22

Before concluding my inquiry with some remarks on the relationship of figure and space in Isa 60, I will provide a brief summary of Isa 60:17–22. In contrast to v. 1–16, which put forward the figure of personified Zion at the beginning (cf. v. 1.4–5) and at the end (cf. v. 16), Yhwh takes action in v. 17 (cf. אביא ['I will bring']) and in v. 22 (cf. אחישנה ['I will accomplish it']). Thus, v. 17–22 are put into a frame, too, though a considerably different one.

In general, v. 17–22 seem to mirror an essentially different situation compared to v. 1–16. This can be concluded from two important facts, namely that v. 17–22 neither mention the nations nor talk about movement to Zion.[76] However, they do mention Zion's people, who are כלם צדיקים ('all righteous'). Henceforth, the inner conditions *in* Zion are at the centre of interest while v. 1–16 envision the effect that the shining Zion will have outside – that is on the nations.[77] As this shift of emphasis can be discerned, it is not astonishing that Zion's spatial design takes a back seat. Nevertheless, v. 17–22 do repeat some ideas already developed in Isa 60:1–16. Yet, the ideas are used according to the different scope in v. 17–22 that is not universal anymore, but limited to Zion and 'your people.'

As can be seen, there is an urgent need to answer the question of how these two units fit together synchronically and how they came together diachronically: it is possible to suppose that Isa 60:17–22 mirror the experience that – contrary to what was primarily expected according to v. 1–16 – Zion did not turn into a shining centre of attraction.[78] Apparently, שלום ('peace') and צדקה ('righteousness') have not been put into practice. Consequently, Yhwh himself appoints (ושמתי) them 'as your overseer' and 'as your taskmaster.' Only peace and righteousness can contribute towards the goal to appoint Zion (ושמתיך) to be 'majestic forever' and 'joy from age to age' (cf. v. 15). My reading is first confirmed by how Isa 60:18 mentions walls and gates. By describing the conditions 'in your land' and 'within your borders,' Isa 60:18 illustrates the idea of social justice in Zion. As a result, Zion will call her walls 'salvation' and her gates 'praise.' Although one is truly right in understanding the sentence metaphorically because of the names,[79] it is noteworthy that they are intrinsically connected with the physical arrange-

76 Cf. e.g. O.H. Steck, Grundtext, 51.56.
77 Cf. ibid., 51.
78 According to ibid., 55–58 and U. Berges, Buch, 433 v. 17–22 are a later addition.
79 Cf. W. In der Smitten, Art. חוֹמָה, 810.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ment of the city. In order to cope with a feeling of disappointment, the authors of v. 17–18 focussed conceptually on ethics in Zion. Thus, salvation can be experienced from within the walls and praise can be heard through the gates.[80]

Second, the idea that Yhwh becomes Zion's 'everlasting light' reinforces the different tone in v. 17–22.[81] Although the image of the sun (cf. שמש) strongly evokes the spatial concept of v. 1–3, v. 19–20 do not produce a concept of space but envision a period of time where Zion's sun will never set. Thus, in a way, v. 19–20 continue the image first portrayed in v. 1–3, but not with regard to its spatial arrangement. First and foremost, the social implications of solar language applied to Yhwh come to the fore in Isa 60:19–20, so it cannot be separated from v. 18. As Yhwh will appoint peace and righteousness so that Zion will call her walls salvation and her gates praise, Zion's daylight will not vanish – her salvation will come true eventually. Finally, Zion's people are called צדיקים ('righteous') and 'the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified.' The designation 'the branch of my planting' refers initially to the idea that possessing the land means being planted there by Yhwh (cf. e. g. Ex 15,17; Ps 80,9).[82] However, the theme of planting is not entirely new. It bears a relationship to the trees in Isa 60:13 that beautify Zion.[83] Finally, it is the righteous people who will possess the holy place. Here, they resemble the righteous in Ps 37:29 who will inherit the land and live in it forever;[84] more strikingly, Ps 37:29 and Isa 60:21 both do not use ארץ ('land') with the definite article. Isa 60:21 probably reflects the discussion about legitimate land possession in postexilic times. Following Ps 37:39, Isa 60:21 strongly opts for the righteous, too – and thus implicitly against the wicked (cf. Ps 37:30–31). Therefore Joseph Blenkinsopp rightly notes that there is 'an underlying issue of setting to right social wrongs in evidence at the time of writing.'[85]

3. Concluding remarks

Jews, Christians, and Muslims all regard Jerusalem as a unifying symbol of their identity. All of them remember this holy place as having central importance within their history of their tradition: for Jews, Jerusalem is significant because it is the site of the Temple; for Christians, Jerusalem is important because Jesus died

80 W.A.M. Beuken, Jesaja, 183, however, assumes salvation and praise even to be the fortification of the city.
81 Cf. O.H. Steck, Grundtext, 51.
82 Cf. J.L. Koole, Jes 56–66, 258.
83 Cf. J. Vermeylen, Prophète, 480.
84 Cf. W. Lau, Prophetie, 64; R. Nurmela, Mouth, 111; M. Arneth, Sonne, 180–181.
85 J. Blenkinsopp, Jes 56–66, 218.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

and was resurrected there; for Muslims, Jerusalem is important because it is the site where the Prophet ascended to heaven.

In postexilic times, Isa 60 paints a vivid portrait of Jerusalem becoming a centre of attraction for peoples from all over the world (cf. Isa 60:4 ff.). The world is mentally mapped as a centre – the shining city of God – and a dark periphery (cf. Isa 60:1–3). Jerusalem is clearly singled out because of its religious quality, yet more strikingly, the city is not explicitly described as holy. As has become apparent, the authors of Isa 60 envisioned Zion to become the navel of the earth, but they did not want to set the centre apart and intended to open it for anyone who is willing to leave the periphery and to contribute to glorify the city of God. In doing so, they want Jerusalem to become a unifying symbol for the whole world.

In producing their concept of space, the authors portrayed Jerusalem in terms of elevation and centrality that clearly evoke the Jerusalem cultic tradition. In Isa 60, however, the holy place is not limited locally – it does extend and is enlarged to the city in its entirety. As personified Zion has to succeed the Servant in becoming 'a light to the nations,' the holy place cannot be thought of as restricted area; likewise, a shining centre of attraction cannot be thought of without envisioning a righteous people in Zion (cf. v. 17–22).

As mentioned above, the idea of Mother Zion is not at all a dominant feature in Isa 60. The figure of personified Zion, however, is addressed in a more general sense throughout the chapter. Thus, space is constructed *for* personified Zion – she becomes not only a spectator of what is happening, but will eventually know her God on the basis of these events (cf. v. 16).

Bibliography

Albani, M., "Wo sollte ein Haus sein, das ihr mir bauen könntet?" (Jes 66,1). Schöpfung als Tempel JHWHs?, in: B. Ego/A. Lange/P. Pilhofer (eds.), Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum (WUNT 118), Tübingen 1999, 37–56.

Arneth, M., "Sonne der Gerechtigkeit". Studien zur Solarisierung der Jahwe-Religion im Lichte von Psalm 72 (BZAR 1), Wiesbaden 2000.

Assmann, J., Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in den frühen Hochkulturen (Beck'sche Reihe), München 2007.

Berges, U., Das Buch Jesaja. Komposition und Endgestalt (HBS 16), Freiburg/Basel/Wien 1998.

– Gottesgarten und Tempel: Die neue Schöpfung im Jesajabuch, in: O. Keel/E. Zenger (eds.), Gottesstadt und Gottesgarten. Zu Geschichte und Theologie des Jerusalemer Tempels (QD 191), Freiburg/Basel/Wien 2002, 69–98.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Berquist, J.L., Introduction: Critical Spatiality and the Uses of Theory, in: J.L. Berquist/C.V. Camp (eds.), Constructions of Space I. Theory, Geography, and Narrative (Library of the Hebrew Bible: Old Testament Studies 481), New York/London 2007, 1–12.

Beuken, W.A.M., Jesaja deel III/A (De prediking van het Oude Testament), Nijkerk 1989.

Blenkinsopp, J., Isaiah 56–66. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AncB 19B), New York u. a. 2003.

Bolte, P., Art. Grenze, in: HRWG (1993) 52–51.

Camp, C.V., Introduction, in: J.L. Berquist/C.V. Camp (eds.), Constructions of Space II. The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces (Library of the Hebrew Bible: Old Testament Studies 490), New York/London 2008, 1–17.

De Hulster, I.J., Iconographic Exegesis and Third Isaiah (FAT II/36), Tübingen 2009.

Dempsey, C.J., From Desolation to Delight. The Transformative Vision of Isaiah 60–62, in: A.J. Everson/H.C.P. Kim (eds..), The Desert Will Bloom: Poetic Visions in Isaiah (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 4), Atlanta 2009, 217–232.

Duhm, B., Das Buch Jesaia (Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament), Göttingen 1914.

Engelken, K., Art. שׂרת, in: ThWAT (1995) 495–507.

Finkelstein, I., Jerusalem in the Persian (and Early Hellenistic) Period and the Wall of Nehemiah, in: JSOT 32 (2008) 501–520.

Gamberoni, J., Art. מָקוֹם, in: ThWAT (1984) 1113–1124.

Gehlen, R., Art. Raum, in: HRWG (1998) 377–398.

George, M.K., Space and History. Siting Critical Space for Biblical Studies, in: J.L. Berquist/C.V. Camp (eds.), Constructions of Space I. Theory, Geography, and Narrative (Library of the Hebrew Bible: Old Testament Studies 481), New York/London 2007, 15–31.

Grabbe, L.L., 'They Shall Come Rejoicing to Zion' – or Did They? The Settlement of Yehud in the Early Persian Period, in: Exile and Restoration Revisited (FS P.R. Ackroyd) (Library of Second Temple Studies 73), London/New York 2009, 116–127.

Grund, A./Janowski, B., "Solange die Erde steht…" Zur Erfahrung von Raum und Zeit im alten Israel, in: B. Janowski/K. Liess (eds.), Der Mensch im alten Israel. Neue Forschungen zur alttestamentlichen Anthropologie (HBS 59), Freiburg u. a. 2009, 487–535.

Hartenstein, F., Die Unzugänglichkeit Gottes im Heiligtum. Jesaja 6 und der Wohnort JHWHs in der Jerusalemer Kulttradition (WMANT 75), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1997.

Häusl, M. (ed.), Tochter Zion auf dem Weg zum himmlischen Jerusalem. Rezeptionslinien der "Stadtfrau Jerusalem" von den späten alttestamentlichen Texten bis zu den Werken der Kirchenväter (Dresdner Beiträge zur Geschlechterforschung in Geschichte, Kultur und Literatur 2), Leipzig 2011.

In Der Smitten, W., Art. חוֹמָה, in: ThWAT (1977) 806–811.

Janowski, B., JHWH und der Sonnengott. Aspekte der Solarisierung JHWHs in vorexilischer Zeit, in: J. Mehlhausen (ed.), Pluralismus und Identität (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 8), Gütersloh 1995, 214–241.

Japhet, S., Some Biblical Concepts of Sacred Place, in: B.Z. Kedar/R.J.Z. Werblowsky (eds.), Sacred Space – Shrine, City, Land. Proceedings of the International Conference in Memory of Joshua Prawer, Basingstoke e. a. 1998, 55–72.

Keel, O., Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus (2 Bde.) (Orte und Landschaften der Bibel IV, 1), Göttingen 2007.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Koenen, K., Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesajabuch. Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie (WMANT 62), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1990.
Koole, J.L., Isaiah. Part III. Volume 3. Isaiah Chapters 56–66 (HCOT), Leuven 2001.
Lack, R., La Symbolique du Livre d'Isaie. Essai sur l'image littéraire comme élément de structuration (Analecta Biblica 59), Rom 1973.
Langer, B., Gott als "Licht" in Israel und Mesopotamien. Eine Studie zu Jes 60,1–3.19f. (ÖBS 7), Klosterneuburg 1989.
Lau, W., Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56–66. Eine Untersuchung zu den literarischen Bezügen in den letzten elf Kapiteln des Jesajabuches (BZAW 225), Berlin/New York 1994.
Lefebvre, H., The Production of Space, Malden 2011.
Leuenberger, M., Gott in Bewegung. Religions- und theologiegeschichtliche Beiträge zu Gottesvorstellungen im alten Israel (FAT 76), Tübingen 2011.
Maier, C.M., Daughter Zion, Mother Zion. Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel, Minneapolis 2008.
Metzger, M., Himmlische und irdische Wohnstatt Jahwes, in: UF 2 (1970) 139–158.
Nurmela, N., The mouth of the Lord has spoken. Inner biblical allusions in Second and Third Isaiah (Studies in Judaism), Lanham 2006.
Osborne, T.P., Lumière contre lumières. Une étude d'Ésaïe 60, in: J. Ries/C.-M. Ternes (eds.), Symbolisme et expérience de la lumière dans les grandes religions. Actes du colloque tenu à Luxembourg du 29 au 31 mars 1996, Turnhout 2002, 135–147.
Otto, E., Art. שָׁעַר, in: ThWAT (1995) 358–403.
Polan, G.J., Zion, the Glory of the Holy One of Israel. A Literary Analysis of Isaiah 60, in: L. Boadt/M. Smith (eds.), Imagery and Imagination in Biblical Literature (CBQ.MS 32), Washington D.C. 2001, 50–71.
Smith, J.Z., Map is not Territory. Studies in the History of Religion (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 23), Leiden 1978.
Soja, E.W., Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory London/New York 1989.
Spans, A., Die Stadtfrau Zion im Zentrum der Welt. Exegese und Theologie von Jes 60–62 (BBB 175), Göttingen 2015.
Steck, O.H., Zion als Gelände und Gestalt. Überlegungen zur Wahrnehmung Jerusalems als Stadt und Frau im Alten Testament, in: ZThK 86 (1989) 261–281.
– Der Grundtext in Jesaja 60 und sein Aufbau, in: idem, Studien zu Tritojesaja (BZAW 203), Berlin/New York 1991, 49–79.
– Heimkehr auf der Schulter oder/und auf der Hüfte. Jes 49,22b/60,4b, in: idem, Studien zu Tritojesaja (BZAW 203), Berlin/New York 1991, 97–100.
– Lumen Gentium. Exegetische Bemerkungen zum Grundsinn von Jesaja 60,1–3, in: idem, Studien zu Tritojesaja (BZAW 203), Berlin/New York 1991, 80–96.
– Tritojesaja im Jesajabuch, in: idem, Studien zu Tritojesaja (BZAW 203), Berlin/New York 1991, 3–45.
– Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis. Wege der Nachfrage und Fährten zur Antwort, Tübingen 1996.
Tiemeyer, L.-S., Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage. Post-Exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood (FAT II/19), Tübingen 2006.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Tsoi, J.T., 'I am the Lord; in its time I will hasten it!' The Dynamic Parallelism of Isaiah 60, in: Jin Dao 16 (2001) 21–55.

Tuell, S.S., The Priesthood of the 'Foreigner'. Evidence of Competing Polities in Ezekiel 44:1–14 and Isaiah 56:1–8, in: Constituting the Community: Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel (FS S. Dean McBride, Jr.), Winona Lake 2005, 183–204.

Ussishkin, D., The Borders and De Facto Size of Jerusalem in the Persian Period, in: O. Lipschits/M. Oeming (eds.), Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period, Winona Lake 2006, 147–166.

Vermeylen, J., Du prophète Isaie à l'apocalyptique. Isaie, I–XXXV, mirroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israel, Louvain 1977.

Weinfeld, M., Zion and Jerusalem as Religious and Political Capital. Ideology and Utopia, in: R.E. Friedman (eds.), The Prophet and The Historian. Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism (Harvard Semitic Studies), Chico 1983, 75–115.

Wells, R.D., 'They all gather, they come to you'. History, Utopia and the Reading of Isaiah 49:18–26 and 60:4–16, in: A.J. Everson/H.C.P. Kim (eds.), The Desert Will Bloom: Poetic Visions in Isaiah (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 4), Atlanta 2009, 197–216.

Werblowsky, R.J.Z., Introduction. Mindscape and Landscape, in: B.Z. Kedar/R.J.Z. Werblowsky (eds.), Sacred Space – City, Shrine, Land. Proceedings of the International Conference in Memory of Joshua Prawer, Basingstoke e. a. 1998, 9–17.

Zapff, B.M., Jesaja 56–66 (NEB 37), Würzburg 2006.

Zillessen, A., "Tritojesaja" und Deuterojesaja. Eine literarkritische Untersuchung zu Jes 56–66, in: ZAW 26 (1906) 231–276.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Casey A. Strine

Imitation, Subversion, and Transformation of the Mesopotamian *MīsPî* Ritual in the Book of Ezekiel's Depiction of Holy Space

The Jerusalem temple is the preeminent holy place in ancient Judah. One imagines this would be all the more true for a Judahite priest, and yet the book of Ezekiel – perhaps the most prominent Judahite priestly voice in the latter prophets – speaks of and treats the Jerusalem temple in a radically different way. In this essay, I shall argue that Ezek 1–11 models the movements of the prophet and YHWH from the Judahite exilic community in Tel Abib to the Jerusalem temple and back on the stages of the Mesopotamian cult statue induction ritual in order to heighten its description of YHWH's destruction and desecration of the Jerusalem temple. Ezekiel also utilizes a theme from the cult statue induction ritual to temporarily relocate YHWH's special presence to a valley near the exiles' residence in Babylonia. The valley is a liminal locale where the people can be purified and their relationship with YHWH restored. All this prepares for the book's climatic vision, in which this purified community accompanies YHWH to a re-sacralized Jerusalem temple, a procession that resolves the narrative tension created by YHWH's earlier desecration of it.

My argument shall proceed in three steps. First, I shall offer a brief overview of the Mesopotamian cult statue induction ritual, known as the *mīs pî* or mouth washing ritual. This overview enables, second, a comparison between the *mīs pî* and Ezek 1–11 that demonstrates how the book employs this model to portray YHWH's judgment upon the Jerusalem temple. Third and finally, I shall explore how the latter portion of Ezekiel (chs. 33–48) draws on the cult statue induction ritual to construct a temporary sacred space for the divine presence with the exiles prior to their return to a transformed Jerusalem.

To begin, then, a brief summary of the *mīs pî* ritual:

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

1. Space and Movement in the Mesopotamian Cult Statue Induction Ritual

Christopher Walker and Michael Dick have summarized the Mesopotamian cult statue induction ritual as follows: '[t]he basic form of the "mouth-washing" ritual involved a washing of the statue's mouth followed by a mouth opening… mouth-washing and mouth-opening take place among the orchards and canals of Ekarzaginna…, and are followed by the entry of the statues into their temple… Both of our ritual texts, the Babylonian Ritual (BR) and the Nineveh Ritual (NR), are elaborations on the basic pattern.'[1]

Angelika Berlejung[2] provides a detailed, 11 stage scheme developed from a composite of the Nineveh and Babylonian texts that Andreas Schüle helpfully condenses into a four-stage process by grouping events that happen in the same locale.[3] Schüle's summary highlights that ritualized actions occur in four locations with processions between them that allow the cult statue, ritual personnel, and other necessary items to move among these places. The *mīs pî* exhibits the following spatial structure and progression:

Locale 1: Workshop (*bīt mummi* or *bīt mārē ummâni*)[4]
Procession from the workshop to the river bank

Locale 2: River Bank (*kišad nāri*) in the Steppe (*ṣērum*)
Procession from the river bank to the orchard

Locale 3: Orchard (*kirûm*)[5]
Procession from the orchard to the temple complex

Locale 4: Temple Complex (*bāb bit ili* and *papaḫḫum*)

The induction process begins in the workshop, where a wood statue is crafted, overlaid with precious metals, and often clothed in elegant garments. This is followed by the first ritualized procession, which moves the statue into the steppe and by the river bank. These two terms overlap in many ways, but each one has a distinct meaning and importance.

1 C. Walker / M.B. Dick, Induction (2001), 16–17. Although Walker and Dick observe 'that the ritual was in a state of continuous development' and lacked a 'canonical order' (ibid., 17), the variation is in the number and order of the incantations used in the induction process and not the locations and overall shape of the ritual.

2 For her detailed argument, see A. Berlejung, Theologie; cf. idem., Washing. Other important studies include C. Walker / M.B. Dick, Induction (1999); idem., Inductio (2001); and P. J. Boden, Washing.

3 A. Schüle, Image, 12–13.

4 C. Walker / M.B. Dick, Induction (2001), 52, note 34.

5 I depart from Schüle in translating *kirûm* as orchard instead of garden. His choice appears determined more by interest in Gen 2–3 than the meaning of *kirûm*.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The steppe (*ṣērum*) is not so much a physical location as a cosmological space, a 'free landscape' where all impurities could be removed from the image and left in an area 'where they could harm no one.'[6] It is a place that 'represents chaos and the uncreated,'[7] a prototypical liminal space where the transition from one social state to another may happen.

The river bank (*kišad nāri*) holds a special significance in the *mīs pî* because it is where 'the image met its father Ea for the first time… the image was in a transition between the craftsmen on one side and the river god, as its divine father, on the other.'[8] When the tools used to fashion the statue are thrown into the river in a symbolic act '[t]he image was thus isolated from the tools,' says Berlejung, 'and thereby divested of its human past. This could be interpreted as a rite of separation.'[9] By borrowing this concept from Arnold van Gennep, Berlejung stresses the transitional nature of these activities, which capitalize on the liminality of the space to move the statue from one social status (humanly crafted statue) into another (vehicle of divine epiphany).

After completing several incantations prescribed for the river bank setting, the statue is moved into the neighboring orchard – a different locale, but one still within the confines of the steppe – where reed huts (*šutukku* or *urigallu*) with thrones (*kussê*) inside await Ea, Šamaš, and Marduk (called Asalluḫi in the ritual text). The cult statue will spend the greatest time here: after a series of offerings to the various gods present, the statue spends the night outside, under the stars, surrounded by members of the divine pantheon.[10] In the morning of the second day there are more offerings, a series of oaths by the human craftsmen disavowing their work in creating the statue, and a series of incantations in which Ea, Šamaš, and Marduk are 'asked to determine the destiny of the image and to activate its vital functions.'[11] This procedure is completed when the priest (a *mašmaššu*) whispers a prayer to the cult statue that asks it to enter its temple, dwell in its land, and rule it with a positive disposition. This ritualized act symbolizes that the deity's vital functions are operative and its divine status is secured. The remaining activities at the orchard serve as a prelude for the procession into the temple: the god is asked to be a good *lamassu*,[12] namely the priest requests that the deity dwell in the temple and, endowed now with divine radi-

6 A. Berlejung, Washing, 54.
7 C. Walker / M.B. Dick, Induction (2001), 52, note 36; cf. A. Berlejung, Washing, 53–54.
8 A. Berlejung, Washing, 55.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid., 57.
11 Ibid., 61.
12 Ibid., 64–65; cf. 'lamassatu' *CAD* 9:60–66, especially meaning 2d.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ance, be the ruler and protector (*ušumgallu*) of his land 'over which he reigned from a seat connecting the two cosmic realms'[13] of heaven and earth.

Upon leaving the orchard, the statue began a hazardous journey through the steppe, into the city, and to its sanctuary. The image eventually passed through the temple gate (*bāb bit ili*), leaving the danger of the city and entering the security of the sanctuary,[14] and then it proceeded to the holy of holies (*papaḫḫum*) where it sat enthroned to receive its worship and perform its obligations (e. g. preserving life, keeping social order, and pronouncing oracles). 'The ritual,' Berlejung concludes, 'thus enabled [the statue] to become the pure epiphany of its god and to be a fully interacting and communicating partner for the king, the priests and the faithful.'[15]

2. Space and Movement in Ezekiel 1–11

This description of the Mesopotamian ritual for inducting cult images, albeit brief, enables comparison with Ezek 1–11. These chapters narrate a series of theophanies, prophetic sign-acts, and oracles that occur in similar locales, including the prophet's exilic residence on the river Chebar, at a hill known as Tel Abib (near Nippur), and finally in Jerusalem and its temple. The similarities between these locations and the movements among them indicate that Ezek 1–11 consciously replicates the spaces and movements of the *mīs pî* ritual. Up to a point, that is.

When YHWH and the prophet arrive at the Jerusalem temple, Ezek 1–11 departs from the pattern of the *mīs pî* ritual. Rather than invalidating the comparison, this divergence constitutes Ezekiel's counterclaim, namely that neither YHWH nor a humanly-crafted cult statue of Judah's patron deity resides in the Jerusalem temple. Quite the contrary: YHWH returns to Jerusalem only to destroy it, indicating that it is no longer a holy place.

One item of prolegomena remains necessary: how did Ezekiel and the Judahite community in Babylon know the *mīs pî* ritual? Although the *mīs pî* is an esoteric text with a limited audience, its basic outline appears in public texts such as Esarhaddon's Babylon inscription[16] and one of Assurbanipal's pageantry texts.[17]

13 Ibid., 64.

14 Ibid., 67–68.

15 Ibid., 72.

16 Esarhaddon, AsBbE, lines 20–24, explains that Marduk's statue, recently restored by the *mīs pî* induction ritual, should process from the *bīt mummi* to the temple of Ekargazinna in Babylon, passing through gardens (*ṣippatum*), orchards (*kirûm*), and canals (*palgum*), locations that recall the *mīs pî*; see R. BORGER, Inschriften, 86–89, esp. 89; cf. C. WALKER / M.B. DICK, Induction (1999), 63–67, esp. 66.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The ritual text itself is not extant outside Mesopotamia, but one of its key incantations has been found in the Levant, confirming that it was known to more than a small group of Mesopotamian literati.[18] Perhaps most importantly, one of the tablets used to reconstruct the ritual is a school text from Nippur.[19] Not only does this evidence reinforce the notion that more than a small number of active priests knew the ritual, it places the text in close proximity to the Judahite exiles. When paired with strong indications that at least one of the authorial hands in Ezekiel received scribal training,[20] the Nippur tablet presents a means for the book's knowledge of the *mīs pî* ritual.

To be sure, the evidence is circumstantial. Yet, there is a preponderance of evidence that Ezekiel knows other similar Mesopotamian texts (e. g. *Erra and Ishum*),[21] suggesting that a sufficient mechanism for influence was present.[22] It is, therefore, justifiable to explore the ways in which Ezekiel alludes to the *mīs pî* ritual.

2.1. Ezekiel 1–3: The Prophet's Movements

Ezekiel 1:1 locates the prophet among the Babylonian exiles על נהר כבר. Typically translated as the river Chebar, evidence suggests that this is actually a canal in the vicinity of Nippur that 'distributed water from the Tigris and Euphrates throughout the city and its environs.'[23] Famously, the prophet witnesses the mystifying *merkabâ* theophany there. This visionary appearance precedes YHWH's commissioning of the prophet, who will speak to a people that will not listen. This situation is illustrated in Ezek 2:8–3:11, where the prophet eats a scroll that is as sweet as honey (דבש) in his mouth.

There are two important connections between Ezek 1:1–3:11 and the cult statue induction ritual. First is their locale: the river bank (*kišad nāri*) and the river Chebar, where the prophet encounters the theophany. Second, there are notable similarities between the theophanic depiction in Ezekiel and the incantation 'When the god was made' (STT 200) that the *mīs pî* uses to express the radiance of the deity represented in the purified statue.[24] That incantation recalls

17 M. STRECK, Assurbanipal, 265–270, esp. 269.
18 Ibid., 20; cf. J. LÆSSØE, Prayer, 60–67.
19 C. WALKER / M.B. DICK, Induction (2001), 28–29.
20 A. WINITZER, Assyriology.
21 D. BODI, Book.
22 See C.B. HAYS, Death, 21–34, esp. 33–34. A more detailed discussion of the mechanisms by which Ezekiel could have known the *mīs pî* ritual is available in STRINE, Problem, 256–57.
23 D.I. Block, Book, 84.
24 Although neither BR nor NR prescribe using this incantation at the river, the similarities between them and Ezekiel suggests that the themes of this incantation are present.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

that the statue is made of various precious and semi-precious stones and states 'he is surrounded in radiance, he is endowed with an awesome radiance / he shines out splendidly, the statue appears brilliantly.'[25] This depiction is mirrored in Ezekiel, where YHWH appears in 'a huge cloud and flashing fire, surrounded by a radiance; and in the center of it, in the center of the fire, a gleam as of amber' (1:4; cf. 1:27–28). 'Amber' is a translation for the rare term חשמל (1:4, 27; 8:2) that Daniel Bodi convincingly argues is equivalent to Akkadian *elmešu*, 'a quasi-mythical stone… used for adorning divine statues.'[26] The recurrence of this rare term in STT 200[27] and Ezekiel could be mere coincidence, but it is notable evidence in a cumulative case for resemblance.

The prophet's first change of locale comes in Ezek 3:12–21, where he is borne by the רוח and brought to the exiles at תל אביב (3:15). Though the name of this place is familiar, its meaning remains uncertain. Daniel Block represents the majority view: '[w]hile the name Tel Abib translates literally "mound of spring produce," as a Mesopotamian toponym it is derived from *til abubi*, "mound of the flood [debris]… a ruin-hill," popularly conceived as having been destroyed by the primeval deluge.'[28] Block, like Zimmerli and Greenberg, bases this reading on the conjecture that '[t]his name may have been applied to the present site in the aftermath of the Chaldean destruction of the region around Nippur,'[29] where the exiles were sent to rebuild. Perhaps, but such conjecture is unnecessary. The literal meaning of תל אביב as 'mound of spring produce' describes a place of agricultural fertility that corresponds to the orchard (*kirûm*), the second station in the *mīs pî* ritual. True, there is some semantic variance between the two terms – whereas אביב is associated with grain (Lev 2:14), *kirûm* is linked to fruits and vegetables – but the shared connotation of horticultural fruitfulness remains.

The prophet changes locale again in Ezek 3:22, where he is commanded to arise and to go out אל הבקעה. Where, exactly, is this valley or plain? Perhaps it is wrong to attempt to place it on a map. Block captures its symbolic importance, remarking that 'this region was wasteland, an appropriate place for a private meeting with God.'[30] The הבקעה is, therefore, comparable to the steppe (*ṣērum*) in the Mesopotamian ritual, not so much a physical location as a cosmological space, a prototypical liminal locale.

The parallel between the valley and the steppe is reinforced by the prophet's next movement: in Ezek 3:24 the prophet is commanded to 'go and shut yourself in your house.' Even though commentators instinctively interpret this as Eze-

25 C. Walker / M.B. Dick, Induction (2001), 98; STT 200, lines 8–10.
26 Quote from M.S. Odell, Ezekiel, 22, 25; see D. Bodi, Book, 82–94 for details.
27 C. Walker / M.B. Dick, Induction (1999), 99.
28 D.I. Block, Book, 135–136; cf. W. Zimmerli, Commentary, 139; M. Greenberg, Ezekiel, 71.
29 D.I. Block, Book, 136.
30 Ibid., 153.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

kiel's home,[31] there is nothing in the text or in the term בית that requires this to be the prophet's domestic residence. If, instead, בית is interpreted as an unspecified dwelling, then it is equally plausible that it correlates to the reed huts (*šutukku* or *urigallu*) in which statues of Ea, Šamaš, and Marduk dwell during the ritual activities in the orchard. It is crucial, therefore, to note what happens after Ezekiel enters this house: YHWH causes the prophet's tongue to cling to the roof of his mouth so that he cannot serve as an intercessor for the people[32] and concurrently declares that the prophet's mouth will be opened אפתח את פיך when there is a divine word for the people. 'The startling effect' of YHWH's statement, concludes James Kennedy, 'is to portray Ezekiel as a kind of living idol.'[33] There is probably no clearer connection to the cult statue induction ritual in Ezekiel.

Beyond these similarities in Ezek 1–3, there are further indications that the prophet's and YHWH's movements are related to the *mīs pî* ritual in Ezek 8–11.

2.2. Ezek 8–11: YHWH and the Prophet Process into and out of the Temple

The text next gives the prophet's locale in Ezek 8:1, after a long interlude of prophetic sign acts and oracles, when Ezekiel says that 'I was dwelling in my house,' precisely where he was when chapter three ended. Almost immediately, the prophet is transported to the north gate of Jerusalem[34] (8:3; cf. BR, lines 59–60) where he once again sees the כבוד אלהי ישׂראל that appeared to him in the valley. William Tooman is correct that this is a *Wiederaufnahme* to Ezek 1:27–28,[35] but it is no less a resumptive repetition for 3:22–27, when the presence of YHWH appeared to the prophet and promised to open his mouth in the future.

This supernatural transfer to Jerusalem begins the final phase of the cult statue induction ritual as well: the procession through the city and into the temple. First, Ezek 8:7 indicates that the prophet, with the כבוד אלהי ישׂראל, has moved from the city gate to the entrance of the temple courtyard (פתח החצר). Second, Ezek 8:14 describes how YHWH transports the prophet to the northern gate of the temple (פתח שׁער בית יהוה אשׁר אל הצפונה; cf. *bāb bit ili*, BR line 60), ever closer to the destination of the ritual procession. Along the inward route from the city gate to the temple, the prophet witnesses a series of cultic practices: an image of jealousy (הקנאה סמל; 8:5), a ritual chamber with detestable images covering its walls (8:10–

31 W. ZIMMERLI, Commentary, 159; M. GREENBERG, Ezekiel, 120–21; D.I. BLOCK, Book, 154; P.M. JOYCE, Ezekiel, 82; M.S. ODELL, Ezekiel, 57–58.

32 R.R. WILSON, Interpretation, 91–104.

33 J.M. KENNEDY, Piṯhôn Peh, 235.

34 Reading with the LXX, which lacks הפנימית; cf. W. ZIMMERLI, Commentary, 217, 237, and S. ACKERMAN, Tree, 39, 53–55.

35 W.A. TOOMAN, Challenge, 500–501.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

11), a ritual entreaty to Tammuz (8:14), and finally 25 men worshipping the sun (8:17). These activities – all related to image-based cultic worship – imply that the procession is moving towards an inner sanctum where one would enshrine a freshly purified and vivified cult statue.

It is, therefore, a noteworthy departure from the Mesopotamian model when YHWH and the prophet take divergent paths in Ezek 9. This is highlighted by Ezek 9:3, the first occasion on which the כבודmoves without the prophet in tow; indeed, the prophet's location remains unmentioned until 11:1, when he joins YHWH at the east gate of the temple. Meanwhile, the כבוד ascends to the threshold of the temple (מפתן הבית),[36] from where YHWH commands a man clothed in linen to search for anyone who 'groans because of the abominations committed within [Jerusalem]' (9:4). YHWH commands six others to smite man, woman, and child without pity (9:5), destroying (שׁחת) Jerusalem's residents. This destruction, which begins with the elders in 'my sanctuary' (מקדשׁי), will defile the temple (טמאו את הבית) and fill its courtyard with the slain. By following the structure of the *mīs pî* ritual faithfully to this stage and then departing from it suddenly, Ezekiel juxtaposes the anticipated installation of a freshly purified cult statue with the astonishing defilement of the holy place where the audience expects that the deity or its representative image should reside.[37]

To grasp the correlation between the *mīs pî* and Ezek 1–11 is to see that the text is a narrative of YHWH's return to the Jerusalem to destroy the city (cf. Ezek 43:2) and not YHWH's initial departure from the sanctuary, as so many commentators conclude.[38] Indeed, the similarities observed between Ezek 1–11 and the Mesopotamian ritual underscore that neither YHWH nor Ezekiel (filling the role of vivified *imago Dei*) resides in the Jerusalem temple. The procession of Ezekiel and YHWH into the Jerusalem temple in Ezek 8–9 is matched by their reverse journey in Ezek 10–11, which narrates YHWH's departure from the desecrated Jerusalem temple.

When the man in linen returns to the sanctuary to report that he and the six others have completed their assignment, YHWH gives him a new task: he is to disperse burning coals (גחלי אשׁ) throughout the city (10:2,6–7). This act correlates to the purification prescribed in the incantation 'As he walked down the street,' which is recited in the cult statue induction ritual during the procession through the city to the temple in order to keep the freshly purified and vivified statue from contamination.[39] YHWH's next movement (10:18), which is to re-mount the

36 This is a parallel to the entrance of the sanctuary (*papaḫḫum*) where the statue resided.
37 The rhetorical technique of defying expectations in this way is also found in Amos 1–2; cf. J. BARTON, Oracle; and idem, Theology, 57–61.
38 W.A. TOOMAN, Challenge, 498–514.
39 C. WALKER / M.B. DICK, Induction (2001), 206–225, esp. lines 58–66; cf. BR, line 59. See also the incantations 'Ki-utu-kam' and 'For the stride of a foot' (ibid., 187, tablet 4, lines 19–39).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

merkabâ in order to process out from the now unclean temple and through the defiled city indicates that a similar notion is intended here. This outward procession unfolds quickly, albeit with some interspersed digressions in the text: Ezek 10:19 tracks the *merkabâ* to the east gate of the temple and 11:22–23 follows the כבוד to a hill east of the city. By suggesting that YHWH could not move freely through Jerusalem any longer, Ezekiel highlights the city's unholiness, its inhospitability to the divine presence, and the need for a pure deity to remain separate from it. Much as Ezek 20 inverts Israel's past interactions with YHWH into a narrative of perpetual unfaithfulness, a kind of *Unheilsgeschichte,* so too does the portrayal of Jerusalem and its temple in Ezek 8–11 remake a sacred space into *Unheiligtum.* Whatever Jerusalem's status as *Heiligtum* might have been in the past, Ezekiel rescinds it in dramatic fashion.

Framing the return trip within the conceptual world of the *mīs pî* ritual underscores Ezekiel's understanding of the divine presence in Babylonia: the two figures move with purpose from a temporary dwelling place, towards a symbolic terminus; but, instead of ending their travels there, they return to their initial, temporary dwelling place. This point – made implicitly through the modeling of Ezek 1–11 on the *mīs pî* ritual – is stated explicitly when the opening section of the book concludes in Ezek 11:14–21. There, Ezekiel asserts that YHWH will be a מקדש מעט for the exiles. This difficult phrase will be discussed further in a moment, but for now I note that this statement is the explicit counterpart that Yairah Amit correctly maintains accompanies an implicit polemic of the sort I have outlined here.[40]

3. Exile as Liminal Sacred Space

YHWH's departure from Jerusalem and the desecration of it raises a related issue: what, if any, sacred space is available for YHWH's dwelling now that Jerusalem lies in ruins? Here, further similarities between Ezekiel and the *mīs pî* ritual elucidate Ezekiel's answer.

As just noted, the clearest statement regarding YHWH's future dwelling comes at the end of Ezek 11. This disputation speech (11:14–21) denies that the land of Judah has been given to the Judahites who remain there and concomitantly explains that YHWH will be a מקדש מעט for the exiles. This enigmatic phrase is either a statement of measure (i. e., describing a reduced sanctuary) or a temporal limitation (i. e., a sanctuary for a restrained period of time). Opinion is evenly split on the question, but Tooman is correct to conclude that there are clear

40 See Y. Amit, Polemics, for the importance of these features in a hidden polemic.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

reasons to favor the temporal interpretation.[41] That position is reinforced by the similarities between Ezekiel and the *mīs pî* ritual. For instance, there is more than a passing resemblance between the מקדש מעט concept and the temporary reed-huts (*šutukku* or *urigallu*) where Ea, Šamaš, and Marduk dwell during the cult statue induction ritual.

If this parallel seems speculative, there is further evidence for it in the instances where YHWH appears to Ezekiel in chs. 33–48. For instance, one indication that the themes of the *mīs pî* ritual are again relevant occurs at Ezek 33:21–22. When the news of the destruction of Jerusalem reaches the prophet, the text indicates that 'the hand of YHWH was upon me' (ויד יהוה היתה אלי). This phrase describes the interaction between YHWH and the prophet at each stage of their movement in Ezek 1–11 as well (Ezek 1:3; 3:14,22; 8:1). The connection to the induction ritual is reinforced by the result of the news, namely that Ezekiel's mouth is opened (ויפתח פי) so that he might mediate the divine word to the exiles. This statement is an unmistakable reference back to Ezek 3:27 in particular and the references to the *mīs pî* ritual woven throughout Ezek 1–11 in general.

Though separated by a series of oracles that condemn the non-exiles and express YHWH's preference for the exiles,[42] the same resonances are present in Ezek 37, which begins with the notable statement that 'the hand of YHWH was upon me (היתה עלי יד יהוה) and brought me out in the spirit of YHWH and set me in the midst of the valley' (בתוך הבקעה). This בקעה is where Ezekiel first encountered YHWH (Ezek 3:22–23), describes the locale from where they began their journey to the Jerusalem temple in Ezek 8 (v. 4), and serves as the parallel to the steppe (*ṣērum*) in the *mīs pî* ritual.

The steppe (*ṣērum*) is central to the *mīs pî* ritual: it is the place where the cult statue, other deities, and ritual personnel spend the most time. This location is not so much a physical location as a cosmological space, a 'free landscape' where all impurities could be removed from the cult statue and left in an area 'where they could harm no one.'[43] It is a place that 'represents chaos and the uncreated,'[44] a prototypical liminal space where the transition from one social state to another may happen. Arnold van Gennep, who developed the concept of a liminal space, observes that these are sparsely settled or largely uninhabited locales where a person 'finds himself physically and magico-religiously in a special situation for a certain length of time,' in a 'symbolic and spatial area of transition.'[45]

But what transition does the book of Ezekiel envision? It is not a purification of the deity's cult statue, but a cleansing for the people. The transitional space

41 W.A. TOOMAN, Challenge, 507, especially note 28.
42 M.A. SWEENEY, Assertion, 156–72; cf. C.A. STRINE, Enemies, 177–227, esp. 181–211.
43 A. BERLEJUNG, Washing, 54.
44 C. WALKER / M.B. DICK, Induction (2001), 52, note 36; cf. A. BERLEJUNG, Washing, 53–54.
45 A.v. GENNEP, Rites, 18.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

affords the exiles an opportunity to dissociate themselves from the image-based worship condemned throughout the book and, by doing so, to mark themselves off as part of the community that may accompany YHWH when the כבוד does return to Jerusalem (i. e. Ezek 37:11–14, 23).[46] It is an etic concept to the ancient Near East to call the valley a liminal space, but the concept clarifies the situation.

Liminal times and spaces enable *communitas* between parties, in this case between the deity and the people. *Communitas*, a concept outlined by Victor Turner in his development of van Gennep's earlier work,[47] represents an ideal relationship between parties, an immediate togetherness, or, as Turner himself borrowed from Martin Buber, 'a dynamic facing of, the others, a flowing from I to Thou.'[48] This ideal interaction is made more likely when the structure of society is left behind for a period of time. The book of Ezekiel capitalizes on the upheaval symbolized in Jerusalem's destruction and the spatial structure of the Mesopotamian cult statue induction ritual to argue that a new, albeit temporary, holy place existed in exile where YHWH and YHWH's people might meet one another afresh. Ezekiel re-appropriates exile, converting it from abandonment in a desolate place into a ritually demarcated, positive space; he transfigures the exilic outpost into sacred space, a protected locale away from the corrupt structures of Jerusalem where YHWH's relationship with Israel might be restored to its ideal form. This is summed up through the so-called covenant formula in Ezek 37:23, which rounds off the narrative: YHWH declares that 'I will save them from all their dwellings, where they sinned, and I will purify them; they will be my people and I myself will be their God.'

Confirmation that this transformation, one might say restoration, is the result of the exile comes when the hand of YHWH grasps the prophet for the final time in Ezek 40:1. YHWH and the prophet travel together once again to Jerusalem in order to visit its eschatological temple, into which YHWH processes once more (43:1–9). This procession, unlike the subversive account of Ezek 8–11, ends positively, with the unmediated presence of YHWH becoming the paramount feature of the city and temple (48:35). YHWH's return to Jerusalem – foreshadowed in Ezek 20 and described at the end of the book – resolves the tension created by both the desecration of Jerusalem and also the temporal limitations placed on YHWH's presence among the exiles. The potentially positive connotations of YHWH's procession into the heart of the Jerusalem temple that are subverted earlier are finally allowed to prevail in the book's concluding statement: 'the name of the city is YHWH is there.' Jerusalem's status as *Heiligtum* is restored and any logic for image-based worship is eviscerated. Indeed, the un-

46 See C.A. Strine, Role, 467–491.
47 V. Turner, Ritual, especially 94–165.
48 Ibid., 126–127.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

mediated presence of YHWH makes this eschatological city an *Überheiligtum*, exceeding any prior theophany.

4. Conclusion

In this essay, I have offered evidence that the book of Ezekiel, at a literary level,[49] models the movements of the prophet and YHWH between the river Chebar, Tel Abib, a valley, the city of Jerusalem, and the Jerusalem temple on those of the cult statue in the Mesopotamian cult statue induction ritual, known as the *mīs pî*. The book intentionally and subversively departs from that model at its culmination, using the procession of YHWH into Jerusalem's temple as a dramatic prelude to its destruction and desecration.

Ezekiel does not stop there. Ezekiel 10–11 follow YHWH back to Babylonia and end with the enigmatic statement that YHWH will be a מקדש מעט for the exiles there. The image plays on the temporary reed huts from which the Mesopotamian deities oversee the purification of the newly crafted cult statue; Ezekiel utilizes this motif in Ezek 37 to convert the barrenness of exile into a positive, ritually demarcated liminal space where transformation can occur and relationships be restored. YHWH dwells in a temporary sanctuary among the exiles, overseeing their purification and in due course their return to the land.

Unlike its compatriots who curtly declared cult images lifeless and powerless (e. g. Jer 10:1–16 and Isa 44:9–20), the book of Ezekiel chose a less direct and more sophisticated tactic for resisting image-based worship and dealing with the trauma of exile: it adopted the spatial structure of the ritual that justified image based cultic worship and incorporated it into the narrative arc of the book, albeit with important and subversive modifications. This allowed it to make a series of powerful claims about what did and did not constitute holy space: the book, in turn, desecrates the Jerusalem temple, sacralizes the exile, and, through its eschatological vision, (re)imagines Jerusalem as not just *Heiligtum*, but as *Überheiligtum*.

Bibliography

AMIT, Y., Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative. Translated by Jonathan Chipman (Biblical Interpretation Series 25), Leiden 2000.

49 It is impossible to know what, if any, relationship the literary presentation of the prophet's experience in Ezek 1–11 has to actual events. The argument is only tenable at the literary level since this is the only site at which an analogy to the *mīs pî* is demonstrable.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Barton, J., Amos's Oracles against the Nations: A Study of Amos 1.3–2.5 (SOTS.MS 6) Cambridge 1980.
– The Theology of the Book of Amos (Old Testament Theology), Cambridge 2012.
Berlejung, A., Washing the Mouth. The Consecration of Divine Images in Mesopotamia, in: K. van der Toorn (Ed.), The Image and the Book. Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East (CBET 21), Leuven 1997, 45–72.
– Die Theologie der Bilder. Herstellung und Einweihung von Kultbildern in Mesopotamien und die alttestamentliche Bilderpolemik (OBO 162), Göttingen 1998.
Block, D.I., The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 1–24 (NICOT), Grand Rapids 1997.
Boden, P.J., The Mesopotamian Washing of the Mouth (Mīs Pî) Ritual (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University), Baltimore 1998.
Bodi, D., The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra (OBO 104), Göttingen 1991.
Borger, R., Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien (AfO 9), Graz 1956.
Gennep, A.v., The Rites of Passage, translated by M.B. Vizedom and G.L. Caffee, Chicago 1960.
Greenberg, M., Ezekiel 1–20. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AncB 22), Garden City 1983.
Hays, C.B., Death in Iron Age II and First Isaiah (FAT 79), Tübingen 2011.
Joyce, P.M., Ezekiel: A Commentary (LHB/OTS 482), London 2007.
Kennedy, J.M., Hebrew *Pitḥôn Peh* in the Book of Ezekiel, in: VT 41 (1991) 233–235.
Læssøe, J., A Prayer to Ea, Shamash, and Marduk, from Hama, in: Iraq 18 (1956) 60–67.
Odell, M.S., Ezekiel (Smith & Helwys Bible Commentary), Macon 2005).
Schüle, A., Made in the 'Image of God'. The Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1–3, in: ZAW 117 (2005) 1–20.
Streck, M., Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's. Bd. 2. Texte (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 7.2), Leipzig 1916.
Strine, C.A., The Role of Repentance in the Book of Ezekiel. A Second Chance for the Second Generation, in: JThS 63 (2012) 467–91.
– Sworn Enemies. The Divine Oath, the book of Ezekiel, and the Polemics of Exile (BZAW 436), Berlin 2013.
– Ezekiel's Image Problem: The Mesopotamian Cult Statue Induction Ritual and the Imago Dei Anthropology in the Book of Ezekiel, in: CBQ 76 (2014) 252–72.
Sweeney, M.A., The Assertion of Divine Power in Ezekiel 33:21–39:29, in: Id., Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature (FAT 45), Tübingen 2005, 156–72.
Tooman, W.A., Ezekiel's Radical Challenge to Inviolability, in: ZAW 121 (2009) 498–514.
Turner, V., The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure, New Brunswick ^{2}1969.
Walker, C. / Dick, M.B., The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Mesopotamian Mīs Pî Ritual. Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary (State Archives of Assyria Literary Texts 1), Helsinki 2001.
– The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Mesopotamian *Mīs Pî* Ritual, in: M.B. Dick (Ed.), Born in Heaven, Made on Earth. The Making of the Cult Image in the Ancient Near East, Winona Lake 1999, 55–122.
Wilson, R.R., An Interpretation of Ezekiel's Dumbness, in: VT 22 (1972) 91–104.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Winitzer, A., Assyriology and Jewish Studies in Tel Aviv. Ezekiel among the Babylonian Literati, in: U. Gabbay / S. Secunda (Eds.), Encounters by the Rivers of Babylon: Scholarly Conversations between Jews, Iranians, and Babylonians, Tübingen 2014, 163–216.

Zimmerli, W., A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. Chapters 1–24, translated by R.E. Clements (Hermeneia 1), Minneapolis 1979.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Megan Daffern

The Psalms: Places for Remembering

The Psalms feature various landscapes: many different places are mentioned or described. These depictions of locales and buildings, whether in the superscriptions or the psalms themselves, have led form critics to argue for liturgical settings, contending that these hymns and songs inform today's theologian of the Temple cult.

Yet it is more complicated. Psalms scholarship has rarely considered that such landscapes should not always be taken literally.[1] Historical biblical scholars have recognised that the places described within the Psalms could sometimes be recollections, and such interpretations hang on the difficulty of tense in Hebrew verse translation, particularly Qal forms.[2] Such past depictions also relate to the difficulty of dating psalms, i. e. whether the Temple was standing or not.

I suggest that it is possible that the landscapes described within the Psalms are inner landscapes, places of the mind's eye, rather than physical localities experienced at the time of the performance of the text itself. Within geographically-resonant texts of the Psalter, there are the places where remembering and prayer occur, and the places that are themselves remembered. The relationship of these depends on the complex nexus of prayer, imagination, memory, and place. I therefore begin by exploring these ideas.

Prayer, Memory, Imagination, and Place

Memory as in the Hebrew *zkr* often has the sense of 'actualising'. To remember something is to have that in one's mind's eye, metaphorically before one's face. For God to remember someone is to have that one effectively made present before him, as such bringing about the continued existence both of that person, and of God's relationship with him. Thus insofar as mankind's remembering of God

1 J. Barton, Nature, on Ps 84.
2 P.C. Craigie, Psalms, 110–113; M. Dahood, Psalms, 361–456.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

also reminds God of man, it is a central part of humanity's very existence in a society where memory is effective, relational, and actualizing. Naturally this will therefore be an important aspect of prayer, whether explicit or not, and whether *zkr* or any other forms in the semantic domain of 'remembering' are used in the text, or not.[3,4]

If memory effectively makes someone present to the one remembering, then one can begin to recognise its power as something that transcends the boundary of physical or non-physical. The presence of someone in one's memory is a kind of memory image.

Philosophers of memory and practitioners of memory-skills for centuries have recognised the relationship between memory and place, and the consequent use of imagination in this relationship. A kind of *thesauron* or treasure-trove, memories can be stored carefully, often using mental spaces. Memory aids employ localities, fictional or real. Place in the imagination can be a memorization tool.[5]

Place can be something remembered or a means of remembering, as well as a physical setting where remembering takes place. Physical place may be an aid to memory, and internal space a crutch by which something or someone is remembered. Places help one remember.[6]

Place and the Divine

Identity is often caught up in place. One might define oneself by where one lives.[7] So naturally one might identify God and the Temple, given that God's Temple is his house, his holy place, the dwelling for his name, even if prayer does play an integral part in effecting this presence.[8]

3 C. Carvalho, Finding, 123–154. She contrasts the one pilgrimage a year to Jerusalem for one of the three high holy days that Israelite males made with the notion of God doing the 'drawing nearer' in 1 Kings 8:27–30: 'the Deuteronomistic historian focuses the reader's attention on the actualization of God's presence through prayer… In this prayer, while the ark represented God's presence within Israel, it was the act of worship itself that made that presence effective for the community,' 130.

4 C.f. B. Childs, Memory; P.A.H. de Boer, Gedenken.

5 On classical medieval memory and place in the imagination c.f. M. Carruthers, Book.

6 'place's *periechon* being, [is] its containing/surrounding function. Place is a *mise en scene* for remembered events precisely to the extent that it guards and keeps these events within its self-delimiting perimeters.' E.S. Casey, Getting, 189.

7 M.R. Wynn, Faith, 86.

8 W. Horbury, Remembrance, 125: 'the mention of God's "place" [i. e. Temple] reactivates the association of the remembrance of God with the invocation of his name.'

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Wynn explores memory, identity, and place,[9] concluding that place in memory in the context of prayer offers space for meditative self-reflection involving both individual identity and the divine identity connected with the places experienced. This relates to the interaction between friendship and place.[10] Insofar as prayer is remembering which actualises divine relationship, so place can be important in the act of prayer, and in the relationship itself.

Place, memory, and prayer, are thus closely interwoven; and Psalms is a textual locus to analyse this further. I next consider the apparent settings of the psalms, as *settings for remembering* that occurs in prayer. After this, recognition that these might be literal physical places or internal spaces leads to a more detailed discussion of the *places that are themselves remembered.* Finally I address the differences between static experience of place, and *movement.* Beyond the major subject of the close relationship between place, prayer, and memory in OT theology, this paper also touches on the broader OT questions of whether the psalms were public or private,[11] what their use might have been in worship and pilgrimage, and the frequently inevitable difficulty of the translation of the Hebrew Qal-form.[12]

9 J.E. Malpas, Place, 182: 'The importance of memory to self-identity, and the connection of memory with place, illuminates… the way in which the experience of places and things from the past is very often an occasion for intense self-reflection… The way in which such memories and places often become more important to us as we age… can be seen as indicative of the founding role of those places in our narratives about ourselves and the establishing of our sense of self-identity.'

10 Places 'encode the moral personalities and relationship of the friends themselves – and visits to the places provide a more-than-mental way of being related to the formation of those personalities, and contribute to the further elaboration of them.' M.R. Wynn, Faith, 42. Wynn further considers the 'genius' of a place, such as what makes 'Dartmoorishness.' By developing this into an understanding of God as the *genius mundi*, he goes beyond place, into what he calls 'supra-individuality,' allowing God as place to be an integral part of individual human identities.

11 Gillingham, while discussing the origins of the Psalter, writes on the public/private question: 'David in the Psalms "prays" some 73 psalms (as seen in the superscription לְדָוִד); many of them are personal and individual, although nearly two-thirds of them, with their extra liturgical headings, indicate some use in public worship. By aligning personal piety both with David and with liturgical practices the Levitical singers thus made individual psalms accessible to the entire cultic community.' S.E. Gillingham, Singers, 91–124.

12 E. Kautzsch, Grammar, 132–135, 309–319, 326–339; P. Joüon / T. Muraoka, Grammar, 330–345, 357–379; B.K. Waltke / M. O'Connor, Introduction, 455–478.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Places Where Remembering Occurs?

Much has been written about Zion, Jerusalem and the Temple itself.[13] One attractive proposal is of Zion and Jerusalem as '…images to describe and to guarantee the stability of the psalmists.'[14] These sacred places are crucial to the communal memory of Israel, both physically and within the text of the Psalter. The Songs of Ascents (Pss 120–134) are sacred texts which are particularly resonant with these holy places.

For instance, Ps 132 demonstrates a rich vocabulary of place. References to David's house and bed sit alongside references to the house of God, the divine resting-place, the place of God's throne, and also that of David and his sons. Moreover, the only occurrence in the Psalter of the particle adverb פֹּה־, 'here', God's own words declare this to be his dwelling-place.[15] His declaration of it even effects his purpose.

It would seem natural to find an emphasis on the centrality of the presence of God in these holy places, yet it is surprising that the texts of the Psalms, commonly regarded as liturgical, so rarely use such proximal deictic adverbs. 'The Lord is here' is one of the most familiar phrases in modern Christian ritual: contrary to expectations, the Psalter is not the foundation of this tradition, as Ps 132 is the only evidence of such theology voiced in Psalmic texts. Salient Hebrew parallels in the same semantic domain are עִמָּנוּ 'with us' and הִנֵּה 'behold'.[16] עִמָּנוּ is used as proximal deictic only in the refrains Ps 46:8, 12. The didactic הִנֵּה usually points out righteous and wicked. Exceptions where הִנֵּה refers to location are in Psalm 40:8,[17] 10 (placing the speaker in the assembly), and again in Ps 132 (verse 6):

הִנֵּה־שְׁמַעֲנוּהָ בְאֶפְרָתָה מְצָאנוּהָ בִּשְׂדֵי־יָעַר׃

13 E.g. bibliographical references within J.M. Day, Temple.

14 S. Gillmayr-Bucher, Shoots, 489–500: '…They are the symbolic space, chosen by God in the past (Ps 132; 133), but are still accessible in memory and reality. Although the psalmist mentions Jerusalem and Zion quite frequently in these psalms, he does not long to go there constantly. It is not being in Jerusalem but being connected to Jerusalem / Zion as a symbolic centre that seems to be important.'

15 H.-J. Kraus, Psalms 60–150, 475, considers the relationship of the psalm to 2 Sam. 6 with regardto the ark and the dwelling-place of the name of God. He also points out that Ps 132:8–10 'has almost word for words been inserted into Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple.'

16 This shares a semantic domain with the language of the 'face' and 'hiding the face,' which is treated by S. Balentine, God.

17 Notably, the previous verse refers to sacrifice and offerings; one reading is that v. 8 responds to this by the speaker himself simply being present at the place of sacrifice, i.e. the Temple.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The reference to the place where the ark was found[18] in this context suggests active contemplation of it in its present setting, envisaging it in the contrasting landscape of Ephrathah and Jaar.[19]

Ps 132 functions both as a vivid description of the Temple and as a reminder of the holy place: reminding both the speaker, and others with him; but also God. The setting for the retelling of God's oath to David – the promise of his throne and the repeating of the covenant – the holy place is not only the place of the psalmist remembering God's greatness, but also the setting for God to remember his covenant. It is natural that the psalmist prays there for God's presence, as he does in v. 8.

A further linguistic complexity arises, both here (Ps 132:17) and in Ps 139 (v. 8), in the form שָׁם, 'there'. The distal deictic adverb, in Ps 139 it is used in parallel with הִנֵּה, which can be understood as an imaginative landscape: the Psalmist envisages heaven first, then Sheol. שָׁם expects God in heaven, while הִנֵּה recognises with surprise that God could also be in the Sheol imaged by the speaker. In Ps 132 it points to the Temple (where a medial or even proximal deictic would be expected instead). Paralleled to God's פֹּה־ is the proximal demonstrative pronoun referring to his divine resting-place זֹאת־מְנוּחָתִי. Could the שָׁם have appeared in the last couplet of the psalm as a result of the psalmist not actually being in the Temple, and (unintentionally?) indicating his distance from the scene he describes?[20] While much of the language of this Psalm points to an actual experience in the Temple, these closing verses, in the final received form of the text, suggest otherwise. They convey less an actual physical presence, more an imaginative presence in a place which is very well-remembered – and here relived – in detail.

What psalm texts clearly have the setting of the place they describe behind their performance? Ps 122 has a strong sense of place in the Temple. Yet שֶׁשָּׁם '*there* the thrones stood': this again makes one reconsider Jerusalem as the actual setting. Is it actually a memory of Jerusalem, rather than a present physical experience of setting? This links with the argument that the three qal forms (שָׂמַחְתִּי v. 1, עָלוּ v. 4, יָשְׁבוּ v. 5) are all past perspective.[21] Even this Song of Ascents

18 1 Sam. 7:1–2; 1 Chron. 13:5–6.

19 To explore the historical setting of where the Ark actually was in the case of David's removal of it to Jerusalem, see S.S. Brooks, Gibeon, 44–47.

20 M. Dahood, Psalms, 247–248: the sequence of the deictics 'resembles the sequence in UT, 54:11–12, yet the content of that Ugaritic text seems far removed from Ps 132.' This is understood as a break in the text after v. 16 by L.C. Allen, Psalms, 266.

21 'The I-figure, therefore, is not only situated beyond his own pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he is also located beyond the time when a pilgrimage to Jerusalem was possible: the tribes used to go up to Jerusalem – now apparently no longer; the thrones to justice used to stand there – now apparently no longer,' A. van Wieringen, Psalm, 751. Compare D. Michel, Tempora, 242.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

conveys the sense that this is only a remembered experience.[22] Could the title שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת be not a physical pilgrimage song, but rather pointing to others the possibility of an inner, imaginative, pilgrimage?

If Temple markers in the Psalms cannot offer the definitive setting for a performance of the text,[23] then where else might the Psalms be spoken? I turn now to the language of the bed, couch, and individual home.

The imagined setting for David's momentous oath to find a place for the Lord in Ps 132 is as David considers his own house, bed, resting-place. David is depicted as *not* in his house, or his bed, but the very existence of home, bed, and the possibility of being there allows for his extreme self-denial. It is as he remembers his home that he remembers God's house (Ps 132:1–5). There are only a few psalms which are clearly set within a private house. Ps 101 is a strong contender. The psalmist refers to walking within his house with a blameless heart (v. 2), considering his household (v. 6–7). Nothing suggests the setting is anything other than his home. Ps 41 pictures the psalmist sick, in bed, with enemies visiting him; his prayer to rise again (v. 11) confirms that the speaker is still laid low.[24]

The semantic domain of bed or couch (עַל־מִשְׁכַּבָּם, מִטָּתִי, עַל־יְצוּעָי, and עַרְשִׂי) is a setting for personal prayer.[25,26] In Ps 149:5, the couch is a place for the faithful to shout for joy. In Ps 4:5, it is a place for speaking in one's heart, אִמְרוּ בִלְבַבְכֶם, a phrase suggestive of prayer and meditation. The bed is a place for speech acts, directed towards God or oneself. Yet within Ps 4 the addressees vary, from God (v. 2), to plural human audience (v. 3), before returning to God again (vv. 7–8). Alongside the heading, pointing to a leader and musical accompaniment, it seems that this psalm has become a blend of wisdom teaching and individual lament.

Indeed, in Ps 6:7 the psalmist refers to his bed in the context of a lament:

יָגַעְתִּי בְּאַנְחָתִי אַשְׂחֶה בְכָל־לַיְלָה מִטָּתִי בְּדִמְעָתִי עַרְשִׂי אַמְסֶה׃

22 Even M. Dahood, Psalms, 203 with a very literal understanding of place in the Psalms, considers this to be 'probably composed by a pilgrim on his return home, while reflecting upon the happy memories of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem.' Yet D.C Allen Psalms, 267 in his discussion of the dating of the psalm, concludes 'All it demands is a temple setting.' On whether the Songs of Ascent in general were pilgrimage psalms, 'we lack sufficient evidence to be dogmatic,' J. Day, Psalms, 62.

23 The superscription to Ps 30 sets the Davidic psalm in the Temple, at the dedication, although apart from this there is nothing to suggest its setting.

24 This is in opposition to the view this is a song of thanksgiving in the sanctuary, and that the psalmist 'gives thanks then turns to the assembled congregation. He testifies concerning Yahweh's help,' H.J. Kraus, Psalms 1–59, 430.

25 Compare William Wordsworth's poem *Daffodils:* 'For oft, when on my couch I lie / In vacant or in pensive mood, / They flash upon that inward eye / Which is the bliss of solitude… .'

26 Only in Ps 36:5 is it a place of wicked planning.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The groaning, the weeping, seems to transport the imagined speaker to that bed, the place of mourning, as if saying 'here I am once again, night after night'. Yet it is not clearly an individual prayer,[27] since v. 9 addresses 'you evildoers', and v. 10 refers to God in the third person, unlike the rest of the psalm. As in Ps 132, the final verses of the text seem to turn its apparent setting around. While vv. 1–8 indicate an individual lamenting in solitude, vv. 9–11 imply an audience, with addressee changing from evildoers (v. 9) to a more general gathering (vv. 10–11). Moreover, the superscription offers musical details, which make the bed-setting less clearly persuasive.[28]

Yet the close reference to Sheol (Ps 6:6) conveys solitude verging on total isolation. For the grave (semantic domain consisting of בְּשְׁאוֹל, בַּקֶּבֶר, בַּאֲבַדּוֹן, בְּלִיַּעַל, and שָׁחַת) is a place where there is no praise, no remembering of God, and no speech to do so (Ps 88:12):

הֲיְסֻפַּר בַּקֶּבֶר חַסְדֶּךָ אֱמוּנָתְךָ בָּאֲבַדּוֹן׃

The grave is a place where God no longer remembers his people, אֲשֶׁר לֹא זְכַרְתָּם עוֹד (Ps 88:6). The uttermost isolation, here there can be no relationship with God, no remembrance either way.[29] Yet the very existence of this prayer indicates that this is only the *imagined* setting, of perceived non-existence and consequent non-relationship.

However, the bleak picture of Ps 88 is not ubiquitous. In Ps 18, the psalmist images being on the grave's edge (v. 5), and yet depicts himself right here calling out to God (v. 7):

בַּצַּר־לִי אֶקְרָא יְהוָה וְאֶל־אֱלֹהַי אֲשַׁוֵּעַ יִשְׁמַע מֵהֵיכָלוֹ קוֹלִי וְשַׁוְעָתִי לְפָנָיו תָּבוֹא בְאָזְנָיו׃

From the boundary of Sheol, the lament can still reach God in his own setting. In just three verses the psalmist moves from the depiction of Sheol to the Temple. Voiceless Sheol is thus never reached, although its edge is a place where cries are heard, where God and psalmist are in fact much closer than the imagined distance implies.[30]

27 P.C. Craigie, Psalms, 91, 93: 'The contents of the psalm do not give any explicit clues as to its initial association with the cult or formal worship in Israel, though such an association is possible… [on vss. 9–11] … Perhaps we should understand the presence of a priest or temple servant, who – having heard the words of the worshiper – declares a message or oracle from God which gives faith to the psalmist.'

28 Could it be that Ps 132 was 'originally' a Temple song, which was altered to a communal one; and Ps 6 was 'originally' an individual lament, whatever that might be, which was later altered for communal (but not Temple) purposes? It would be interesting (but beyond the scope of this paper) to consider this against the historical background and the rise of the synagogue.

29 'If He no longer "remembers" the dead (88:5), it is not that He forgets as men forget, but that He brings to an end His saving interventions (88:12; for with God to remember is to act),' D. Kidner, Psalms, 62.

30 Ps 116 is similar in this respect.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The wilderness (מִדְבָּר) too allows for closeness where distance is expected. Ps 63:2:

כָּמַהּ לְךָ בְשָׂרִי בְּאֶרֶץ־צִיָּה וְעָיֵף בְּלִי־מָיִם

The metaphorical language, likening thirsting for God to the thirstiness of a dry parched land, may have been inspired by the psalmist's surroundings, giving rise to the scene-setting of the scribal heading ('A psalm of David, when he was in the Wilderness'). Historically this could be tied in with 1 Sam 23:14–15; 24:1 or 2 Sam 15:23, 28; 16:2. Kraus argues for a setting in the Temple,[31] and Weiser in the sanctuary itself, at the pre-exilic festival of the Yahweh cult.[32] Tate's response wisely allows for individual spirituality.[33] Yet the wilderness could still be the setting of this psalm's performance. As with Ps 122, the Temple setting in Ps 63 depends on the translation of the Qal perfect, in כֵּן בַּקֹּדֶשׁ חֲזִיתִיךָ (v. 3). This could therefore be a remembering of the sanctuary, a reliving of a Temple experience in the wilderness. There is also reference to the bed-setting (63:7):

אִם־זְכַרְתִּיךָ עַל־יְצוּעָי בְּאַשְׁמֻרוֹת אֶהְגֶּה־בָּךְ׃

The bed, a place of remembering; yet the particle אִם suggests indirectness. It is possible but not necessarily here fulfilled that such remembering can go on within one's bed. In the wilderness, therefore, places of prayer are remembered: the Temple, and the bed. The wilderness itself is a place where songs are set, where psalms can be performed, within which other settings for prayer and remembering can be pictured. Places of remembering are themselves remembered places.

Remembered Places?

The Temple and Jerusalem might therefore be viewed as places that are remembered, as plausibly as they might be viewed as the setting for the Psalms in which they are mentioned. Indeed, perhaps more so: for why remember a place when one is actually in it? If one is in the Temple, the building itself no longer needs to act as the vehicle for God's identity – its very present experience enables prayer addressed directly to God, with no need of an aide-memoire to enhance sacred contemplation.

31 H.-J. Kraus, Psalms 60–150.

32 A. Weiser, Psalms, 779.

33 The Davidic superscription 'has loosened it from any original cultic setting and made it available for individual worshipers, who could use it to enter into the inner spiritual life of David and make it their own… the title is an exercise in scribal exegetical imagination which relates the psalm to the spiritual life of David,' M. E. Tate, Psalms, 126–127.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

I therefore argue that the Temple, in the psalms as received, is more likely to be an aid to prayer, an image or internal landscape which provides the right mental space for meditation on God. Here I examine how that might be established, and consider other places within the imagination that function in the same way. I have already touched on many psalms where that is possible, so now I consider some texts in more detail.

Ps 137 is a clear example of remembering Jerusalem from worlds away. The scene is immediately set at the waters of Babylon. Jerusalem is not described in detail; what sticks in the singer's memory is the destruction of those sacred spaces, the baring of the foundations (v. 7). The songs of Zion are identified with the Lord's songs, thereby identifying God with the buildings of Jerusalem, and the Temple. Vv. 5–6 contrast with v. 7 with a swift shift of addressee from God's place to God himself.[34] Remembering the holy places of Jerusalem and the Temple is like remembering God: to remember them not is to be accursed (vv. 5–6). Now remembering Zion has a double sense: not just remembering God, but also remembering the enemy, and the destruction there. The addressee is changed to Babylon (v. 8). By remembering Jerusalem and its destruction, the psalmist wants God to share his anger, and thereby to wreak the same devastation on Babylon as Babylon has wrought on Jerusalem (vv. 7–9). Yet this is where the identity of Temple and God breaks down: Babylon has destroyed Jerusalem, but has it destroyed God? The very existence of the prayer to God suggests not, although the combination of these identities, and the changing addressees, escalates the impact that the Babylonian actions have had on God himself. The memory of Jerusalem and its destruction calls for God to defend himself, and consequently defend the people of Jerusalem.

Pss 79 and 74 echo these sentiments, depicting the Temple and its destruction. The terse language in Ps 79:1 clearly contrasts the enemy and God, sacrilege and the sacred:

אֱלֹהִים בָּאוּ גוֹיִם בְּנַחֲלָתֶךָ טִמְּאוּ אֶת־הֵיכַל קָדְשֶׁךָ שָׂמוּ אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם לְעִיִּים׃

The psalmist describes the unburied corpses graphically, before lamenting the sins they must have committed, and requiring God instead to pour out his wrath on his enemy. The image of the destroyed Temple and city becomes a motivation for God to act, that he be not mocked by the nations, either for his apparent absence in past devastation, or for future lack of revenge.

34 'Meir Gruber aptly observes that from the Babylonian perspective, what their captives sing are national songs, "Zion's songs", whereas the Judaeans themselves view them as sacred music, "a song of the Lord",' R. Alter, Book, 474. Similarly, 'Just as in the songs of Zion, praise of Zion represents praise of God, so here [the psalmist's] expression of loyalty to Jerusalem is a measure of loyalty to Yahweh since the city, the very "city of God" … symbolizes divine presence,' D.C. Searle, Commentary.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Ps 74 focuses on the particularities of the Temple. Although the precise meaning of vv. 5–6 is disputed, the threefold occurrence of words for 'axe' offers a jarringly violent tone, before the description of the flames that consumed the building, in the uncomfortable juxtaposition of בָּאֵשׁ מִקְדָּשֶׁךָ and the vicious חִלְּלוּ מִשְׁכַּן־שְׁמֶךָ in v. 7. It is contradictory: how can the dwelling-place of God's name be profaned? The psalmist effectively asks: was it the dwelling-place of God's name at that very time? The signs and wonders of God are doubted, as enemies perceive signs in their destructive actions (v. 4), and the psalmist and God's people are left without signs or prophets (v. 9). With the Temple itself as a sign of God, its destruction means the absence of divine signs.

Imperative זְכָר־זֹאת (v. 18) indicates that this scene is not presently experienced, but visited in the psalmist's mind. There is no הִנֵּה which one would expect, and the psalmist's reminder to God conjures the devastating image as a plea and argument for revenge. The final verses continue building up this picture, even audibly in v. 23 קוֹל צֹרְרֶיךָ שְׁאוֹן קָמֶיךָ, as the shouts and din of the enemy victory are heard again. All these reminders are placed carefully to stir God to action. The implication is that he is not in his dwelling-place right now, otherwise he would not need to be reminded of it by such vivid actualisation. These descriptions contrast with pictures of God's might through the ages (vv. 12–17), God's care for the poor and needy (v. 21), and the pointed self-reference to the singers as God's 'dove' and his 'lowly ones' in the abrasive הַבֵּט לַבְּרִית at the beginning of v. 20. The covenant sits at the centre of this reminding: the Temple and what happens to it becomes a reminder of God's covenant.[35,36]

Pss 42 and 43, by expressing distance from the Temple, imply that the Temple is still standing, and convey the possibility of being there once again. Ps 42:7 locates the psalmist:

אֶזְכָּרְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ יַרְדֵּן וְחֶרְמֹונִים מֵהַר מִצְעָר

The translation of the Qal imperfect conveys either a commitment to remembering or an ongoing remembering that the psalmist is performing in the land of Jordan, Hermon, and Mount Mizar. His lament at God's absence is formed around an image (v. 5):

אֵלֶּה אֶזְכְּרָה וְאֶשְׁפְּכָה עָלַי נַפְשִׁי כִּי אֶעֱבֹר בַּסָּךְ אֶדַּדֵּם עַד־בֵּית אֱלֹהִים בְּקוֹל־רִנָּה וְתוֹדָה הָמֹון חוֹגֵג׃

Evoking the sights and sounds of the festal procession, the psalmist's nostalgia for the movement towards the Temple is an image of his desire to come closer to

35 M.S. Smith, Deities, 6: He recognises the power of Temple architecture: it 'embodies and conveys various divine narratives, and in this way, temples may recapitulate the understanding of deities.'

36 Consider NT studies and the equation of Christ as priest, and atoning sacrifice; also the body of Christ as the Temple of God; thus closely related to Christian Eucharistic theology.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

God; but as geographical distance prevents him from accessing the Temple, so the downcast nature of his soul prevents him from approaching God in spirit. This is echoed later in a pairing in Ps 43:3–4:

שְׁלַח־אוֹרְךָ וַאֲמִתֶּךָ הֵמָּה יַנְחוּנִי יְבִיאוּנִי אֶל־הַר־קָדְשְׁךָ וְאֶל־מִשְׁכְּנוֹתֶיךָ׃

וְאָבוֹאָה אֶל־מִזְבַּח אֱלֹהִים אֶל־אֵל שִׂמְחַת גִּילִי וְאוֹדְךָ בְכִנּוֹר אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהָי׃

The psalmist prays that God would lead him to his holy mountain,[37] to his altar; and consequently that he would be in a place to praise God. The images of holiness experienced in the psalmist's imagination give him hope (v. 5). The psalmist's attempts to walk in the Temple within his inner landscape are pictorial representations of his attempt to walk with God. The ending indicates consolation from this inner pilgrimage, יְשׁוּעֹת פָּנַי וֵאלֹהָי. As the psalmist yearns for God, the meditational evocation of the Temple has successfully brought him into God's presence.

Movements?

The discussion to now has led to thinking of both being at particular places as well as *not* being at those crucial places, the places that are remembered as well as the places where remembering happens. I thus arrive at a sense of movement. Notions of being settled, established, firm, are conveyed by verbs such as יָשַׁב and עָמַד, and nouns such as כִּסֵּא, and the semantic domains of house, bed, couch, and so on. Notions of movement are expressed by verbs such as קוּם,שׁוּב, יָצָא, הָלַךְ, בּוֹא and עָלָה.

God is settled in his house, on his throne, on Mount Zion; men yearn to be established in the house of God, as a spreading olive tree (Ps 52:10). Indeed, few men dwell in the house of the Lord. The exhortation to praise of Ps 134 functions like praise itself,[38] particularly here. Those who 'stand nightly in the house of the Lord' may not actually dwell there but simply be pilgrims spending the night before the altar. Yet the psalm expresses their devotion as an aspiration. Ps 84:5 lauds those who dwell in God's house, always praising God, as 'blessed'. Ps 27:4–6 clearly expresses the goal of dwelling in the house of God:

אַחַת שָׁאַלְתִּי מֵאֵת־יְהוָה אוֹתָהּ אֲבַקֵּשׁ שִׁבְתִּי בְּבֵית־יְהוָה כָּל־יְמֵי חַיַּי לַחֲזוֹת בְּנֹעַם־יְהוָה וּלְבַקֵּר בְּהֵיכָלוֹ׃

כִּי יִצְפְּנֵנִי בְסֻכֹּה בְּיוֹם רָעָה יַסְתִּרֵנִי בְּסֵתֶר אָהֳלוֹ בְּצוּר יְרוֹמְמֵנִי׃

37 The use of this image here seems to strengthen the argument that this psalm too is prayed from the setting of Mount Mizar.

38 Noted as how the text functions, with particular respect to Ps 150, by A. Wagner, Sprechaktsequenzen, 310–333.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

וְעַתָּה יָרוּם רֹאשִׁי עַל אֹיְבַי סְבִיבוֹתַי וְאֶזְבְּחָה בְאָהֳלוֹ זִבְחֵי תְרוּעָה אָשִׁירָה וַאֲזַמְּרָה לַיהוָה׃

It is the 'one and only thing' that the Psalmist seeks with emphatic אַחַת: he desires nothing else. He enters the imaginative space of the Temple, expressing this yearning, and hearing his own shouts of joy, his singing and hymns. It is a state of exaltation and protection simultaneously.

The desire for divine protection by being close to God is expressed in poetic parallelism in Ps 91:1: to dwell in the shelter of the Almighty is to abide in the protection of Shaddai. Having unfolded this theme, the psalm closes with God's speech, reassuring his devotee of that deliverance. The place of protection also becomes the place of honour in the Davidic Ps 110. Sitting at God's right hand, the king waits while God makes his enemies his footstool. It is a place of both protection and honour for this divinely-appointed king, a priest forever. This seat of approbation is naturally sought moreover by the wise and righteous, and the aspiration of Ps 140:14 is not simply to a place in God's presence but rather to the righteousness it entails.

Given that dwelling in the Temple is a goal of wisdom, a sign of honour and a means of protection, it is hardly surprising that some psalms focus on the entry into the Temple. Ps 5 pictures this (v. 8):

וַאֲנִי בְּרֹב חַסְדְּךָ אָבוֹא בֵיתֶךָ אֶשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֶל־הֵיכַל־קָדְשְׁךָ בְּיִרְאָתֶךָ׃

The combination of Qal perfect 'I (have) come in' with the Hishtael cohortative or imperfect 'let me/ I will bow down' indicates ongoing, present movement. Again, this could well be a metaphorical, imaginative entering rather than a physical, spatial experience. God's people are not place-bound by their sacred spaces, but they seek to make their homes wherever they may be. The wisely-constructed relationship between physical movement and spiritual movement is particularly brought out in phrases such as Ps 119:54:

זְמִרוֹת הָיוּ־לִי חֻקֶּיךָ בְּבֵית מְגוּרָי׃

Praise, wisdom and righteousness go together, while the final two words offer a striking juxtaposition of 'dwelling-place' and 'sojourning.' The people of Israel desire to dwell constantly with God and yet their home is itself a place of travel. Finding a home with God is a dwelling associated richly with movement.

Movement, physical and spiritual, is of particular interest in those psalms entitled 'Songs of Ascents.' Scribal tradition encouraged an understanding of these as psalms to be sung on pilgrimage to the Jerusalem Temple. In some there is, counter-intuitively, an absence of scenery; yet this returns to the argument that there is no need to picture a place which one is presently physically experiencing. Without needing to describe the journey, it is natural however to imagine the destination as in Ps 122; 132; 134. Yet that is not to say that the journey is not

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

described, but the Temple is. Where psalms indicate an outdoor setting, such as 'I lift up my eyes to the hills' (Ps 121:1), these could be theological statements. Ascents, 'goings-up,' connote movements to high places; and if the Temple and Mount Zion are equated with God's presence, then those looking to ascend will appropriately direct their gaze towards heights, real or imagined. Equally, the Temple as destination is often not described, but it is easily conceivable that on a journey one may not always have the goal in mind, but also the journey itself. There is space for wider contemplation while travelling: even domestic settings are pictured (Pss 123; 127; 128; 131; 132). These images may be related, in that the individual household ideally mirrors the household of God in righteousness and flourishing, and the blossoming of family life is a sign of the Lord's blessing. Moreover, the households of Jerusalem itself may be in view here, the houses that surround the Temple: physical proximity to the sanctuary itself.

I return to the reflections of Bucher-Gillmayr on Ps 132:

> Psalm 132 once more breaks out into memory. It remembers the great challenges of establishing a centre for God and his people and it emphasises the promises derived therefrom. The merging of natural historical and symbolic space in this memory still constitutes the centre.[39]

The Ascents could in fact be a spiritual journeying to the centre: the centre of the people of God, and the centre of the individual, reflected in the image of travelling to the centre of Jerusalem, from hills, to households, to the House of God.

Arrivals?

Ps 90:1b depicts the collision of God and place:

אֲדֹנָי מָעוֹן אַתָּה הָיִיתָ לָּנוּ בְּדֹר וָדֹר׃

מָעוֹן is used of 'refuge' or 'habitation', always in connection with God. Ascribed to Moses, the great journeying prophet, this psalm portrays total overlap between God and place unspecified.[40] Different from the idea that God can be identified simply with his Temple or with holy places, here there is the simple sense that God can be identified with place *in general*.[41]

39 S. Gillmayr-Bucher, Shoots, 498.

40 Indeed, time is also kept as general as possible in Ps 90:1. Such connections of place and time are fascinating yet space again prevents discussion here.

41 It has been argued that Ps 90 connects time and wisdom with the experience of finitude and transience (in contrast to the divine being) which helps humanity to face suffering. See R.J. Clifford, Psalm.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

To turn back to Ps 139 and its deictic adverbs: one can now understand that the sense of 'there' and 'here' can coincide. For God is here, and I am here; yet if I were there, God would be in my 'here' too, that is, there, alongside me wherever I would be. God cannot simply be said to be 'here' or 'there,' for God is effectively place, insofar as his people are a place-bound people. To journey to the Temple, then, is to journey to God. On another level, the metaphor of journeying to the Temple is also a journeying within one's mind's eye, a travelling to the centre, where God is.

This fits with the observation that less emphasis is put on departures in the Psalms.[42] Movement is towards a holy place rather than away from it. Even the wilderness is desired, in Ps 55, a paradoxical expression of refuge which makes most sense if understood as that identified with God. Little is made of departures. Gillingham classifies Pss 132–134 as a phase of 'departure' within the group of Songs of Ascent, yet the evidence that allows this description is arguably scant.[43]

Conclusions: Points of Departure?

The psalm texts as received are not literally tied to place, but often describe an internal landscape. This inner space is often related to remembered experiences of physical place. Such memory can be individual, or communal: the Temple was regarded as that which gave the Israelites a sense of identity, the 'cult community.'[44] A recollection of a shared holy place could be an expression of collective identity, of membership of the group who share the imaginative area of a particular space.

Yet such remembrances of holy places are not necessarily communal. In fact, the places where the remembering is often itself situated tend to the opposite conclusion: that public places which speak of national identity are recalled instead in individual privacy, in solitude, in a domestic or wilderness setting. Thus by the act of remembering the individual is not just placing himself within a collective space, but is also relating himself to a collective identity. It is natural that in isolation one might remember relationships – to God, to other members of the community – in order to transcend solitude and thereby help define self-identity, a particularly necessary task when alone.[45]

42 Any language of departure seems to be ambiguous: various translations can be offered, eg. Ps 122:6–9 'could be understood in terms of greeting or farewell,' D.C Allen, Psalms, 212.

43 Pace S.E. Gillingham, Singers.

44 J. Bright, History, 372, contrasts the First and Second Temples, what they symbolised, and how they functioned.

45 Compare how William Butler Yeats' *Under Ben Bulben* is considered as relating communal

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Thus I consider the Psalms as crucial to our theology of place. The references to place therein may often be interpreted as remembrance of place, and also thereby tell the reader of the place where remembering occurs. The landscapes described may more powerfully be understood as mental images, inner places where an individual's relationship with God may be explored and – counter-intuitively – also shared in the context of the public texts as received today.

There is therefore in prayer not only a continual movement between God and man, but also between individual and collective human experience, which can only be fully comprehended if the inner landscape as well as the physical locality is examined.

In summary, I suggest that (1) places in the Psalms are to be taken much less literally than form-criticism has formerly understood; (2) place in prayer is integral both to individual and communal memory, and *vice versa*; and (3) these observations point to the possibility of a wider study of OT Israelite spirituality.

Bibliography

Allen, L.C., Psalms 101–150 (WBC 21), Columbia ²2002.

Alter, R., The Book of Psalms. A Translation with Commentary, New York 2007.

Armstrong, C.I., Figures of Remembering. Poetry, Space, and the Past, Basingstoke 2009.

Balentine, S., The Hidden God. The Hiding of the Face of God in the Old Testament (Oxford Theolocial Monographs), Oxford 1983.

Barton, J., The Nature of Biblical Criticism, London 2007.

Bright, J., A History of Israel, London ³1993.

Brooks, S.S., From Gibeon to Gibeah. High Place of the Kingdom, in: J. Day (Ed.), Temple and Worship in biblical Israel (LHB/OTS 422), London 2005, 44–47.

Carruthers, M., The Book of Memory. A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature), Cambridge ²2008.

Carvalho, C., Finding a Treasure Map. Sacred Space in the OT, in: C.M. Bechtel (Ed.), Touching the Altar. The Old Testament for Christian Worship (Calvin Institue of Christian Worship Liturgical Studies Series), Grand Rapids 2008, 123–153.

Casey, E.S., Getting back into Place. Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place – World (Studies in Continental Thought), Bloomington 1993.

Childs, B.S., Memory and Tradition in Ancient Israel (Studies in Biblical Theology 37), London 1962.

Clifford, R.J., Psalm 90. Wisdom Meditation or Communal Lament?, in: P.W. Flint / P.D. Miller (Eds.), The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception (VT.S 99 / Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 4), Leiden 2005, 190–205.

Craigie, P.C., Psalms 1–50 (WBC 19), Texas 1983.

and individual: 'The Irish poet attempts to fully fuse the poet's own legacy with that of a locality which is to have a national significance,' C.I. Armstrong, Figures.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Dahood, M., SJ, Psalms 3. 101–150 (AncB 17 A), New York 1970.
Day, J., Psalms (Old Testament Guides), Sheffield 1990.
Day, J. (Ed.), Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel (LHB/OTS 422), London 2005.
de Boer, P.A.H., Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des Alten Testament (Franz Delitzsch Vorlesungen), Stuttgart 1962.
Gillingham, S.E., The Levitical Singers and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter, in: E. Zenger (Ed.), The Composition of the Book of Psalms (ETL 238), Leuven 2010, 91–124.
Gillmayr-Bucher, S., 'Like olive shoots around your table'. Images of space in the psalms of ascent, in: E. Zenger (Ed.), The Composition of the Book of Psalms (ETL 238), Leuven 2010, 489–500.
Horbury, W., The Remembrance of God in the Psalms of Solomon, in: L.T. Stuckenbruck / S.C. Barton / B.G. Wold (Eds.), Memory in the Bible and Antiquity (WUNT 212), Tübingen 2005.
Joüon, P. / Muraoka, T., A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, Rom ^{2}2011.
Kautzsch, E. (Ed.), Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, New York 2006.
Kidner, D., Psalms 1–72. An Introduction and Commentary on the Books I and II of the Psalms (The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries), London 1973.
Kraus, H.-J., Psalms 1–59. A Commentary, Minneapolis 1988.
Kraus, H.J., Psalms 60–150. A Commentary, Minneapolis 1989.
Malpas, J.E., Place and Experience. A Philosophical Topography, Cambridge 1999.
Michel, D., Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen (Abhandlungen zur Evangelischen Theologie 1), Bonn 1960.
Schottroff, W., "Gedenken" im alten Orient und im Alten Testament. Die Wurzel zākar im semitischen Sprachkreis (WMANT 15), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1964.
Searle, D.C., Commentary on the Psalms. John Calvin, Edinburgh 2009.
Smith, M.S., Like Deities, Like Temples (Like People), in: J. Day (Ed.), Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel (LHB/OTS 422), London 2005, 3–27.
Tate, M.E., Psalms 51–100 (WBC 20), Texas 1990.
Wagner, A., Sprechaktsequenzen und Textkonstitution im Biblischen Hebräisch, in: L. Morenz / S. Schorch (Eds.), Was ist ein Text? Alttestamentliche, ägyptologische und altorientalistische Perspektiven. 1. Einleitung, Berlin / New York 2007, 310–333.
Waltke, B.K. / O'Connor, M., An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, Indiana 1990.
Weiser, A., The Psalms: A Commentary, Göttingen 1959.
van Wieringen, A., Psalm 122. Syntax and the position of the I-figure and the text-immanent reader, in: E. Zenger (Ed.), The Composition of the Book of Psalms (ETL 238), Leuven 2010, 745–754.
Wynn, M.R., Faith and Place: An essay in embodied religious epistemology, Oxford 2010.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Till Magnus Steiner

‘God is in the midst of the city’. Temple and City in Ps 46

H. Gunkel did not define the genre ‘Songs of Zion’ according to its formal characteristics, but by the thematic focus of the texts:[1] ‘praise of the holy place.’[2] He adopted the designation ‘Songs of Zion’ from Ps 137 (v. 3[3]: שירו לנו משיר ציון), in which the request to sing the songs of Zion is in close connection to the remembrance of the city of Jerusalem (v. 5). The first psalm in the Book of Psalms that is categorized as a ‘Song of Zion’ is Ps 46 (cf. Ps 48; 76; 84; 87; 122[; 132]).

In contrast to the categorization and description of Ps 46 as a ‘Song of Zion,’ H. Spieckermann rightly points out that it is striking that no use of the term ציון, Zion, is made in the psalm (contra, for example, Ps 48[4]), despite the characteristic mention of YHWH Zebaot in vv. 8,12 as well as the theme of the threatened city (vv. 5–6): ‘[c]ertainly to call Ps 46 also a Song of Zion means that no importance is ascribed to the missing mention of Zion and the Holy Mount. But one does not have the impression that the mention of the (mount of) Zion in Ps 46 is unintentionally left out.’[5] Only in vv. 5–6 does the psalm focus directly on a holy place:

1 The author is Research Associate of the Department of Old Testament Studies, Faculty of Theology, at the University of Pretoria. This article was written befor the publication of Michael Lichtenstein’s very valueable doctoral thesis about Ps 46: M. Lichtenstein, Von der Mitte der Gottesstadt bis ans Ende der Welt (WMANT 139), Neukirchen-Vluyn 2014.

2 H. Gunkel / J. Begrich, Introduction, 56. U. Sperling has rightly pointed out that the psalms which are mentioned by the classical genre critic as ‘Songs of Zion’ are in the proper sense ‘theophanic YHWH-superior-songs’; see U. Sperling, Jahwe-Überlegenheitslied, 429–438. In his monograph, he adopts the definition of H. Gunkel, according to which ‘Songs of Zion’ are psalms in which the subject of praise is analogous to the hymn of YHWH, but in addition to the deity the ‘holy place’ is also praised. Nevertheless, he writes: ‘I cannot fully speak of the songs of Zion, but only Pss 87; 48, Ps 122 with restriction, and Ps 46 with even greater reluctance in this regard.’ (Quotes from German will be given in an English translation followed by the German original: “Allerdings kann ich nicht uneingeschränkt von ‘den Zionsliedern’ sprechen, sondern lediglich die Pss 87; 48, mit Einschränkung Ps 122 und mit noch größerer Zurückhaltung Ps 46 in dieser Hinsicht nennen.“ [U. Sperling, Jahwe-Überlegenheitslied, 322]).

3 The numbering of the verses follows the edition of the BHS.

4 Cf. T.M. Steiner, Space, 685–704.

5 “Doch auch Ps 46 einen Zionspsalm zu nennen, heißt der fehlenden Erwähnung des Zion oder des heiligen Berges keine Bedeutung beizumessen. Man gewinnt in Ps 46 jedoch nicht den

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

this is represented by the words עיר אלהים, City of God, in v. 5a and קדש משכני עליון, the most holy of the dwelling places of the Most High, in v. 5b. The first term is clearly city-oriented, while the second term seems to be more temple-oriented – but H. Spieckermann explains the missing term 'Zion' and the use of 'City of God' and 'the most holy of the dwelling places of the Most High' as follows: '[i]t looks like a side branch developed from the Theology of Zion, which tries to explain the presence of God not as temple-oriented but completely city-oriented… Instead of the temple and the holy mount, the uncertain and needy city emerges as the holy dwelling.'[6]

In contrast to this interpretation B. Janowski stresses that the use of משכן in v. 5b is clearly for the temple and not a description of the city: '[t]he connection with the temple comes out clearly with the expression "the most holy of the dwelling places of the Most High"… In my opinion Ps 46:2–8 is not only city-oriented (so naturally v. 5a), but, as the semantics of v. 5b prove, also temple-oriented.'[7] It seems that Ps 46 refers in vv. 5–6 to the city *and* to the temple. But the syntax in v. 5 makes it so that the term קדש משכני עליון stands and functions as an apposition for עיר אלהים. How do the city and the temple relate to one another?

The thesis presented in this article is that Ps 46 represents a temple-oriented Theology of the City[8]. This theology is the reason why 'Zion' (ציון) is not mentioned.[9] The first question that should be answered in the following is: (1.)

Eindruck, die Erwähnung des Zion(berges) sei nur unbeabsichtigt unterblieben." (H. Spieckermann, Stadtgott, 27).

6 "Vielmehr hat es den Anschein, daß aus der Zionstheologie ein Nebenzweig herausgewachsen ist, der die Gegenwart Gottes nicht tempelorientiert, sondern ganz stadtorientiert zu denken versucht … . An die Stelle von Tempel und Berg tritt die unsichere, hilfsbedürftige Stadt als heilige Wohnung." (H. Spieckermann, Stadtgott, 27); see also the following quotation: 'In Ps 46, the sanctity of the temple is transmitted to the whole of the city of God.' ("Die Heiligkeit des Tempels wird in Ps 46 auf die ganze Gottesstadt übertragen." [C. Körting, Zion, 183]) Further Körting writes that the city of God in Ps 46 'already clearly bears the features of the temple' ("bereits deutlich die Züge des Tempels trägt" [C. Körting, Zion, 185]); see also B.M. Zapff, Burg, 91.

7 "Der Tempelbezug kommt in der Wendung 'die heiligste der Wohnungen des Höchsten' … zum Ausdruck. M.E. ist Ps 46,2–8 nicht nur stadtorientiert (so natürlich V. 5a), sondern, wie die Semantik von V 5b belegt, auch tempelorientiert." (B. Janowski, Wohnung, 46 n. 90).

8 Cf. F.-L. Hossfeld / T.M. Steiner, Problems, 254.

9 In the opinion of B.M. Zapff, the reason for the non-use of the term 'Zion' is to be found in v 8 and lies in the fact that the text 'does not make the connection of God to a specific city, but emphasizes the presence of God in the midst of the community which confesses him as its protection and fortress.' ("dass es hier nicht in erster Linie um die Verbindung Gottes mit einer konkreten Stadt geht, sondern um die Gegenwart Gottes inmitten der ihn als Schutz und Burg bekennenden Gemeinde." B.M. Zapff, Burg, 89, see also 90). Such an interpretation completely ignores the statement of v 5–6 as referring to a real city and at the same time it nullifies the importance of this city as well as the temple. C. Körting sees the omission of the term 'Zion' as a change in relation to the theology expressed in Psalm 48. Because the city is not in itself important, it will not be called Zion: 'the city is "merely" the place where divine protection is

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Are vv. 5–6 city-oriented and/or temple-oriented? This interpretation of vv. 5–6 will be investigated in a second stage under the question: (2.) What function do vv. 5–6 have in Ps 46? The investigation of the meaning of vv. 5–6, more precisely the meaning of the expressions עיר אלוהים and קדש משכני עליון and their function in the structure and statement of Ps 46, leads to the structural perception of the spatial perspectives in Ps 46. Ps 46 represents a concentric world-view, in which the city of God and the temple present a *heterotopia* (M. Foucault) in their relation to God, which unfolds itself in the text and which is based on the actual city of Jerusalem.

1. City, Temple or Both? (vv. 5–6)

Vv. 5–6 explain the relationship of God to his city, the City of God, which is made glad by water channels (v. 5) and in which God himself dwells (v. 6a) providing it with permanent protection.

1.1 עיר אלהים and קדש משכני עליון

The 'holy place' described in vv. 5–6 is called עיר אלהים קדש משכני עליון. The expression עיר אלהים serves as the object of the statement in v. 5a that will be gladdened through water channels. Both H. Spieckermann and B. Janowski understand קדש משכני עליון as an apposition to עיר אלהים.[10] In accordance with JM § 131a, apposition is defined as follows: 'Apposition is the simple juxtaposition of a noun to a preceding noun, whereas the noun in the genitive or in the attributive accusative is subordinated to the preceding noun, the noun in apposition is coordinate to the first noun. There is an indicated relationship of identity or equation between the two components, which can be transformed into a nominal clause, "A is B".' Read in this way, קדש משכני עליון is equated to עיר אלהים.

concretized. Through the omission of the name of Zion, the changed profile of Ps 46 vis-á-vis Ps 48 is made clear.' ("Die Stadt ist 'nur' noch der Ort, an dem sich der göttliche Schutz konkretisiert. In der Weglassung des Zionsnamens wird das gewandelte Profil von Ps 46 gegenüber Ps 48 deutlich." [C. Körting, Zion, 186]).

10 LXX offers another version for v. 5: Instead of קדש being the adjective of the *nomens regens* of the following genitive construction, LXX presupposes a vocalization of קדש as a verb (perfect, 3. pers. sg. in piel: קִדֵּשׁ) from which an independent verbal sentence occurs in LXX 5b: ἡγίασεν τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ ὁ ὕψιστος. This goes hand in hand with the fact that in LXX the genitive construction of MT is not available, but עליון becomes the subject of the sentence and משכני is read as משכנו. The reading of the LXX interrupts the direct relationship between the city of God and the statement in v. 6 which refers to the city of God as it is given in MT.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The expression עיר אלהים appears in the Hebrew Bible a second time in Ps 48:2,9 and describes Zion as the city of the Great King (קרית מלך רב) with its towers, ramparts and palaces.[11] Similar designations such as עיר האלהים (Ps 87:3), עיר יהוה (Ps 48:9; 101:8; Isa 60:4; cf. Jer 31:38) and עיר יהוה צבאות (Ps 48:9) stand for Zion/Jerusalem as a city.[12] The term משכן used in the genitive construction refers to the temple: in the Book of Psalms the term משכן expressed in the singular or as an intensive plural in the feminine plural form[13] designates the temple in Jerusalem (cf. Ps 26: 8; 74:7 and Ps 43:8; 84:2; 132:5,7).[14] In Ps 46:5b the term appears not as the known intensive plural, but in masculine plural, which is only found one other time in the Hebrew Bible in Ezek 25,4. There the word stands in close affinity to טירות, the fortified nomadic settlements (cf. Num 31:10) of the sons from the East.[15] The expression משכן shows in Ezek 25,4 as well as in Ps 46:5 less of the nature of the place, but designates the place of the act, which is expressed with the verb שכן. Thus Ezek 25,4 narrates the action in the following sequence: the sons from the East will pack into the fortified settlements and make them their homes. In the language of the Hebrew Bible, the word משכן is used for a place of living. It is sometimes used parallel to the term אהל, tent (cf. Num 24:5; Isa 54:2),

11 Cf. T.M. Steiner, Space, 685–704.

12 2 Sam 10:12//1 Chr 19:13 mentions עיר אלהינו. The plural indicates that it refers not only to Jerusalem, but to several places such as the cities that are considered to be God's own property. An interpretation of עיר אלהים that reads עיר as not referring to a city but to a temple could be deduced through 2 Kings 10:25. It is reported in 2 Kings 10:25 that after the killing of all the worshipers of Baal in the temple area according to Jehu's command to his bodyguards and fighters (v. 23), the authorized killers went after that עד עיר בית בעל in order to destroy the holy pillars. The location of the holy pillars is the actual place of worship from which the temple area and the altars can visibly be differentiated. So LXX^{Luc} translates in 2 Kings 10:25 עיר with ναός; cf. also J. Gray, Kings, 507; O. Keel, Welt, 122. That עיר refers here to the interior part of the temple area is in close correspondence to v. 26–27 since the destruction of holy pillars from the interior of the temple is followed consequently by the destruction of the temple itself. Generally one should not be so quick to equate the meaning of the word עיר with 'city' as 2 Kings 17:9 shows: under the keyword עיר, there is here a summarized margin from watch tower/place of refuge (מגדל) up to a fortified, walled city (עיר מבצר) (cf. F.S. Frick, City, 31.39). Also according to 1 Kings 3:1 and 8:1, the city of David (עיר דוד) is to be understood as a suburb of Jerusalem. Analogous to עיר דוד, it is also thinkable that the temple area which is to be distinguished according to 1 Kings 8:1 was described by the עיר דוד in the old tradition as עיר אלהים. Such an understanding of the term עיר אלהים in Ps 46:5a, however, would have been singular in the MT – and cannot be proven.

13 'The plural form of the one house of God does not mean the plurality of the temple, or the various edifices on the sides of the temple. It is better understood as intensive plural, *plural majestatis*, poetically employed because of the special quality of the temple.' (M.J. Obiorah, Perception, 535); see also F.-L. Hossfeld / E. Zenger, Psalmen, 571f. The feminine plural form is also used to describe the profane living quarters of Israel during the exodus (Ps 78:28), and the dwellings of Jacob in Ps 87:2 as well as a designation for graves in Ps 49:12.

14 In Ps 78:60 משכן is used for the designation of the temple in Shiloh without referring to Jerusalem.

15 Cf. D.I. Block, Ezekiel, 13.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

referring to accommodation; the holy Tent of God in the desert after the exodus from Egypt (cf. above all Exod 25–40 and Num 1–10) is also termed a משכן. In Num 16:27 the term is used generally for a place of tents. A clear designation of a city as משכן cannot be found.[16]

The noun משכן shows the location of the act, which is expressed with the verb שכן. M. Görg writes about this verb: '[t]he accent of škn is on the aspect of settling without enduring ties, i. e. without legal possession of property.'[17] The aspect of the right of ownership, or attachment to a place affects only human actors in relation with the verb שכן; when it is used for God, M. Görg describes it as 'dynamic presence'[18] which expresses the manifestation of God. This finding is particularly evident when one considers that in Ps 78:60 משכן refers to the temple in Shiloh which is expressed as identical to the tent (אהל) which God temporarily inhabited (שכן). In connection to Ps 78:60 one can understand why משכן is used in the plural in Ps 46:5b: the dynamic settlement of God or his dwelling is not static, but can take place in different places.[19] The place mentioned in v. 5b should be understood as one of the many related defined places ('group plural') – different places of worship. This does not mean a relativization of the place as the formulation קדוש משכני עליון shows.[20] The adjective קדש in v. 5b is to be understood as the indication of a superlative in conjunction with the following genitive con-

16 Cf. Jer 30:18; this is however an inter-textual admission of Num 24:5 (cf. also Jer 9:18). 'The structures in this promise are characteristic of rural life (tents and dwelling) and royal (city and citadel). The first two terms appear in the same order in Num 24:5 where they also function as a double metonymy for the people Israel.' (G.L. Keown / P.J. Scalise / T.G. Smothers, Jeremiah, 103).

17 M. Görg, Art. שכן, 696.

18 M. Görg, Art. שכן, 697; he writes further on p. 698: 'The dependency of human and creaturely škn on divine authority suggests that škn itself may represent a form of Yahweh's manifestation. Because here too no qualifying syntagmas are necessary, the focus is again on the lack of fixed ties to any one location and on an active, dynamic divine "dwelling".'

19 Ps 46:5 is ambiguous about whether the dwelling is to be understood according to Ps 78:60 successively at different places or if it proceeds from a concurrent presence of God in different places.

20 A. Doecker sees it in a different way: '[h]ere the plural of משכן is not to be understood as indicating the existence of several divine "residences", but should show clearly the prominent position of the city.' ("Dabei ist der Plural von משכן nicht als Hinweis auf das Bestehen mehrerer göttlicher 'Wohnsitze' zu verstehen, sondern soll die herausgehobene Stellung der Stadt verdeutlichen." [A. Doeker, Funktion, 188]). – One does not contradict the other. H. Schmidt proposes that the given vocalization should be changed and the yod should be read as accompanying yod (cf. H. Schmidt, Jahwe, 183). Such an argument could be supported by the fact that LXX presupposes משכנו, MT however does not offer any reason for an emendation, as the text can be explained conclusively. D. Michel writes: '…for the existing superlative construction in Ps 46:5 the group plural is the most meaningful.' ("… bei der Ps 46,5 vorliegenden superlativischen Konstruktion ist der Gruppenplural auf *-īm* höchst sinnvoll." [D. Michel, Grundlegung, 47]).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

struction משכני עליון (cf. 2 Chr 21:17 and GK § 133 h)[21]: 'the most holy of the dwelling places of the Most High.'[22] The expression קדש משכני עליון clearly refers to the temple as the dwelling place of God. Therefore one can agree with B. Janowski in his assessment of v. 5a as city-oriented and v. 5b as temple-oriented.

The primary framework for understanding the expression עיר אלהים is the city. If v. 5b is an apposition for עיר אלהים and refers to the city, but v. 5b is talking about the temple, then the problem arises that two different entities are being set at the same time in relation to one another, respectively that two different entities are equated.[23] By comparing the syntax of v. 5 with Deut 3:5, one may find a solution to this problem: in Deut 3:5, חומה גבהה דלתים ובריח is in apposition to ערים בצרות. The quality of the city as 'fortified' (בצרות) is explained from the point of view that all the cities had high walls, gates and bars. The apposition mentions what fortifies the cities; it explains the quality 'fortified.' In the same way, one finds that in Psalm 46:5 the temple is in the city and the city is described as the City of God. Just as in Deut 3:5 where the walls, the gates and the bars do not designate the city as a whole, Psalm 46:5b also only refers to a part of the city: the temple. But this temple is the reason for calling the city עיר אלהים, City of God.

1.2 The Theology of the City (vv. 5–6)

The City of God described in vv. 5–6 receives its quality through the location of the temple, 'the most holy of the dwelling places' of God, as indwelling in the city. The City of God as defined by the location of the temple corresponds to the statement in v. 6a that God is 'in the centre of the city' (בקרבה). This statement has a double meaning: the term בקרבה is a relational statement about the special relationship of God to this city (cf. Exod 17:7; Mi 3:11; Zeph 3:17) as well as a spatial indication (see Gen 18:24; Jer 6:6), that God resides locally in the City of God, more precisely in the temple as the centre. This statement of the local relationship is reflected in the structure of vv. 5–6, in which the two names of God עליון (at the end of v. 5) and אלהים (at the beginning of v. 6) appear in the middle of these two verses, so that God stands indeed in the centre: in the middle of the statement and in the middle of the description of the city. Spatially, vv. 5–6 show two different directions: v. 5 describes the salvation that comes from outside of the city (see below 1.2.1) and v. 6 describes the protection of the city, based on the

21 Cf. B. Janowski, Wohnung, 44.

22 The choice of words עיר + קדוש cannot be found in the Hebrew Bible (but see also the theological statement from Zech 14:20f.); Ex 40:9 (cf. Lev 8:10) reports that the משכן of God, the temple, should be made holy through an anointing (וקדשת) and so should be holy (קדש).

23 For the definition of 'apposition' see above p. 88 and JM § 131.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

fact that God resides in its centre and protects it from any 'external' enemy (see below 1.2.2).

1.2.1 The נהר that Delights the City of God

נהר stands as *casus pendens* in Ps 46:5 in opposition to the depictions of vv. 3–4, and is differentiated by the water supply channels[24] which go out from it and flow into the City of God (V. 5a). A נהר is a 'perennial river,'[25] 'respectively a water mass like the sea.'[26] A נהר can be understood according to Isa 43:2 as a danger or according to Ps 105:41 as a metaphor for fertility. The symbolism of water as a life giving entity finds its expression in Ps 46:5 in the verb שמח: '[a]s the term "delight" indicates, a figurative understanding of the picture of the water current in the text is at least brought closer here. "Delight" expresses the granting of salvation in the broad sense of the word.'[27]

> Excursus: Understanding of v. 5b in relation to the City of Jerusalem
> The theological statement of v. 5a about the steady flow of salvation/delight is based on the perceived space of Jerusalem: '[t]he given reality of Jerusalem such as the Gihon source and the Siloah channel did not generate the picture of God's current in Psalm 46:5, but guaranteed in some sense its correspondence to reality.'[28] Here it is of special interest that Isa 8:5–6 reads as a reversed picture of Psalm 46:3–7. These verses refer to the situation of the Syrian-Ephraimitic war. The words of judgment in vv. 7–8 use the imagery of water overflowing the banks of the Euphrates as נהר, whose masses of water will flood and forcefully overflow Judah in order to express the fact that the king of Assur will attack Judah. This close connection of the (chaos-)water symbol and the threat of the enemy can also be found in Ps 46:3–7 (cf. Ps 65:8). In opposition, Isa 8:6 mentions the מי השלוח ההלכים לאט, the waters of the Shiloh that flow gently, which the people rejected. The word השלוח is derived from the Akkadian *šalḫu* or *šilīḫu*, which can

24 The water masses are channelled as the noun of the verb root פלג expresses. פלג describes a division and thus an arrangement (cf. Gen 10:25; Job 38:25; 1 Chr 1:19) that in its nominalized form can be expressed as a symbol of salvation, stemming from the notion that from the deity or the place of the deity emanates life-giving and thus channelled water – as Ps 65:10 expresses (cf. Isa 33:21; Ez 47:1–12; Joel 4:18; Zech 14:8; see also B. Ego, Wasser, 361).

25 L.A. Snijders, Art. נהר, 264. An equation of נהר with the Euphrates as C. Maier postulates (see C. Maier, Daughter, 47) does not reflect the many sides of the use of the term in the Hebrew Bible as stream but also as ocean.

26 Cf. Isa 18:5; Ps 66:5; 114:3,5 with the parallelization of ים and נהר and cf. the additional close connection of אפפי ארץ to נהר in Ps 72:8; Zech 9:10.

27 "Wie der Begriff 'erfreuen' erschließen läßt, ist ein übertragenes Verständnis des Strombildes im Text wenigstens nahegelegt. 'Erfreuen' besagt Gewährung von Heil im umfassenden Sinn des Wortes." (J. Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, 222f., with reference to Isa 56:7; Jer 31:13; Ps 86:4; 90:15; 92:5; Esr 6:22; Neh 12:42).

28 "Die Jerusalemer Gegebenheiten wie Gihonquelle und Siloahkanal haben das Gottesstrommotiv von Ps 46:5 zwar nicht generiert, aber in gewissem Sinn dessen Realitätsbezug gewährleistet." (B. Janowski, Wohnung, 50).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

be translated as 'water flow' or 'water pipe' (cf. Ps 104:10; Ezek 31:4; Neh 3:15).[29] It does not refer to the Shiloh tunnel which King Hezekiah built, but as B. Ego says, 'one has to think more of the two channels which direct the water of the Gihon source on the east slope of the city along to the south. The archaeological findings could show the nature of one of these channels closely: it is partly open and partly covered with flat stones, at a depth of about 1.75 m and a width of 30 to 50 cm. It was provided with openings to the side of the valley, which indicate that it was used for the irrigation of the Kidron Valley. Since the slope of these channels is initially 4 to 5 per mill and only increases towards the end up to 5 %, the expression of the gently flowing water seems to be quite suitable [for Isa 8:6 – TMS].'[30] Isa 8:6 describes מי השלוח, the waters of Shiloh as God's care for the people, from which the people turned away. Psalm 46 on the other hand appreciates this source of water and views it as reason to believe and trust in God.
End of the excursus

V. 5a does not directly reveal what or who is the reason that from נהר, the massed water, water channels delight the City of God. Ps 36:9; 65:10 show that the motif of God supplying water can be seen as a blessing and a metaphor for the goodness of God.[31] Psalm 46:5a, however, does not show any clear connection of the water

29 Cf. J.D.W. Watts, Isaiah, 154.

30 "Vielmehr hat man an die beiden Kanäle zu denken, die das Wasser der Gihon-Quelle am Osthang der Stadt entlang nach Süden leiteten. Archäologische Funde konnten die Beschaffenheit eines dieser Kanäle näher aufzeigen: Er war zum Teil offen, z.T. mit flachen Steinen überdeckt, bei einer Tiefe von ca. 1,75 m und einer Breite von 30–50 cm war er mit Öffnungen ab der Talseite versehen, die darauf hindeuten, daß er zur Bewässerung des Kidrontales diente. Da das Gefälle dieser Kanäle anfänglich nur 4–5 Promille beträgt, und erst gegen Ende bis auf 5 Prozent ansteigt, scheint die Ausdruckweise von dem sanft fließenden Wassern durchaus passend zu sein [für Jes 8,6 – TMS]." (B. Ego, Wasser, 380–381).

31 Ps 65:10 speaks about פלג אלהים and is thus connected to Ps 46:5 by the word פלג. B. Ego writes: '[i]f פלג אלהים so appears as "cosmic" water, then it can be established firstly that the mentioned channel of God does not only express the terminology of Ps 46:5 but it is also conceptually and structurally parallel to the current of the City of God.' (B. Ego, Wasser, 372). B. Ego sees the channels of the water masses / the current (Ps 46:5) in the city of God and the channel of God (Ps 65:10) in a corresponding relationship: '[t]he water of the city of God "inside" represents the fertile water of the streams and rains "outside," since both originate from the powerful, chaos transforming, kingly God.' (B. Ego, Wasser, 372). Ps 65 does not explain the origin of the water, but God is mentioned as the originator. This God is referred to as אלהים בציון in v. 2. V. 5bα clarifies that the reason for the saturation, which lies in the successful production of food by God, respectively which is based on the irrigational channel of God (vv. 10–14), is the house of God (ביתך) which is the temple of Zion. The irrigational channel of God is thus not mentioned as part of the temple, but it has the blessing of God who is in Zion and has his temple there. There is a clear difference between Ps 65:10 and Ps 46:5: '[t]he current in Ps 46:5 which brings joy to the city of God now brings joy to the whole world.' (C. Körting, Zion, 104). Ps 36:9a as well as Ps 65:5bα describe being saturated/satisfied through the temple. Ps 36:9 emphasizes that the people who seek refuge in God can feast on the fat of the temple and drink from the stream of delight. The chiastic structure of the verse places בית and נחל in relation to each other and locates the origin of the goodness of God in the temple or in relation to God whose temple it is (see B. Ego, Wasser, 369). However in this instance the metaphor of the flowing water is directly referring to God.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

channels or of נהר to God. Only from v. 6b can one link the delight of the City of God back to God. The relationship of water imagery to God becomes clearer in vv. 3–4 (see below 2.1.1). Even though a possible reason for the delight of the City of God in the massed water via water channels is not mentioned, v. 5 shows in the syntax a clear movement from outside to inside. The mention of נהר here reflects something which is to be located outside/apart from the City of God. The water channels, which present a perceived space, direct the water/salvation into the City of God. This city of God is defined in its quality as the City of God in v. 5b through the temple. V. 6a emphasizes that in the middle of the City of God is God himself. Vv. 5–6a represents a thematic movement from outside to inside:

נהר → פלגיו → עיר אלהים → קדש משכני אלהים → אלהים

1.2.2 God as the Guarantor of the City of God's Protection

In the structure and the theological statement of vv. 5–6, God as עליון and אלהים is clearly the focus. God and his being are defined in v. 6a as the reason why the City of God will not be shaken – completely contrary to the mountains (v. 3, cf. also the tottering of the kingdoms in v. 7). The statement in v. 6aß that the city will not be shaken (בל תמוט) is not because of the city itself, but because of the constant helping of God as is expressed in v. 6b. A. Doeker notes that the statement בל תמוט, the connection of this verb with the negation, is normally used to designate the unshakableness of the righteous (Ps 10:6; 16:8; 17:5; 21:8; 30:7; Prov 10:30; 12:3), or also of the non-tottering of the earth (Ps 93:1; 96:10; 104:5; 1 Chr 16:30; exception: Job 41:15).[32] In both circumstances the stability is due to the relationship to God as J. Jeremias emphasizes: '[w]hat Ps 93 and its literally and identical parallels express about the stability of the world, because God exercises his authority over it, that Ps 46:6 praises the special quality of Zion, in the sense that God took his dwelling place in Zion and through this action made it the centre of the world (v. 5).'[33] However it is to be emphasized that everything depends on the relationship of God to his city, which in v. 6b is presented as a city in need.[34] That the City of God will not be shaken is not a quality of the city in itself, but depends on the constant care of God (v. 6b).[35] V. 6a locates God in the

32 Cf. A. Doeker, Gottesrede, 188 n. 6.

33 "Was Ps 93 und seine Parallelen wörtlich identisch von der Gehaltenheit der Welt aussagten, weil Gott die Herrschaft über sie ausübt, preist Ps 46:6 spezieller als Qualität des Zion, weil Gott auf ihm Wohnung genommen hat und er dadurch zum Mittelpunkt der Welt geworden ist (V.5)." (J. Jeremias, Erde, 179).

34 'The most holy of the dwelling places of the Most High is totally dependent on his presence so that it will not waver.' ("Die heiligste der Wohnungen des Höchsten ist ganz auf seine Gegenwart angewiesen, damit sie nicht wankt." [C. Körting, Zion, 184]).

35 In v. 6b the plural בקרים attracts attention: The term לפנות בקר is also found in the description of God's action in Ex 14:27 (see also Jdg 19:26). From this context one can conclude that just as

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

city and the imagery and metaphor of the sun in v. 6b shows God as one that always appears anew for the protection of the city that never will totter. The idea of God as a Sun God who intervenes for his city, suggests a hostile threat from the outside (cf. v. 7).

It appears – less clearly than in v. 5 – that the syntax of v. 6 follows the direction of the action: the God in the centre of the city (v. 6aα) protects his city against the threat of the enemy from the outside (v. 6aβ-b).

The image of the continuous dependence of the city on the saving action of God (v. 6b) corresponds positively to v. 5 in two ways: (1.) the city of God is introduced as the object of the action of God; and (2.) an image is selected which positively represents the constant concern and the continuous care of God for his city. The explanations so far have shown that in vv. 5–6 the expression קדש משכני עליון describes the temple as a holy place which qualifies עיר אלהים as such. Vv. 5–6 are not praising the City of God, but are a relational statement about this city in relation to God, who is located within it; vv. 5–6a design a concentric and horizontal view of the world, in whose midst God is located and described as the saviour of its fundamental existence (v. 6b).

2. The Function of vv. 5–6 in Ps 46

There is no 'praise of the holy place' in vv. 5–6, but they reflect the meaning of God's action for the City of God in relation to the world. The motif of the water masses (נהר) in v. 5 and the help for the City of God (v. 6b) refer clearly to the outside of the city and raise the question of the relation of the City of God to the world. Accordingly, the term ארץ is therefore also the guiding concept of the psalm (vv. 3,7,9,10,11).[36] One of the theological highlights of the Psalm is the universal claim of God, expressed in v. 11 in His own voice: ארום בגוים ארום בארץ. The God who is described and who speaks in v. 11 is the ruler of the entire world and of all peoples. At the same time, this psalm describes in vv. 5–6 the special relationship of God to the עיר אלהים and the קדש משכני עליון. As it is shown by the

on that particular morning in which God saved the Israelites during the exodus from Egypt, he continues every morning to save the city. But C. Körting justly demands that the 'motive of the help in the morning as a theophany metaphor (should gain an increased attention)' especially 'connected with the description of Yhwh as a sun god who chases away his opponents daily with his rise (see Ps 76:5; 84:12).' (Dass das "Motiv der Hilfe am Morgen als Theophaniemetapher [stärkere Beachtung erlangen sollte]" besonders "verbunden mit der Vorstellung von Jhwh als Sonnengott, der mit seinem täglichen Aufgang die Gegner vertreibt (s. Ps 76:5; 84,12)." (C. Körting, Zion, 183 n. 90).

36 Cf. S. Kelly, Psalm 46, 306.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

localization of vv. 5–6, Ps 46 is characterized in its structure by the presentation of God both as a particular and a universal God.

2.1 Spatial and Exegetical Observations in Ps 46

The focal statement about the nature of God in v. 2 is proven true in vv. 5–6. Vv. 5–6 as well as v. 2 (cf. vv. 8,12) put God in a special relation to the city, respectively to the 'We-group.' The God that is sung about in v. 2 is the God of the 'We-group' (אלהים לנו…) and they experience him as strength and refuge. The term מחסה implies protection and refuge (cf. Job 24:8; Ps 14:6) – as place of refuge in a spatial perspective (cf. Ps 61:4; Ps 91:2; 94:22; and especially Isa 4:6), as it is given in the City of God according to v. 6. This positive connotation of God as space corresponds to the statement in v. 2b: LXX translates βοηθὸς ἐν θλίψεσιν ταῖς εὑρούσαις ἡμᾶς σφόδρα, but H. Hupfeld has solidly established that this does not correspond with MT and therefore the MT should 'not to be translated … "the problems that concerned us", but *adjudged*, that is well tested and proved, *as help for problems* (in opposition to the first hemistich).'[37] Usually the verb נמצא is translated as niphal perfect.[38] According to this reading, v. 2b means that God has proven to be a reliable help out of his own free will.[39] However, it is also grammatically possible to understand נמצא as a Qal 1. Pers. Pl. imperfect, which shows the absolute certainty of finding further help in God. One cannot find something by force of will alone, but rather finding is the direct and delightful result of searching. However, Deut 4:29; Isa 55,6; 65,1 show that searching for God leads to the finding of God. Accordingly Ps 46:5 expresses that God lets himself be found and that the 'We-group' will find him – now and in the future (v. 6b).[40]

37 "nicht … 'Nöthen die uns betroffen haben', sondern als Hülfe (Appos. zum 1. Halbv.) in d. N. *erfunden*, d.i. erprobt, bewährt" (H. Hupfeld, Psalmen, 435).

38 'The verb is put into the passive voice, apparently because it should not be emphasized that someone finds something actively. "Finding" is already an active verb, but not in the volitional sense, it is active through the taking of initiative ("searching" is an intentional act, the "finding" must be given); this applies even more so to a passive formulation.' ("Das Verb ist ins Passiv gesetzt, offenbar, weil nicht betont werden soll, daß jemand aktiv etwas findet. Ist 'finden' schon im aktiven Gebrauch nicht eindeutig willensbestimmt also initiativ ('suchen' kann man mit Absicht, das 'finden' muß man sich schenken lassen), so gilt dies für die passivische Formulierung noch stärker." [H. Schweizer, Burg, 112]).

39 The certainty in this theological statement is emphasized by מעד – God has not proved himself just as a helper, but a reliable helper. This superlative word is a keyword for Ps 46–48 – here it expresses the relational faith in God. In Ps 47:10 the majesty of God is enhanced by the addition of the superlative word (נעלה מעוד) and Ps 48:2 leads to the statement that this God is to be praised (מהלל מעוד).

40 If one reads נמצא in v. 2 as Qal imperfect 1. Pers. Plural, it corresponds to נירא in v. 3a.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The situation in which help is needed is described as בצרות, 'the most limited space is described by the Hebrew word ṣārôt, "troubles", that connotes narrowness and confinement, a dense situation with no easy way to escape.'[41] The description of God's nature in v. 2 is also a description of space: God is a place of refuge for the 'We-group.' When they are threatened and in a cramped situation, God lets Himself be found and is found within the space accessible to humans. This 'space theology' between the cramped and dangerous and the liberating saving place of refuge characterizes the theology of Ps 46 as it relationally unfolds on the basis of the City of God.

The concept of צרות is made clear in the view of the forces of nature in vv. 3–4(.7b) (see below 2.1.1) and the view of the nations in vv. 7,9–11 (see below 2.1.2 and 2.1.4). The keyword עזרה from v. 2b is followed by the statement that God helps (יעזרה) the City of God in the morning[42] and the whole description of the city of God (vv. 5–6) explains the naming of God as מחסה (v. 2), which enhances the statement in vv. 8,12 that God himself is as משגב, a shelter (see below 2.1.3).

2.1.1 Vv. 3–4 as a Contrast Space to vv. 5–6

The commitment to God in v. 2 is followed in vv. 3–4 by a statement of certainty that is introduced with a self-articulated על כן לא ניראא, 'therefore we will not fear' (comparable to the hymnal כי). Vv. 3–4 unfold an 'even if'-logic for which v. 3aβ-3b is the theme. The basic statement is found in v. 3aβ: בהמיר ארץ.[43] The infinitive form המיר is derived from the verb root מור, whose basic meaning is 'exchange/change' (cf. Lev 27:10.33; Ps 106:20; Jer 2:11; 48:11, etc.). In Ps 46:3a, the meaning is similar to 'wavering/tottering,' but with a connotation of exchange or change. The basic statement of v. 3aβ is explained in v. 3b: the aforementioned mountains (הרים) and the depths of the sea (לב ימים) are to be understood as the highest and the lowest points of the cosmos/world (ארץ). When the psalmist speaks about mountains crashing into the sea (cf. Ψ 45,3 and Ps 104:6), the directional up and down are swapped, and the world would be turned upside down, so to speak.[44]

41 C. Maier, Daughter, 45.

42 Cf. S. Kelly, Psalm 46, 308.

43 One can see in LXX how the translator misread v. 3 and v. 4, or intentionally intervened in the text in order to link it more strongly and read בהמיר in v. 3a as analogous to יחמרו in v. 4a. Such an emendation destroys the relationship between the verse partitions in v. 3.

44 'If it is mentioned now in v. 3 that the mountains "waver" in the depths of the sea, it means then, so to speak, that the most stable thing on earth loses its stability and this points to a dangerous creation- threatening situation.' ("Wenn in V 3 nun davon die Rede ist, daß Berge in die Tiefe des Meeres 'wanken', also sozusagen das Stabilste, was es auf Erden gibt, seine Standfestigkeit verliert, so deutet dies auf eine gefährliche, schöpfungsbedrohende Situation hin." [B.M. Zapff, Burg, 86]). – Which is, however, embraced by the power of the Creator, see below.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

V. 4 does not develop the image of v. 3 further, but locates such an event in the realm of God's power. This interpretation depends on the understanding of the enclitic personal pronoun in v. 4. V. 4a starts with two verbs whose subject is the word מימיו.[45] The verbs יהמו יחמרו point to the chaos motif and the corresponding tottering (במוט) of the mountains in v. 3b. LXX reads the first enclitic personal pronoun connected to the sea in v. 3b, as E. Zenger has written about both enclitic personal pronouns in v. 4: 'the singular suffixes refer to the plural of *jammîm* "sea" in [3b]; these can be considered as an "amplifying" plural, in which the singular reference is possible.'[46] In my opinion the psalmist consciously opens different possibilities of understanding by the use of the singular enclitic personal pronouns: they refer to a masculine noun in the singular, and have no direct correspondence in v. 3b. Besides that, v. 4a does not speak about the sea, but generally about water (cf. the connection to v. 5). In v. 4b, the mountains are the clear independent subject connected to v. 3b: the mountains will tremble in its/his grandeur (בגאותו). The Hebrew term גאות is used in most cases in reference to human pride (cf. Ps 10:2; 31:19,24; 36:12; 73:6); however, in other cases, it expresses the sovereignty of God (cf. Deut 33:26; Ps 68:35; Isa 13:3). If one takes the related verb גאה or the word גאון into consideration, it is possible that the forces of nature raise chaos (cf. Ps 89:10; Job 38:11) and with that, the sea or its water are the reason for the quaking of the mountains. However v. 4 offers a second possibility of interpretation. The second possibility is to connect the enclitic personal pronouns directly to אלהים.[47] Two arguments speak in favour for this reading: (1.) The reference on גאותו corresponds to the statement about the sovereignty of God which is expressed in v. 5b calling God עליון and corresponds to God, who says in v. 11 ארום בגוים ארום בארץ, expressing his majesty and highness. (2.) V. 7b describes the theophanic appearance of the voice of God as one that brings the universe into tottering (cf. v. 4); the verbs from 3b,4,7b could be credited to the

45 The verbs should be read as jussives, cf. A. Grund, Festung, 62 n. 28.

46 "Die Singularsuffixe beziehen sich auf den Plural *jammïm* 'Meere' in 3b zurück; das kann als 'amplifikativer' Plural betrachtet werden, auf den singularischer Rückbezug möglich ist." (F.-L. Hossfeld / E. Zenger, Psalmen I, 286); cf. B. Janowski, Wohnung, 43–44: 'ימים "sea" v. 3b, to which the singular suffix in v. 4 refers to as plural amplification.' ("ימים 'Meere' V. 3b, worauf sich die singularischen Suffixe von V. 4 beziehen, ist Plural amplificationis.").

47 'גאותו in v. 4 must refer to YHWH as judged by the suffix. From the content, however, the relationship to מימיו\ימים seems closer (*constructio ad sensum*). Perhaps the relationship here should remain ambiguous until its unique meaning is revealed in v 7.' ("גאותו in V.4 müßte sich, nach dem Suffix zu urteilen, auf JHWH beziehen. Inhaltlich liegt jedoch die Beziehung auf מימיו\ימים näher [constructio ad sensum]. Vielleicht soll die Beziehung hier bewußt in der Schwebe gehalten werden, bevor sie in V.7 Eindeutigkeit erlangt." [H. Spieckermann, Stadtgott, 23–24 n. 55]); in contrast, C. Körting clearly writes that it is 'not the ungodly chaotic powers that cause the mountains to tremble, but the grandeur (גאותו) of God.' ("Nicht widergöttliche Chaosmächte, sondern die Erhabenheit (גאותו) Gottes bringt die Berge zum Erzittern." [C. Körting, Zion, 182]).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

same semantic field. These two observations reveal that God could be the cause of the uproar of the water and the trembling of the mountains in vv. 3–4; this shows the reader that even the threatening chaos of nature is contained within the sphere of God's power.

The motif of the water mentioned in v. 4a is closely connected with the reference to the sea in v. 3b and also with the water mass (נהר) referred to in v. 5a. While water according to v. 4a can roar and foam, water will be enjoyed via irrigation channels in the City of God (פלגיו). The *casus-pendens* structure in v. 5a refers clearly to the *casus* נהר, by use of the enclitic personal pronoun in the third person singular (פלגיו) following the enclitic personal pronouns in v. 4 which are linked to the sea as well as to God.

The reader, who understands from v. 7 that God is already the 'actor' in vv. 3–4 (see below), deduces that the chaotic waters in vv. 3–4 mean salvation when they flow into the city and that they originate from God (v. 6). In this perspective, it is important to see that v. 4 ends with בגאותו.[48] If גאות, translated as sovereignty, refers to God, it links to the statement in v. 5; when one reads v. 4 and v. 5 together, the majesty of God is understood as the necessary and reliable 'current' whose channels gladden the City of God.

Vv. 3–4 describe the possible danger of nature which is within God's power. The consideration of the cosmos with the designation ארץ sets the stage for the location of the City of God in this world according to vv. 5–6. The *casus-pendens* structure נהר פלגיו in v. 5a has its contrastive and connective correspondence in relation to ימים to מימיו in vv. 3b.4a.[49] While God can wreak havoc in the world through water, he also uses water to bring delight and salvation into the City of God. The difference and thus the contrast between the world and the City of God shows itself explicitly in the syntax of v. 5. The verse begins with a *casus pendens* and on the one hand it takes up the water motif from vv. 3–4, and on the other it contrasts it sharply with the experience in the City of God. The stage of the world (ארץ) is contrasted by the coulisse of the city in v. 5. The city does not need to worry in the face of a possible worldly chaos because: (1.) God is master over the chaotic powers (vv. 3–4); and (2.) God himself resides in the midst of the city and protects it from harm (cf. v. 6 in connection with v. 2).

2.1.2 V. 7 as Proof for the Statement in vv. 5–6

The water motif connects and contrasts vv. 3–6a. The promise of the constant theophanic intervention of God as supporting and helping Sun God in the morning opens the motif of the threatened city of God in the face of the nations

48 Cf. A. Doeker, Gottesrede, 187.
49 Cf. D.T. Tsumura, Structure, 38.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

(v. 6b). V. 7 contrasts the image of the City of God and the action of God for it, with the world and the action of God in the world – which, reading between the lines, one understands as the action of God for the city of God in the world. The keyword המה is used again (cf. v. 4). Interestingly, the tense changes and the action of the nations (v. 7a) and also the action of God (v. 7b) are expressed in the perfect tense, as a past action which can neither be attributed to a particular time or to a historical event.[50] V. 7 attracts attention through the radical compactness of the statement: the menacing roar (המו) of the nations is followed directly in the next word by the tottering (מטו) of the kingdoms. גוים and ממלכות are synonymous: the roaring of the nations leads to the faltering of their (own) kingdoms. Strength and weakness are thus united in the nations/kingdoms with which the theophanic power of God is contrasted in v. 7b: 'While the "raging", i. e. the disorder generating aggressiveness of the nations, comes to an end in its own "tottering" without any external effect and without endangering the earth, the earth can only "totter" and tumult when it falls under the war cry of the Lord of the universe.'[51] If one delves into this interpretation of J. Jeremias, it can be seen that the expression נתן בקולו is written in the perfect tense, which leads one to understand that the theophanic event in the voice of thunder (cf. 2 Sam 22:14//Ps 18:14; Ps 68:34) is the reason for the faltering of the kingdoms. 'The sound of the voice of God is a noticeable intervention of God in the universe. נתן בקולו is an action, and so תמוג ארץ must be a reaction.'[52] As המו גוים is an action and מטו ממלכות a direct consequence which relates to 7b, the term ארץ can be seen as a natural condition such as the sea or the mountains or also the nations and kingdoms[53] – therefore the theophanic appearance of God in the voice of thunder in Ps 46:7 causes the earth to shake and the kingdoms to totter.

50 Cf. C. Körting, Zion, 183. – 'If we accept Ibn Ezra's suggestion that Psalm 46 is a psalm of thanksgiving in the aftermath of Sennacherib's aborted siege of Jerusalem, it is tempting to compare its attitude with one that the prophet Jeremiah condemned, the attitude of those who did not fear the Babylonians (Jer 7: 4–7).' (A. Folger, Understanding, 41).

51 "Während die 'tobende', d. h. Unordnung stiftende, Aggressivität der Völker schon ohne jede Außenwirkung in ihrem 'Wanken' endet, ohne die Erde gefährden zu können, kann die Erde nur dann 'schwanken', wenn sie unter dem Kriegsruf des Weltenherrn in Aufruhr gerät." (J. Jeremias, Erde, 180).

52 "Das Erschallen der Stimme Gottes ist ein fühlbares Eingreifen Gottes in das Weltgeschehen. Ist nun נתן בקולו: Aktion, so ist תמוג ארץ: Reaktion." (M. Weiss, Wege, 438).

53 Am 9:5 (cf. Ps 75:4) clearly illustrates what it means when God causes the world to tremble (תמוג). In Am 9:5, it is God's contact with the earth (ארץ) which leads to its crumbling or tottering. This is explained in the verse division b as the lifting and lowering of the earth, i. e. an earthquake. Here it is emphasized that the inhabitants of the earth (יושבי בה) are affected and mourn. ארץ is clearly understood here as a scene of human life.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

2.1.3 Vv. 8,12 – Avowal in the Face of the God of the City of God

V. 7 (cf. already v. 6b) broadens the perspective of ארץ. Not only does ארץ stand for nature but it also stands for the world with its historical dimension, peoples and kingdoms. This broadening of the perspective in v. 7 results in the identification of God as YHWH Zebaot in v. 8. Of particular interest is the transition from v. 6 to v. 7, as in v. 7 the subject of נתן בקול is not mentioned, but must be drawn from the action of God for the city in v. 6b. The God who helps his city is the one who can shake the whole cosmos/world with his voice of thunder alone; this God is YHWH Zebaot (v. 8). The use of this title of God in Ps 24:10; 48:9; 84:4,13 suggests that the relationship of God to the City of God or to the temple is one with a sheltering function (against enemies).[54] With the thematization of the military context, the psalmist consciously uses the name of God, YHWH Zebaot, and not the general אלהים as in vv. 2–7. The use of 'YHWH Zebaot' ties together both hemistiches of v. 7 and interprets the action of God which caused the earth to quake as an action corresponding to the statement from v. 6: God is in the midst of the City of God and helps his city, which leads to the statement in v. 8, that the martial acting God, YHWH Zebaot, is on the side of the 'We-group' (עמנו).

The God that was introduced in v. 2 as מחסה is now praised metaphorically as משגב. He is 'a saving place, a high walled (or similarly surrounded) living place'[55], a protective fortress or a high house for escape.[56] As J. Creach writes, '[t]he refuge metaphor seems to communicate the comprehensive responsibility of ancient oriental kings to ensure the safety of their subjects through military and judicial means.'[57] The interpretation's direction of v. 2 (מחסה) to v. 8 (משגב) with the description of the city of God in vv. 5–6 in the face of natural forces (vv. 3–4) and a story of a saving event (v. 7) establishes the certainty that God himself can be called the protective fortress of the City of God in which God himself is a perceivable space, a משגב. The hint of historical events in v. 7 and the present reader's association of the City of God with Jerusalem corresponds to the mention of God's name in v. 8a and the identification of God as relationally bound to a historical ancestor, whereby the We-group professes to be a descendant of Jacob and thus expresses a clear national identity.[58] The God who protects the city of

54 Cf. U. Berges / A. Spans, Jhwh, 177–178.

55 "ein fester Ort, ein hoch ummauerter (o. ä. umgebener) Wohnplatz" (P. Hugger, Jahwe, 97).

56 'YHWH is a refuge and protection, not Jerusalem itself. The city enjoyed its safety only through him.' ("Jahweh ist Zuflucht und Schutz, nicht Jerusalem selbst. Die Stadt erfährt ihre Sicherheit nur durch ihn." [J. Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, 220]).

57 J.F.D. Creach, Yahweh, 52.

58 The connection to Jacob gave distinction to the first collection of Psalms of the Sons of Korah (Ps 42–49). Ps 44:5 praises God as the one who orders the rescue of Jacob and Ps 47:5 praises God as the one who chose the hereditary land, meaning Israel, and also known as the pride of Jacob (see also Ps 84:9; 85:2; 87:2). Outside the patriarchal narratives, it is striking that the title

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

God is YHWH Zebaot, who is the God of Jacob and therefore has a special relationship to the 'We-group' and to Jerusalem. Jerusalem as the City of God is in this interpretation the *Realsymbol* of the abstract statement that God is a refuge (מחסה) for the 'We-group', which strengthens the belief that God is a perceptible shelter/saving place, a fortress with high walls in the actual city of Jerusalem, the City of God.

2.1.4 Vv. 9–11 as Proclamation of the Faith Statements in vv. 2–8

Ps 46 could end with the faith statement about the nature of God in v. 8.[59] However, the nations theme in v. 7 and the help for the city of God in v. 6 lead up to and help elaborate the theme of the nations in vv. 9–11. The description of vv. 3–7 is followed in v. 9 by a prompting perspective that calls for a review of the confession in v. 8. The confession is confirmed by the word of God in v. 11, which leads to the repeated affirmation of the v. 8's confessional statement in v. 12. A. Doeker writes about vv. 9,11: 'לכו ("go") is expressed from the perspective of those who pray to the listener of the text. The following two imperatives הרפו ודעו ("let go and recognize") are expressed in direct speech from the divine perspective to the same addressee.'[60] The possible answers to the question 'Who are the listeners?' could be the 'We-group' or the In-group of the We, as well as the nations. From the point of view of H. Hupfeld, the imperative shows that 'the "come and see!" must be credited to a fact of the past, which is still fresh and has an enduring effect. The perfect שם also seems to prove this to be true.'[61] V. 9 reflects the city's experience of security comparable to Ps 48:13 f.[62] The imperative לכו חזו demands an experiential reality founded in history (שם – Perfect) (cf. v. 7).[63] With the word מפעלות, the works of God are generally addressed without

'God of Jacob' in Ps 46:8,12 and Ps 84:9 is closely related to the name 'YHWH Zebaot.' In Isa 2:3; Mi 4:2 and Ps 20:2 the name is closely connected with Zion/the Temple. A second major place of its occurrence is in the Asaph psalms where this title of God is above all used in the theme of God's judgment (cf. Ps 75:10; 76:10; 81:2,5).

59 This view is represented by the following exegetes: see e.g. E. Otto, Krieg, 113; B. Ego, Wasser, 363; F. Hartenstein, Tosen, 138–139; E. Zenger, Hilfe, 311 n. 47.

60 "לכו ('geht') richtet sich aus der Sicht der Beter an die Hörer des Textes. Die folgenden zwei Imperative הרפו ודעו ('laßt ab und erkennt') richten sich, aus der göttlichen Perspektive, in direkter Rede an die gleichen Adressaten." (A. Doeker, Gottesrede, 186–187).

61 "das 'kommet, schauet' auf eine Tathsache der Vergangenheit gehen muss u. zwar wol einer noch frischen u. in ihrer Wirkung fortdauernden; worauf auch d. Perf. שם zu weisen scheint." (H. Hupfeld, Psalmen, 441); he writes further: '[b]ut the retrospective is mixed with general images which make the fact into a general truth and that give reason for a general application.' ("Aber der Rückblick ist gemischt mit allgemeinen Bildern, die die Thatsache zu einer allgem. Wahrheit machen u. eine allg. Anwendung begründen.").

62 See also M. Weiss, Wege, 442.

63 A close parallel to v. 9a is presented in Ps 66:5. Ps 66:5 demands in the here and now the

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

differentiating whether they are works of creation or historical deeds (cf. Ps 66:5; Prov 8:22). The word connection שם + שמות is used syntactically in this way only in Ps 46:5. The use of שם + ל + שמה is often seen, especially in the book of Jeremiah, for the destruction of a nation, a land or a city (cf. e. g. Jer 4:7; 18:16; 19:8; 25,9). While מפעלות places the works of God at the forefront, שמות emphasizes the effect, which is described as a ruin and which carries a martial connotation.[64] V. 9 emphasizes that the deeds and power of God are not limited to the boundaries of the city, but the focus here is that his power reaches over the whole world, which is indicated by the final position of בארץ (cf. v. 11). V. 9 (and also v. 10) justify the statement in v. 11, which is God's speech to the nations and which also functions as the reassurance of the 'In-group.' The fact that the verse includes divine speech connects it to the קול of God in v. 7 which sounded over the whole world. V. 11 is an allusion to v. 7.[65] The imperatives to behold the deeds of God are framed by the sequence v. 7+Refrain and v. 11+Refrain. V. 11 alludes to God's speech in v. 7b. V. 11b adopts the words גוים and ארץ from v. 7.

The letting go (הרפו), which God demands in v. 11a suggests a resistance to God, the God of Jacob, and the God of the City of God.[66] The letting go should lead to the recognition of the one God, which has been demanded (ודעו) – the recognition formula, which is characteristic of the book of Ezekiel appears here in its own character as a call to the nations (cf. Ps 83:18). YHWH Zebaot, the God

admiration of the works of God. This demand is connected in the following verse with the historical memory of the Exodus in which in v. 6 the power over the creation is expressed in the story. V. 6 expresses the force of ים and נהר, which presents water as a natural force in the historical context of the story of the Red Sea – in the same way Ps 46:9 thematizes the historical power of God over the forces of nature and thus for Israel against the nations.

64 See also M. Weiss, Wege, 442: 'Some hear in שמות the "horrible", attracted by the devastation of horror; others explain it as exciting wonder. The LXX translates τέρατα, i. e. things which paralyze one with astonishment (horrenda). This seems to me to be the right interpretation, even when I presume that some ambiguity exists here." ("In שמות hören manche das 'Schauerliche', das durch Verwüstung erregte Entsetzen, andere erklären es als das Erstaunen-erregende. Die LXX übersetzen: τέρατα, d. h. Dinge, über die man vor Staunen starr wird (horrenda). Dies scheint mir das Richtige, wenn ich mir auch die Vermutung gestatte, dass hier Vieldeutigkeit vorliegt.").

65 See M. Weiss, Wege, 441.

66 P.C. Craigie understands the imperative הרפו at the beginning of v. 11 as 'relaxing': '[h]ence the people may "relax" in appropriate confidence (v 11a); to know that God is God is to know his Lordship of nature and history, and therefore to be aware of his total capacity as Protector' (P.C. Craigie, Psalms, 345). He takes his derivation of the word רפה from the fact that LXX translated it with σχολάσατε – although רפה usually means 'to let go of something.' Besides Ps 46:11, LXX translates the root רפה also in Ex 5:8,17 with σχολάζουσιν and σχολάζετε. In Ex 5:8,17, the root רפה has the meaning 'to be lazy.' For Ps 46:11 a positive translation could be 'being idle' – in any case, the verb is preceded by a previous activity, as it is described, for example, in the uproar of the nations in v. 7a. Similarly, v. 10 assumes an act of war. For this reason, P. Auffret is justified when he refers the imperative הרפו to v. 10 and understands it as letting go from war. (Cf. P. Auffret, Ville, 324; see H. Hupfeld, Psalmen, 442).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

of Jacob, lets himself be recognized as the almighty God (אלהים) according to vv. 2–6 (v. 6a: אלהים). This demanded recognition is, according to v. 11, a necessary or almost a compulsory action, since God declares himself lord over the nations and over the whole world. The use of the imperfect forms (2x ארום) can be understood in a twofold sense, either as 'an expression of an on-going action'[67] according to M. Weiss, or instead as the apparent impending absolute power of God. The latter interpretation seems more reasonable in the context of the imperative הרפו. The nations should abandon their resistance, because God will always be more powerful and no matter how the story goes, he will rule over all the nations and the whole world. Both possibilities of interpretation, in my view, are intentionally created in v. 11b (cf. Ps 47:6; cf. also Ps 18:47//2 Sam 22:47; Ps 57:6; 108:6; Isa 30:18). The mention of the elevation of God above the nations and above the world connects to v. 7 and also to the themes of vv. 3–4 (world and nature) and to vv. 7,9–10 (world as human world). The term ארץ at the end of the verse embraces both aspects.

Excursus on the source-critical evaluation of v. 10

A. Grund denies the secondary character of v. 10 and reads the conspicuous metric (tricolon) as expressing the centrality of the verse and as stylistically intended: '[a]lone, v. 10 seems to be metrically overloaded, but which stichos should be cancelled? The participial formulation v. 10aα is the best connection to v. 9 and the use of the keywords in v. 10a match the style of the rest of the psalm. The form of v. 10 is different due to its central location in the psalm. In agreement with v2f. and v6, the nominal introductory phrase relates to the following verbal phrase like a thesis to an argument.'[68] E. Zenger's source critical evaluation of Ps 46 is, after the arguments of A. Grund, still valid. I will repeat and strengthen it:[69] (1.) stylistically, v. 10 has three characteristics that differ compared to Ps 46: (a.) The use of a participle for the description of the nature of God (משבית); (b.) While Ps 46 is consistently formed in bicola, v. 10 offers a tricolon; (c.) vv. 9,11 use בארץ as a statement to show the realm of God on earth, whereas the use of עד קצה הארץ is conspicuous. (2.) 'While the rest of the psalm presents YHWH as a military protector of his city, v. 10 describes him as a universal peacemaker (cf. especially Isa 2^{1-5} = Mi 4^{1-5} Hos 2^{20}).'[70] The universal claim of God is consistent with the statement in vv. 7,9,11, however the final statement in v. 10 contradicts the constantly renewed help of

67 "Ausdruck einer andauernden Handlung" (M. Weiss, Wege, 445).

68 "Allein V. 10 scheint metrisch überladen – doch welcher Stichos ließe hier streichen (sic!)? Die partizipiale Formulierung V.10aα ist der geeignetste Anschluss an V.9, und der Einsatz von Stichworten in V.10a entspricht dem Stil des übrigen Psalms. Dass die Form von V.10 abweicht, ist auf seine zentrale Stellung zurückzuführen, und dass der einleitende NS sich zu den folgenden VS wie eine These zu ihrer Explikation verhält, entspricht im Übrigen der Abfolge von V.2f. und V.6." (A. Grund, Festung, 66).

69 See F.-L. Hossfeld / E. Zenger, Psalmen I, 285.

70 "Während der übrige Psalm JHWH als kriegerischen Beschützer seiner Stadt darstellt, zeichnet ihn 10 als universalen Friedensstifter (vgl. besonders Jes 21–5 = Mi 41–5 Hos 220)." (F.-L. Hossfeld / E. Zenger, Psalmen I, 285).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

God according to v. 6b. According to the translation of LXX ἀνταναιρῶν, the participle משבית means that God will finally end all war actions (מלחמות) everywhere in the world (עד קצה הארץ) – God ends all wars in the world (cf. Ps 76:4).
V. 10 is the inserted explication of the statement of v. 9 in order to present the actions in a peace-minded theological way of thinking as final actions: either as the exilic response to the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 BC, or as a post-exilic response to the *pax persica*.[71]
End excursus

The God who constantly helps the City of God (vv. 5–6) is the God who, with his voice of thunder, demonstrates his power to the possibly dangerous nations before they can be a threat to the whole world. His protective power over the city has been historically demonstrated against the nations (v. 7) and therefore the 'We-group' can confess him as their YHWH Zebaot, who is the God of Jacob (v. 8), and request the action of God to be considered in history (v. 9). These actions are based on the confession in v. 10 that YHWH Zebaot, the God of Jacob, is the almighty God, who brings the wars to an end. This is the God He reveals Himself to be in v. 11 and to who the 'We-group' confesses in v. 8 and then affirms and repeats in v. 12.

2.2 Structural Observations on Ps 46

Various structural proposals based on different criteria are discussed in the research literature. As demonstrated below, I believe that the perception of space is the structural principle of Ps 46, in which the description of the City of God (vv. 5–6) is to be positioned.

MT and LXX divide the text through סלה or διάψαλμα in three strophes (vv. 2–4,5–8,9–12).[72] Analysis of the water imagery in vv. 3–4 and v. 5 and the function of the *casus-pendens* structure in v. 5a have shown proof of the power of God as well as their intentional relation and intended contrast. An excessive strophic separation would not do it justice.[73] Accordingly, a concentric or palindromic structure for vv. 2–8 is often assumed, in the center of which the City of God in vv. 5–6

71 The construction of the explication of the participial statement of v. 10a in 10b is interesting: while the destruction of bow and spear is only briefly mentioned, the statement about the war wagons / transportation vehicles is marked by an imperfect and the verb is determined by the adverb באש. The term עגלה in MT generally describes a transportation vehicle in all occurrences, or according to 1 Sam 6:7–11; 2 Sam 6:3; 1 Chr 13:7, the transportation vehicle of the ark. God does not only destroy the weapons, but also the transportation means for the war.

72 See e.g. F.-L. Hossfeld / E. Zenger, Psalmen I, 285.

73 Cf. A. Folger, Understanding, 36; A. Grund, Festung, 63 n. 37.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

stands. The resulting division of the psalm corresponds to the refrain in vv. 8,12.[74] B. Ego, for instance, emphasizes that the concentric structure of vv. 2–8 is framed thematically by a spatial structure: vv. 2–4,7–8 present the 'outside: earth', while vv. 5–6 introduces the 'inside: city'[75]. B. Janowski writes: '[t]he theology of Jerusalem designed in Ps 46:2–8 is based on the "symbolism of the centre". YHWH is presented as saviour (v. 6) in the "middle" (קֶרֶב) of the city of God, the "most holy dwelling place of the Most High" (v. 5), while at the periphery the natural and historical representatives of the chaos roar and rage (v. 3f. par v. 7), but are held under control through the sovereignty of the kingly God.'[76] A. Grund, however, has criticized such a structure: '[t]hat v.3–6 are marked from the periphery-centre-motif is certainly out of the question, and the motif of the nations and above all the motif of "God" in v.7 certainly cannot be classified as the cosmic periphery, so that v.3f.7 does not appear as the framework of v.5. The repetition of the keyword אֶרֶץ in v.2,6 forms an inclusion that frames the paragraph, and v.7, with its combination of chaos motif (cf. v.3; referring back to v.2–6) and motif of the nations (cf. v.11; in anticipation of v.8–12), needs to be seen as a connection verse.'[77] A. Grund also contradicts B. Zapff, who maintains the division of the psalm into two parts, but understands v. 8 as a connecting verse or as he puts it: 'the psalm is originally divided into two parts in which v. 8 forms the transition and is attributed to both parts of it.'[78] B. Zapff can claim this on the basis of an important observation on the use of the names or titles for God[79]: vv. 2–7 generally use the unspecified title of God אלהים (vv. 2a,6a,b) or עליון (v. 5b). B. Zapff writes: 'consequently, in the following verses [vv. 8–12 – TMS], God as אֱלֹהִים is not mentioned, but solely God as Yahweh (v. 9) or Yahweh Zebaot (v. 12) and the

74 Cf. e.g. D.T. Tsumura, Structure; E. Otto, Krieg, 113; B. Ego, Wasser, 367; B. Janowski, Wohnung, 45.

75 See B. Ego, Wasser, 367.

76 "Die in Ps 46,2–8 entworfene Theologie Jerusalems basiert auf der 'Symbolik des Zentrums'. In der 'Mitte' (קֶרֶב) der Gottesstadt, 'der heiligsten Wohnung' des Höchsten' (V. 5), ist JHWH als rettender Gott gegenwärtig (V. 6), während an der Peripherie die natürlichen und geschichtlichen Repräsentanten des Chaos tosen und lärmen (V. 3f. par V. 7), aber durch den souveränen Königsgott niedergehalten werden." (B. Janowski, Wohnung, 45f.).

77 "Dass V.3–6 von der Peripherie-Zentrum-Motivik geprägt ist, steht gewiss außer Frage, doch lassen sich das Völkermotiv und vor allem 'Gott' in V.7 nicht der kosmischen Peripherie zuordnen, so dass V.3f.7 keine Rahmung um V.5f. ergibt. In der Wiederkehr des Stichwortes אֶרֶץ V.2.6 ist vielmehr eine abschnittsrahmende Inclusio und in V.7 mit seiner Kombination von Chaosmotiv (vgl. V.3; Rückbezug auf V.2–6) und Völkermotiv (vgl. V.11; Vorgriff auf V.8–12) ein Scharniervers zu sehen." (A. Grund, Festung, 65 n. 39).

78 "Der Psalm zerfällt zunächst in zwei Teile, wobei V. 8 den Übergang bildet und beiden Teilen zuzurechnen ist." (B.M. Zapff, Burg, 84.); see also B. Janowski, Wohnung, 44.

79 See B.M. Zapff, Burg, 83. The use of various names of God in Ps 46 is part of the Psalm, the so-called Elohistic redaction is not to be found in Ps 46; cf. F.-L. Hossfeld / E. Zenger, Psalter, 49.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

God of Jacob (v. 12), who himself speaks in v. 11 and calls himself אֱלֹהִים so that it is now established beyond doubt who the acting God in vv. 2–6 is.'[80]

> Excursus to the use of עליון in Ps 46
> B.M. Zapff suggested that the use of עליון is simply a 'variation' concerning אלהים.[81] The use of עליו as a title is more than an ordinary variation, and theologically has an important function in the psalm: (1.) In v. 5b the title of God, עליון, corresponds to the description stating that the City of God is the holiest of all dwelling places – the superlative holiness statement thus corresponds with the description of God as the 'Most High'. (2.) The description of the City of God in vv. 5–6 shows in its structure the statement of v. 6a that God is in their midst. The last word of v. 5 and the first word of v. 6 are both a designation of God; this stylistic variation was most likely consciously chosen. The description of God as the Most High and the City of God as the most holy of the dwelling places of the Most High corresponds to the later speech of God in v. 11 in which God himself is described as אלהים and titled as sublime/exulted (ארום) above the world and the nations and thus relates to the semantic field of highness in v. 5b and v. 11. V. 8 identifies יהוה צבאת with the designation of God in v. 2a as אלהים, who is relationally described as אלהים יעקב; that explains the direct relationship of the We (לנו) to this God. End of Excursus

The speech of God in v. 11 identifies the speaking God as the cause for the security of the City of God (v. 6a) because of his relation to Jacob (vv. 8,12). V. 11 is closely connected with the statement in vv. 2–7 and identifies this God. But B. Zapff is right to say that the use of God's name in v. 8 together with v. 12 forms a decisive frame in the structure. Vv. 8–12 is divided concentrically and v. 8 is completely repeated in v. 12. Inside the frame stand two verses (vv. 9,11) which begin with a double demand in which either God's title or God's name appears and that end with בארץ.

The statement in v. 8 that this God, YHWH Zebaot, is on the side of the 'We-group' summarizes v. 2 and vv. 5–7:[82] this God, YHWH Zebaot, is presented and localized as protection for the 'We-group' (v. 2) and thus is 'available' in the midst of the City of God (vv. 5–6).

V. 8 has a dual function in Ps 46: v. 8 is the reacting confessional statement of vv. 3–7, that is proclaimed in vv. 9–11 and reaffirmed in v. 12.[83] As the *casus*

80 "In den folgenden Versen [v. 8–12 – TMS] wird dann in Konsequenz nicht mehr in allgemeiner Weise von Gott אֱלֹהִים gesprochen, sondern ausschließlich von Jahwe (V 9) bzw. Jahwe Zebaot (V 12) und dem Gott Jakobs (V 12), der sich in V 11 sogar selbst zu Wort meldet und als אֱלֹהִים bezeichnet, so daß nun zweifelsfrei feststeht, wer hinter dem in Vv 2–6 handelnden Gott zu suchen ist." (B.M. Zapff, Burg, 83).

81 Cf. B.M. Zapff, Burg, 83.

82 Cf. the function of the chorus in Ps 42/43.

83 According to A. Grund, v. 7 needs to be understood as a transition to vv. 8–12: 'The first half of the Psalm is rounded up with v. 7 as the connecting verse, in which two keywords of the first half (המה, מוט) appear for the last time and which at the same time with a keyword גוים of the continuing half makes a curve to the end of the next half, v 11b.' ("Abgerundet wird die erste

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

pendens shows in v. 5a, vv. 2–6 refer to the positive contrast in which the City of God stands in relation to the chaos. The inclusion of the verb root המה frames the City of God and transmits the statement in the face of natural forces/chaotic powers or the danger of profane enemies. Thus v. 7 theologically deduces that the statement of vv. 2–6 leads into vv. 8–12. The use of the divine name YHWH Zebaot in vv. 8,12 connects the statement of and about God in vv. 9–11 back to the City of God. Vv. 9,11 functions as the proclamation of the confession of faith from vv. 2–8.

Accordingly, the draft structure for the final text of Ps 46 must acknowledge and integrate different structural levels:

a) Vv. 3–4 and 5(.6) are consciously structured as contrasts to each other, but at the same time vv. 3–4 and 5(.6) are connected by the water imagery.

b) If one reads v. 8 as a transmission verse, vv. 8–12 could be taken as concentric structure: (v. 8 → v 12 [chorus]; v. 9 → v 11 [2 imperatives; God's name; בארץ in final position]; v. 10 as centre). The secondary insertion of v. 10 means that the participial statement about God as one who ends wars (v. 10a) stands in the centre of the statements in v. 9 (the works of God and the horror that God has placed in the world) and v. 10b (the destruction of the weapons and the destruction of the important means of transport for war).[84] In the same time, vv. 9–

Psalmhälfte aber erst mit dem Scharniervers V. 7, in dem zwei Leitworte der ersten Hälfte (המה, מוט) zum letzten Mal vorkommen, und der zugleich mit einem Leitwort der zweiten Hälfte גוים einen Bogen zum Ende der zweiten Hälfte V.11b schlägt." [A. Grund, Festung, 65]). The designation of גוים as a keyword is certainly not correct; it is true, however, that vv. 8–12 are thematically introduced through the mention of the nations in v. 7 that she entitles: 'God as fortress in the world's political unrest' ("Gott als Festung in welt-politischen Unruhen" [A. Grund, Festung, 64]). Vv. 2–6 she entitles 'God as help against the threat of the cosmic order' ("Gott als Hilfe bei Bedrohung der kosmischen Ordnung"); cf. A. Folger, Understanding, 36: 'While the first stanza [vv. 2–4 – TMS] evokes awful natural forces and these two verses [vv. 5–6 – TMS] evoke an idyllic stronghold, verses 2–6 are nonetheless united through the use of natural imagery. In contrast, verses 7, 10 and 11 explicitly evoke martial imagery. Even the refrain in verses 8 and 12 evokes that imagery through the use of the Divine Name "Lord of Hosts". In this context, the destruction which the audience is urged to behold should be understood as God's victory over Israel's enemies.' However A. Grund as well as A. Folger overlook the fact that the city of God qua city in itself does not belong to the 'cosmic order' or even to the 'natural imagery.' As a needy city, the city of God evokes the motif of the outside nations and their relationship to the city (especially v. 6). The fact that the name of God, YHWH Zebaot, is used in vv. 8,12 is in close connection to the theology of Zion. With the mention of the nations in v. 7 and the portrayal of the theophany of God and the melting away of the world in v. 7b, the sections vv. 2–6 and vv. 8–12 are intertwined and set the cosmic understanding of the world as the key to interpreting the political facts and circumstances – the City of God has its fixed place in the world because of the actions of God. God as a warrior (YHWH Zebaot) fights for his city and controls the facts and history of the world, as well the extrahistorical events of the world. It can be seen, by the use of the imperative, that vv. 9–11 have a different function than v. 7.

84 A closer examination reveals that what is often noticed in the research as metric inconsistency

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

11 can be read in a linear way: demand to consider the works of God (v. 9); the qualification of God as one who ends wars and the qualification of the works as destruction of war material (v. 10); God's speech, the statements in vv. 9–10 highlight the truth of the right of God to claim to power (v. 11).

c) V. 8 acts as refrain at the end position for vv. 2–8 and, at the same time, as a frame for vv. 8–12. Vv. 8,12 are, as refrain, a further theological development of the beginning of the confession (of faith) in v. 2: the spatial metaphor for God מחסה – the abstract statement that God offers refuge – is further developed in the face of the space experience through vv. 5–6 to the statement that the protection of the City of God lies in the fact that the God who is in the midst of the city is a protective fortress (משגב) for the City of God and for the 'We-group.' In the same way, the name of God, YHWH Zebaot, refers back to the motif of the help God bestows on the City of God in v. 6.

d) V. 7 indirectly takes up the protection statement of v. 6b and prepares for the request in vv. 9,11. V. 7a adopts the words המה and מוט from vv. 3–4, frames the verses about the City of God (vv. 5–6), and transfers the topic of God's actions from the context of the natural powers to the nation's theme (גוים), as discussed in vv. 9–11 and mentioned again in v. 11. At the same time, the voice of thunder foreshadows the speech of God in v. 11.

e) In v. 11 God calls himself אלהים and is thus identified with the God who dwells in the midst of the city according to v. 6a.

f) There is a similarity between vv. 7–8 and 11–12: a statement about גוים and ארץ in relation to God which is followed in each case by the refrain.

The resulting structural image of Psalm 46 has many sides and a reduction to strophes or concentric structures will not do justice to it. However, if one follows the spatial perspective opened in v. 2 and locates God, who, in the verse is described as a place of refuge, one finds a structured interpretational instruction for reading the psalm. In this reading, the City of God is clearly positioned and the theological statement of the psalm is contoured: if one follows the keyword ארץ and relates the use of it with the mention of God as אלהים, עליון, יהוה צבאות, אלהי יעקוב there occurs a counter play between the world (ארץ) and the 'We-group,' in which God is characterized in his role as a particularistic and universal ruler – the City of God is only a subcategory of God's relationship to the 'We-group.'

– the tricolon in v. 10 – has a structural function in the final text. The statements in v. 9–10 present themselves as a triptychon. In the centre stands the participial statement about God as the universal God who brings wars to an end (v. 10a) which is expressed in a two-fold action in v. 10b (the destruction of weapons and of the transport means for the war) – as well as in v. 9 in a two-fold abstract action that should be considered (the works of God and the horror that he causes). This structure explains the metric of v. 10, showing the deliberately emphasized position of God as the universal God who brings wars to an end and proves the theological peace promised in God's speech in v. 11 to be true.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The starting point of Ps 46 is the statement about the nature of God in relation to the 'We-group' in v. 2: God is given the title of a refuge for the 'We-group' (מחסה) – the taking of refuge presupposes a place where God can be found or will be found (נמצא), when the 'We-group' finds itself in a cramped living place/situation (בצרות). Therefore v. 2 describes God as a counter space for possible negative life and/or world experience. The 'We-group's' special perspective of their God is expanded in vv. 3–4 with the perspective of ארץ (v. 3a as theme): the world/the cosmos is described as a possible place of צרות, here expressed as natural disasters; the 'We-group' describes the potential danger/constriction in the world as embraced by the power of God. After the focus on ארץ follows in vv. 5–6 – explaining God as מחסה – the representation of the City of God, which is aimed at showing the relationship of God as a protector to this place which structurally presents itself in concentric circles (City of God → Temple → God); God, being in the centre as the heart of the place and giving meaning to the place. The confidence statement about אלהים in v. 2 is closely linked with the City of God through v. 6a, according to the designation of God as מחסה and the resulting function for the City of God and the 'We-group.' The presentation of the City of God in vv. 5–6 results in the action of God in the world for the city in v. 6b. Thus the perspective shifts in v. 7 back to ארץ and includes not only the description of the forces of nature in vv. 3–4 but also takes the nations and their kingdoms into consideration. The real power of God over the world, the whole world including nature and nations, is placed in opposition to the inferior forces of the nature and the nations.

The response to this view on the relationship between God and the world (v. 7) is the commitment of the 'We-group' to this God so that the perspective is again directed to the 'inside' (the believers facing the world). The description of the City of God leads to the statement that God praised as אלהים in v. 2 is יהוה צבאות, the God of Jacob, with whom the 'We-group' identifies themselves as a people. While God is abstractly described in v. 2 as מחסה, this understanding develops into the idea of God as a real shelter as seen by the metaphor משגב. God is the ultimate shelter for the City of God, just like the great ancient Middle Eastern cities in which the protective castle/fortress in the midst of the city offers the last safe place in case of danger. The relationship of God to the 'We-group' in v. 8 (and v. 11) is a tangible reality in the City of God, a *Realsymbol.* This close relationship between God, his city, and his adherents, calls in vv. 9–10 for the 'empirical' verification of the statement connected with v. 8 in which the perspective centres again on ארץ – the nations and the 'We-group' are being addressed: the confessed God is the one who takes care of and acts in the world. The occurrence of the word ארץ is intensified in vv. 9–11. The use of the word בארץ (vv. 9,11) placed in each end position frames the comprehensive statement עד קצה הארץ, which manifests the acting and controlling power of God over the world as absolute, as is shown in

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

God's speech in v. 11. In this speech, God reveals himself as אלהים, the God whom the 'We-group' according to v. 6a confesses as being in the midst of the City of God (אלהים בקרבה). The two imperatives in v. 11 invite the world to enter into a relationship with God, which is described in vv. 2,5–6,8: because this God is the almighty God not only for the City of God but also for the whole world. Following this speech of God, and after its 'empirical' review in v. 9, the 'We-group' repeats the statement of v. 8 in v. 12 and proclaims it to the world.

The structure of Psalm 46 is influenced by the relationship between the world (perspective from inside on the outside / perspective on God's relationship to the world) and of the 'We-group'/the City of God (perspective on the relationship to God in the face of the world). As the structure in vv. 5–6 indicates, Psalm 46 directs its perspective alternately inwardly and outwardly. Vv. 5–6a focus their view from outside on the water mass/current (נהר) via the water channels (פלגיו) into the City of God (עיר אלהים), in which the temple (קדש משכני עליון) and God himself (אלהים) are located. V. 6 concentrates its attention on the centre (אלהים בקרבה), on the City of God, which shall never be shaken (cf. v. 7). Vv. 5–6 read like the panning of a camera, first from the outside to the inside and then from the inside out. This corresponds with the movement of thought which is the structure of Ps 46. The internal perspective is the direct relationship between God, the 'We-group,' and the City of God. The external perspective corresponds to the relationship between God and his 'We-group' or the City of God in the face of the world.

V. 2: interior/internal perspective
  Vv. 3–4: external perspective
  Vv. 5–6: interior perspective;
  V. 7: external perspective
  V. 8: interior/internal perspective
  Vv. 9–10: (internal and)[85] external perspective
  V. 11: external perspective
V. 12: interior/internal perspective

3. The Function of vv. 5–6 in Psalm 46, or: Why is Zion Not Mentioned?

The presentation of the City of God (in vv. 5,6) is to visualize the confessional statements made in vv. 2,8,12. While chaos (vv. 3,4) and war (vv. 7,10) are observed in the world, the City of God is an expression of organized chaos (v. 5) and

85 The imperatives in v. 9a can indicate at least both an interior and an exterior perspective.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

of peaceful, secure, and relaxed existence (v. 6). By reading Isa 8:6 inter-textually with Ps 46:5, one also observes that the experience of the water channels is an expression of the peaceful salvation which God gives to his city. With this mention of the water channels, the description of the City of God is rooted in the perception of Jerusalem, in which 'the most holy dwelling place of the Most High' (the temple) is located. The experiential space Jerusalem is 'located theologically' in the represented theology, in which God is seen as an enabling source for the existence and security of the city, as God is located in the midst of the city. Ps 46 offers the possibility to experience Jerusalem as a place of refuge in God. The world described in Psalm 46 is characterized by horizontal concentric circles within which God, his city, and the temple are located. It is from there that he administers his power to the ends of the earth. This is also reflected in the fact that the description of the City of God and the action of God for it (vv. 5,6) are framed by the description of God's action in the world, both in terms of the forces of nature (v. 3,4) and the nations (vv. 7,9,11). In this world view the City of God is the (tangible) verification of the confessions in vv. 2,8,12.

The function of the City of God in Ps 46 can be described as *heterotopia:* According to M. Foucault, *heterotopias* are places, so to speak, that describe a real utopia and 'which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality.'[86] The City of God is characterized in Ps 46 as a place with a functioning relationship to and with God, which has been demanded from the world in v. 11. Contrary to the potential chaos of the world through nature and wars, the actual city of Jerusalem is characterized as a peaceful and protected dwelling place of God. In this perspective, the City of God is designed as a place of opposition, a counter-space against the troublesome world: the City of God presents the possible reality of the world's existence in an undisturbed relationship with God. In this view, the City of God is designed as *crisis heterotopia:* 'there are privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis.'[87] In contrast to the perceived chaos of the world, the City of God is a fortress, a place in which one can take refuge in God. In this sense, the City of God is a *heterotopia of compensation* in accordance with the definition of M. Foucault: '[they] create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as

86 M. Foucault, Spaces, 24.

87 M. Foucault, Spaces, 24. – Instead of society or human environment, Ps 46 puts the world, the concept of ארץ, in contrast to the *heterotopia.*

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled.'[88] The City of God in Ps 46 can therefore be described in its function as *heterotopias of compensation and crisis* which makes the experiential Jerusalem into a real utopia and the relationship between the 'We-group' and God in the face of the world into a space that derives its significance from God as place and space, as משגב.

Ps 46 categorically states that the City of God, on the scale of the concentric circles, has no ending point: the observation of the world leads to the location of God in space. The city mentioned in vv. 5–6 is the City of God, in the sense that the temple, the actual holy place משכני עליון (קדש), is located within it and God resides in the temple (cf. v. 6a). The temple itself is not holy, but God dwelling within it makes it a holy place. It is from this focus on the centre that the City of God is not referred to as Zion: within the city, the temple is consciously named as a place that qualifies the city. The temple is at the same time within the City of God and separated from it.[89] This corresponds to the finding in Ps 68, which also designs a Zion theology without mentioning ציון. In Ps 68:29–32 the difference is clearly made between the profane city and the temple above Jerusalem, על ירושלים (v. 30; cf. also Ezek 37:27f.). Ps 68; 122 and Ezek 40–48 design theologies which thematize the temple and the presence of God in it but which consciously distinguish the temple from the city and avoid the use of the term ציון which more strongly emphasizes the intrinsic quality of the place (cf. Ps 48). According to Ps 46:5, it is clear that the City of God owes its existence to God, who is in its midst and is enthroned in the temple as the most holy of his dwelling places. Analogous to Ps 78 and the naming of the Temple in Shiloh as משכן – the dynamic meaning of the root שכן – the plural משכני עליון in Ps 46:5b clearly indicates that (1.) this is not the exclusive residence of God – even if it is temporarily the most holy – and that (2.) the importance of the place according to v. 6a is dependent upon the self-positioning of God in the centre of the city. Thus Ps 46 is significantly different from the position against which Jeremiah in Jer 7:4 polemicizes. The temple alone, the city alone, and the holy place alone, are no guarantee of security. Thus, in this way, Ps 46 theologically prepares for the situation, as described by Ezek 1:3–28, in which God withdraws his presence from his city and from his temple, making the holy place lose its meaning, albeit temporarily. In the perspective of Ps 46, however, the City of God is first and foremost dependent on the presence of God, a holy place, which is designed in the text as a real utopia, as *heterotopia.*

88 M. Foucault, Spaces, 27.

89 The following statement of S. Gillingham is of fundamental importance: 'Zion is never used in parallelism with the Temple or the house of God' (S. Gillingham, Singers, 92 n. 8.); see, however, the close connection in Ps 134:1,4.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Bibliography

Auffret, P., La ville de Dieu. Étude structurelle du Psaume 46, in: ScEs 41 (1989) 323–342.
Berges, U. / Spans, A., Jhwh Zebaot in Prophetie und Psalmen. Theologiegeschichtliche Überlegungen zur (Nicht-)Verwendung eines Gottesnamen, in: I. Müllner / L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger / R. Scoralick (eds.), Gottes Name(n). Zum Gedenken an Erich Zenger (HBS 71), Freiburg im Breisgau et al. 2012, 169–193.
Block, D.I., The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 25–48 (NICOT), Grand Rapids 1998.
Craigie, P.C., Psalms 1–50 (WBC 19), Nashville 2004.
Creach, J.F.D., Yahweh as refuge and the editing of the Hebrew Psalter (LHB/OTS 217), Sheffield 1996.
Doeker, A., Die Funktion der Gottesrede in den Psalmen. Eine poetologische Untersuchung (BBB 135), Berlin 2002.
Ego, B., Die Wasser der Gottesstadt. Zu einem Motiv der Zionstradition und seinen kosmologischen Implikationen, in: B. Janowski / B. Ego (eds.), Das biblische Weltbild und seine altorientalischen Kontexte (FAT 32), Tübingen 2001, 361–389.
Folger, A., Understanding Psalm 46, in: Jewish Bible Quarterly 41 (2013) 35–43.
Foucault, M., Of other Spaces, in: Diacritics 16 (1986) 22–27.
Frick, F.S., The City in Ancient Israel, Missoula 1977.
Gillingham, S., The Levitical singers and the editing of the Hebrew Psalter, in: E. Zenger (ed.), The Composition of the Book of Psalms (BETL 238), Leuven 2010, 91–123.
Görg, M., Art. שכן, in: TDOT 9 (1998) 691–702.
Gray, J., I & II Kings. A Commentary (Old Testament Library), London 1964.
Grund, A., "Eine Festung ist uns der Gott Jakobs". Psalm 46 in jüdischen und christlichen Deutungen, in: M. Grohmann / Y. Zakovitch (eds.), Jewish and Christian approaches to Psalms (HBS 57), Freiburg im Breisgau et al. 2009, 57–76.
Gunkel, H. / Begrich, J., Introduction to Psalms. The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel, transl. by J.D. Nogalski, Macon 1998.
Hartenstein, F., "Wehe, ein Tosen vieler Völker…" (Jes 17,12). Beobachtungen zur Entstehung der Zionstradition vor dem Hintergrund des judäisch-assyrischen Kulturkontakts, in: F. Hartenstein (ed.), Das Archiv des verborgenen Gottes. Studien zur Unheilsprophetie Jesajas und zur Zionstheologie der Psalmen in assyrischer Zeit (BThSt 74), Neukirchen-Vluyn 2001, 127–174.
Hossfeld, F.-L. / Steiner, T.M., Problems and Prospects in Psalter Studies, in: S. Gillingham (ed.), Jewish and Christian Approaches to the Psalms. Conflict and Convergence, Oxford 2013, 240–258.
Hossfeld, F.-L. / Zenger, E., Die Psalmen I (NEB), Würzburg 1993.
Hossfeld, F.-L. / Zenger, E., Psalmen 51–100 (HThK AT), Freiburg im Breisgau et. al. 2000.
Hossfeld, F.-L. / Zenger, E., The so-called Elohistic Psalter. A New Solution for an Old Problem, in: B.A. Strawn / N.R. Bowen (eds.), A God so near. Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller, Winona Lake 2003, 35–51.
Hugger, P., Jahwe meine Zuflucht. Gestalt und Theologie des 91. Psalms, Münsterschwarzach 1971.
Hupfeld, H., Die Psalmen, Gotha 1867.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Janowski, B., Die heilige Wohnung des Höchsten. Kosmologische Implikationen der Jerusalemer Tempeltheologie, in: O. Keel / E. Zenger (eds.), Gottesstadt und Gottesgarten. Zu Geschichte und Theologie des Jerusalemer Tempels (QD 191), Freiburg im Breisgau et al. 2002, 24–68.

Jeremias, J., Die Erde "wankt", in: R. Kessler et al. (eds.), "Ihr Völker alle, klatscht in die Hände!". FS E.S. Gerstenberger, Münster 1997, 166–180.

Keel, O., Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik und das Alte Testament. Am Beispiel der Psalmen, Göttingen 1996.

Kelly, S., Psalm 46. A Study in Imagery, in: JBL 89 (1970) 305–312.

Keown, G.L. / Scalise, P.J. / Smothers, T.G., Jeremiah 26–52 (WBC 27), Dallas 2002.

Körting, C., Zion in den Psalmen (FAT 48), Tübingen 2006.

Lichtenstein, M., Von der Mitte der Gottesstadt bis ans Ende der Welt (WMANT 139), Neukirchen-Vluyn 2014.

Maier, C., Daughter Zion, Mother Zion. Gender, Space and the Sacred in Ancient Israel, Minneapolis 2008.

Michel, D., Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax. Sprachwissenschaftliche Methodik, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2004.

Obiorah, M.J., The Perception of God's House in the Psalter. A Study of how the Psalmists understand the Temple, in: A. Lemaire (ed.), Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007 (VT.S 133), Leiden 2009, 531–539.

Otto, E., Krieg und Frieden in der Hebräischen Bibel und im Alten Orient. Aspekte für eine Friedensordnung in der Moderne (Theologie und Frieden 18), Stuttgart 1999.

Schmidt, H., Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen in Jerusalem, in: ZAW 67 (1955) 168–197.

Schreiner, J., Sion-Jerusalem, Jahwes Königssitz. Theologie der Heiligen Stadt im Alten Testament (SANT 7), München 1963.

Schweizer, H., "Ein feste Burg …". Der Beitrag der Prädikate zur Aussageabsicht von Ps 46, in: TQ 166 (1986) 107–119.

Snijders, L.A., Art.נהר, in: TDOT 14 (1998) 261–270.

Sperling, U. Das theophanische Jahwe-Überlegenheitslied: Forschungsbericht und gattungskritische Untersuchung der sogenannten Zionlieder, Frankfurt am Main et al. 1991.

Spieckermann, H., Stadtgott und Gottesstadt: Beobachtungen im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament, in: Biblica 73 (1992) 1–31.

Steiner, T.M., Perceived and Narrated Space in Psalm 48, in: OTE 25 (2012) 685–704.

Tsumura, D.T., The Literary Structure of Psalm 46,2–8, in: Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute 6 (1980) 29–55.

Watts, J.D.W., Isaiah 1–33. Revised Version (WBC 25), Nashville 2005.

Weiss, M., Wege der neuen Dichtungswissenschaft in ihrer Anwendung auf die Psalmenforschung. Methodologische Bemerkungen dargelegt am Beispiel von Psalm XLVI, in: P.H.A. Neumann (ed.), Zur neueren Psalmenforschung, Darmstadt 1976, 400–451.

Zapff, B.M., Eine feste Burg ist unser Gott. Beobachtungen zu Ps 46, in: BN 95 (1998) 79–93.

Zenger E., Erhebe dich doch als Hilfe für uns. Die Komposition Ps 42–44; 46–48 als theologische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Exil, in: I. Kottsieper et al. (eds.), Berührungspunkte. Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt. FS R. Albertz (AOAT 350), Münster 2008, 295–316.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Hywel Clifford

'And they saw the place where the God of Israel stood'. Exodus 24:10 LXX in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria

I. Introduction

Mt. Sinai, where the ancient people of Israel's formative encounter with God occurred, holds great prominence among all of the holy places in the biblical narrative.[1] This is evident throughout the scriptural canons, and it continued for Jewish and Christian translators and commentators in later antiquity concerned to understand and explain events that lay at the foundation of their religious history. Exod 24:10 LXX was a part of this, in that this Greek translation attests expansions whose equivalents are not found in ancient Hebrew biblical manuscripts. This had important consequences for those who commented on the Greek Bible rather than its Hebrew equivalent, for which Philo of Alexandria is a fine case in point. There are four passages in the extant writings of Philo in which all or parts of Exod 24:10 are quoted and discussed in varying ways. According to a recent five-fold classification of his writings (*Quaestiones*; Allegorical commentary; Exposition of the Law; Apologetic and Historical; Philosophical) the four passages all contain allegorical exegesis; the first (*QE* 2.37) is from the first group, and the other three (*Somn*. 1.62; 2.222; *Conf*. 96) are from the second group.[2] This study is in three parts. First, general comments are made about Exod 24:10 LXX as a translation. Second, each of the four passages from Philo is contextualised, quoted and analysed for its use of Exod 24:10a, and of 24:10b where this occurs.[3] Third, Philo's interpretations are compared to other ancient

1 I am grateful to the following: Professors Paul Joyce and Michael Wolter, for the invitation to contribute to this volume even though I was unable to attend the conference that gave rise to it; Dr. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, for the opportunity to present a short version of this study for the Program Unit 'Vision and Dream Accounts in the HB, NT, Early Judaism, and Late Antiquity' (EABS) under the aegis of the Society for Biblical Literature International Meeting in Amsterdam in July 2012; and readers who gave helpful feedback on longer versions. The responsibility for the views expressed is mine.

2 J.R. Royse, Works, 33–34.

3 The quoted translations are from F.H. Colson / G.H. Whitaker, Philo.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

translations and interpretations to illuminate the Philonic contribution to the late antique reception of the vision of God at the holy place of Mt. Sinai.

II. Exodus 24:10 LXX

Modern readers of Exod 24:10a will perhaps be familiar with the striking statement about Moses and the elders of Israel following their ascent of Mt. Sinai: 'and they saw the God of Israel', a translation that follows Hebrew manuscripts of the Masoretic Text (MT) tradition. Philo's interpretations, however, were based upon the Greek Bible, or Septuagint (LXX), whose expansive translation 'and they saw *the place where* the God of Israel *stood*' (cf. 24:11) calls for some initial comments. If the entire chapter of Exod 24 LXX is compared with MT a number of differences emerge, but the most substantial is that found in v. 10a. Its longer line is a good example of what has been called the 'expansionist character' of Exod LXX.[4] Three ways of accounting for this expansion have been proposed in recent years. Whichever of these factors, if any, was more important in determining why the ancient Hebrew text was translated as it was is not the primary concern here, but an outlining of the likely factors is useful as it bears upon trends in Philo, ancient translations and other ancient interpretations.

First, the LXX translation makes sense in its immediate literary context.[5] God is nowhere described in the chapter, even if an inquisitive person might wonder what those at Mt. Sinai witnessed, as Philo recognised (*QE* 2.37, below). But that which was 'under his feet' is described with two similes in 24:10b, 'like a pavement of sapphire' and 'like the very heaven for clearness' (NRSV after MT), which convey in colourfully poetic terms something of the remarkable visionary scene. In view of this, the anthropomorphic phrase 'under his feet' in 24:10a probably prompted '*the place where* God *stood*': the expansions express what was readily implied. It has been suggested, alternatively, that the Greek translator used a longer parent Hebrew text; the LXX would not, then, attest an expansion as such.[6] While that cannot be ruled out in principle, this is an unnecessary conclusion to draw given the lack of evidence for a longer line in ancient biblical Hebrew manuscripts.[7] And in confirmation of this, evidence from late antiquity for more literalistic translations (*Aq.*; *Sam. Tg.* (var.); *Vulg.*; *Pesh.*) and other ancient ver-

4 J.W. Wevers, Text, 148.

5 J.W. Wevers, Notes, 384–385; J.W. Wevers, Text, 147.

6 A. Hanson, Treatment, 559.

7 The earliest surviving Hebrew manuscript evidence for Exod 24:10, 1st Century BC fragments from Qumran (4QpaleoExod^{m}), does not allow a firm adjudication either way. For a reconstruction that accords with MT see M.G. Abegg Jr. / P.W. Flint / E.C. Ulrich, Bible, 59.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

sions with various expansions (*Sym.*; *Tg. Onq.*; *Tg. Ps.-J.*; *Tg. Neof.*; *Frg. Tg.* (P)) all presuppose the extant MT text type.[8]

Second, the LXX translator might have intended intertextual allusions to other theophanies and sanctuaries in other biblical texts. Those about the patriarchs, and then Moses, describe an encounter with God in a 'place' (Gen 22:3, 9, 14; 28:11, 16, 17, 19; 31:13; 32:30; 35:1, 7, 14, 15; Exod 3:5; 33:21) with which the events at Mt. Sinai were in continuity and were also a culmination. Moreover, understandings of the tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple, where God was later encountered, came to influence how the vision at Mt. Sinai was understood retrospectively. The biblical writers implied that they had much in common: divine presence, boundaries, consecration, congregation, priests, altar and sacrifice (cf. Philo *Somn.* 1.62, below).[9] These aspects were echoed in later translations: there are obvious LXX tabernacle/temple resonances for Exod 24:10a LXX (e. g. Ps 131:7 LXX 'Let us enter into his tabernacles: let us worship at the place where his feet stood') as well for what follows in 24:11 LXX (cf. Exod 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:16).[10] Thus, the translator not only made sense of the immediate literary context, but also infused the translation with ancestral and cultic significance; or at least used terms that could be taken to be consonant with that.

Third, the LXX translation was most probably motivated by propriety and caution, so as to safeguard divine transcendence. This has been a long-standing and the most common explanation.[11] A literal translation of the MT text type would have contradicted passages in which the sight of God was prohibited with the threat of death (Exod 33:20; Deut 4:12; cf. Judg 13:22). At Mt. Sinai, stern stipulations were given that the people had to keep at a safe distance (Exod 19:9–23; 20:18); Moses and the elders, even though they received the privileged call to ascend, were not exempted from this threat (cf. 24:11). It is worth at least registering that when compared with MT there are some LXX passages, unlike Exod 24:10 LXX, in which what might have been read as a direct vision of God was not 'corrected' or 'removed' by a translator; and others, perhaps more surprisingly, in which it seems to have been introduced by a translator.[12] Propriety and caution do not, then, seem to account for all such instances. Be that as it may, when compared with other ancient translations that attest expansions, Exod 24:10a LXX has certainly come to represent that tendency.

8 For the main ancient versions see A. Salvesen, Symmachus, 105–106.

9 C.T.R. Hayward, Giving, 270–271, 275 n.13 (cont.). See also H. Köster, Art. τόπος, 189. 195–199. 204–205, on מקום / τόπος applied to the tabernacle/temple in biblical and other texts.

10 C.T.R. Hayward, Giving, 270–273 argues for this understanding in the Targums as well.

11 J.W. Wevers, Text, 255; A. Hanson, Treatment, 559; J. Joosten, God, 290.

12 C.T.R. Hayward, Understandings, 386–388. Cf. J. Joosten, God, 295–298.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

III. Philo's Interpretations of Exodus 24:10 LXX

Questions and Answers on Exodus

Philo's commentaries on Genesis and Exodus that use the pre-/classical genre ΖΗΤΗΜΑΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΛΥΣΕΙΣ 'Question and Answers' (traditionally applied to Homeric writings) were, as far as is known, the first sizeable instance of this genre applied to biblical texts.[13] Philo's texts have, however, survived incompletely; the Greek books are lost, but a 6th Century Armenian version of four books on Genesis and two on Exodus are extant, with some Greek fragments cited by Christian authors, and a 4th Century Latin portion (not in Armenian), also extant; the books on Exodus have suffered more loss in transmission.[14] The structure of the books is similar at many points to the division of the text of the Pentateuch in ancient synagogue lectionaries; and it suggests in turn that Philo's works on Genesis and Exodus originally had six books each.[15] Just as in ancient classical scholarship, so Philo broached selected matters for biblical interpretation, rather than offering verse by verse commentary. That said, given the sequential form of this genre, comments on v. 10 could have been made by him, as was indeed the case. The brief portions on each verse often contain comments on the literal sense (e.g. explanations of the narrative setting) and the allegorical sense (e.g. the soul's contemplative ascent) in Philo's distinctive homiletic style; those on lines in Exod 24 are typical in these regards.

> 2.37. (Ex. xxiv. 10) What is the meaning of the words, **"They saw the place where the God of Israel was standing, and under His feet (was something) like the work of a plinth of sapphire and like the form of the firmament of heaven in purity"?**
> All this is, in the first place, most suitable to and worthy of the theologian, for no one will boast of seeing the invisible God, (thus) yielding to arrogance. And holy and divine is this same place alone in which He is said to appear, for He Himself does not go away or change His position but He sends the powers, which are indicative of His essence. And if it is right (to say so, we may) say that this place is that of His Logos, since He has never given a suspicion of movement but of always standing, for the nature of the Father

13 J.R. Royse, Works, 34–35 prefers 'Problems and Solutions'. The evidence for this genre from the 3rd Century BC Demetrius the Chronographer is more piecemeal: see J.H. Charlesworth, Testament, 843–854.

14 J.R. Royse, Works, 36–37. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.18 reports that the full text of the *Quaestiones* no longer survived. The 11th Century Viennese codex *Vindobonensis theologicus graecus* 29 indicates that three of the books on Exodus were lost by the 4th Century, so were unavailable to the Armenian translators; see D.T. Runia, Philo, 16–24. The Armenian texts were translated into Latin: J.B. Aucher, Paralipomena. For a French translation of the Armenian and Greek fragments see A. Terian, Quaestiones. For the Greek fragments see F. Petit, Quaestiones.

15 J.R. Royse, structure, 41–78, with 53–63 on Exodus. This insight might support the view that the *Quaestiones* were intended as elementary instruction in a synagogue or school setting. J.R. Royse, Works, 33.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

> remains fixed and unchanged and more lucid and simpler than the (number) one which alone is a form of likeness. Now he has represented the unchanged and immutable nature of God (as) the oneness of unity because of His substance. And the whole heaven altogether was under His feet, for its colour indeed was rather like a sapphire. And the "plinth" is a figure of the stars as one group, harmoniously arranged in an order of numbers, proportions and progressions, that is (as) a constant likeness and image of an incorporeal form. For it is a very holy and sense-perceptible type-form of the intelligible heaven and is a worthy portion of the divine essence, of which I have spoken earlier. Therefore it is said, "Like the form of the firmament in purity," for incorporeal forms are most lucid and pure inasmuch as they have obtained a share of unmixed essence and of that which is most simple. Accordingly, he says that the sense-perceptible heaven, which he calls "firmament," is distinct from the intelligible form because of its purity.

The title 'theologian' refers to Moses (cf. *QE* 2.74; *QG* 2.33). Philo lauds him for a statement whose (literal) opposite – the natural sight of God – was inadmissible.[16] This does not imply that Philo knew MT and agreed with LXX as an expansive 'correction' of it: the four Philonic quotations of Exod 24:10a prompt no comment on its translation as such.[17] Rather, Philo treats matters the LXX presents: in case an inquisitive person was wondering it is not only impossible to see 'the invisible God' (cf. *QE* 2.47) but it would also be arrogant to claim its possibility; indeed, the soul that drew too close to God would be consumed (*QE* 2.28; cf. *Migr*. 169–70).[18] Philo nevertheless offers a positive (allegorical) interpretation. God's sending of his Powers that are indicative of God's essence, which the Logos as 'this place' contains (cf. *QE* 2.39, with *Somn*. 1.62, below), mediated a visionary encounter with God; for which reason, 'the same place alone' was 'holy and divine'.[19] Philo thereby implies that God was not literally present ('in which He is *said* to appear' (emphasis added); *QE* 2.45 'God…was not there'; cf. *Spec*. 1.45). That God was nevertheless 'standing' elicits comments on the impropriety of divine motion to and from 'the place' (cf. *QE* 2.45), giving Philo an opportunity to mention, under Platonic influence, the attribute of immutability.[20] The divine

16 A Greek fragment of this line has survived: 'No one may so far yield to unreasonable folly as to boast that he has seen the invisible God', in C.D. Yonge, Works, 887. For its manuscript history beyond its quotation in the non-extant florilegium *Sacra parallela* (attributed to John of Damascus) see J.R. Royse, Texts, 26–27. For the Greek text see R. Marcus, Philo, 250; F. Petit, Quaestiones, 263–264.

17 As for other early Greek evidence, apart from Philo, there are no formulaic quotations of Exod 24:10 where they might have been expected, whether in Philo (e. g. *Moses* 1, 2; *Decal*. 32–35), Josephus (e. g. *A.J*. 3.75–82) or the New Testament (e. g. Matt 17:1–13; Acts 7:55–56; Heb 12:18–24).

18 This does not contradict other passages in which Philo describes the approach to God of Moses' inspired 'prophetic mind' (*QE* 2.28, 29) or the soul in contemplation (*QE* 2.39, 40, 51). On this see S. Mackie, Logos, 25–47; and S. Mackie, Means, 147–179.

19 It is clear from Philo's comments on Exod 24:10 that λόγος is intended here, even though the Armenian *banaworout'iun* equates to Greek λογιότης 'eloquence'. R. Marcus, Philo, 78 n. c.

20 M.A. Williams, Race, 39–42 observes that while Plato did not often describe the change-

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

likeness to 'one' that follows is elucidated by an earlier allegory on the 'mixing bowls' of Exod 24:6 (*QE* 2.33; cf. *Her*. 183) that reflects Platonic-Pythagorean influence: in contrast to humankind's generation, duality and change, the more fundamental causation, unity and immutability of God means that the divine nature is simple in substance.[21]

The similes of Exod 24:10b are developed in Philo's interpretation of what was 'under His feet'. Their imagery is read allegorically with a three-tiered philosophical cosmology: God, the invisible paradigms, and the visible heaven. In what is a somewhat dense and esoteric comment, Philo usefully mentions his previous discussion ('of which I have spoken earlier'), which refers not just within 2.37 (on 24:10a) but also to other passages in *QE:* 'heaven itself and everything in heaven are found worthy of the divine and best essence and come near to God and are consecrated to Him' (*QE* 2.33 on Exod 24:6).[22] Here, the 'plinth' (NRSV 'pavement') on which God was standing is a 'figure' of the stars as a visible planetary system.[23] Their orderly attributes make them like an 'incorporeal form' or 'type-form' (Terian '*empreinte*') of the intelligible heaven: that is, they are like the (Platonic) forms of the created but invisible realm of the intellect ('heaven'), which is the paradigm for the visible heaven (cf. *Spec*. 1.302 on Deut. 10:14 'heaven of heavens'). In other words, the upper region of the visible cosmos that is closer to God, unlike the sublunary region, signifies the realm of the forms: the 'holy' and 'sense-perceptible' planetary system, to the extent that it reflects the unseen realm is, thereby, 'a worthy portion of the divine essence'.[24] Philo's comment on 'the form of the firmament of heaven in purity' continues in the same vein: the 'firmament' at the edge of the visible cosmos (cf. *Opif*. 36–37) is, in its purity, like the 'incorporeal forms' that share in the nature of the divine: 'unmixed essence' and 'most simple'.

---

lessness of the forms with ἑστάναι 'standing' (although see *Parm.* 132d) the stability of the noetic realm came to be typified by this language in Platonic tradition (e. g. Diog. Laert. 3.13, 15 (Alcimus); Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 1.12.6a – both of which use *Parm.* 132d; cf. also Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 18).

21 For relevant philosophical texts (e. g. Diogenes Laertius 8.25) see K. Stähle, Zahlenmystik, 19–20. As M.A.Williams, Race, 32, puts it neatly: 'Philo associates unity with the ability to "stand".' Cf. *QE* 2.29; *Mos*. 2.288.

22 Philo might have also referred to the lost ΠΕΡΙ ΑΡΙΘΜΩΝ (2.87). A. Terian, Quaestiones, 164 n. 1; and A. Terian, Priority, 34.

23 R. Marcus, Philo, 79, supposing that the original was πλινθίς or πλινθίον (LXX πλίνθου) translates Latin *laterculus* not 'small brick' but 'figure' (Terian '*représentation*') since the list of attributes (e. g. 'harmoniously arranged') suggest that Philo was playing on a metaphorical meaning of πλινθίον 'musical scale' (cf. *QE* 2.38).

24 On the higher ontological status of objects farthest from the earth's centre in Platonic-Aristotelian cosmology in Philo see also *Mos*. 2.193; *QG* 4.57; cf. Plato, *Phaedr*. 247c-e; *Resp*. 6.508e1. D.T. Runia, Creation, 177.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

On Dreams

Philo's discussions of biblical texts that describe dreams form part of his series of allegorical commentaries on Genesis. Philo's books 'On dreams that are sent by God' (conventionally *On Dreams*) originally comprised five books; two books have survived. The first, on dreams in which the dreamer's own thoughts play no part (*Somn.* 1.1; cf. 2.2), is lost. The second (= *Somn.* 1), on dreams in which the dreamer's mind is inspired and foresees the future, treats Gen 28:12–15 and 31:11–13 (Jacob); and the third (= *Somn.* 2), on dreams in which the dreamer may interpret, treats Gen 37:7, 9 (Joseph), 40:9–11 (chief butler), 40:16–17 (chief baker) and 41:11–17, 22–24 (Pharaoh).[25] The interpretative senses that Philo adduces in this commentary series, including in the books *On Dreams*, are similar to those in the *Quaestiones*, but there are differences: Philo often discusses parallel passages in the Pentateuch, as in Jewish midrash; and he includes moralistic themes with sophisticated rhetoric, as in Greek diatribe.[26] Those characteristics are relevant for a consideration of Philo's two interpretations of Exod 24:10 in the two surviving books.

> (62) Now "place" has a threefold meaning, firstly that of a space filled by a material form, secondly that of the Divine Word, which God Himself has completely filled throughout with incorporeal potencies; for **"they saw"**, says Moses, **"the place where the God of Israel stood"** (Ex. xxiv. 10). Only in this place did he permit them to sacrifice, forbidding them to do so elsewhere: for they were expressly bidden to go up "to the place which the Lord God shall choose" (Deut. xii. 5), and there to sacrifice "the whole burnt offerings and the peace offerings" (Ex. xx. 24) and to offer other pure sacrifices. (63) There is a third signification, in keeping with which God Himself is called a place, by reason of his containing things, and being contained by nothing whatever, and being a place for all to flee into, and because He is Himself the space which holds Him; for He is that which He Himself has occupied, and naught encloses Him by Himself. (64) I, mark you, am not a place, but in a place; and each thing likewise that exists; for that which is contained is different from that which contains it, and the Deity, being contained by nothing, is of necessity Itself Its own place.

Philo uses the term τόπος 'place' most frequently in *Somn.* 1. This is not surprising given its threefold mention in the biblical text prior to the dream (Gen 28:10–11) which receives extensive comment (*Somn.* 1.4–132), and after the dream (Gen 28:16, 17, 19). A survey of τόπος in this book indicates that the three senses enumerated here are broadly representative. The first is the natural sense,

25 Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.18.1–4; J.R. Royse, Works, 39–40, 44–45.

26 J.R. Royse, Works, 38–39. This might support the view that *On Dreams*, as with the others in the series of Allegorical commentaries, were intended as advanced instruction beyond that of the *Quaestiones*; they might nevertheless contain synagogue homilies. J.R. Royse, Works, 33, 38–39.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

which may be traced to Aristotle and Stoic thought: place is space filled by a material form.[27] This is in effect assumed under the third sense ('that which is contained is different from what which contains it', 1.64) and it is implicit elsewhere, often in relation to God (1.63, 68, 182, 184, 187). The second sense, that the place is the Logos filled with the Powers, for which Exod 24:10a is the proof-text, is very similar to *QE* 2.37 (above). There are, however, some differences. Exod 24:10b is not quoted at all; rather two biblical proof-texts on the unique place of sacrifice are included. And here the Logos is mentioned first with the Powers as an aspect of it, whereas their metaphysical role is not clear in *QE* 2.37. That the place is the Logos suggests, with the latter part of *QE* 2.37, that Philo had in view the (Platonic) forms that the Logos contains (cf. *Opif.* 16–25).

The third sense is about God directly. Philo defines God's relation to place in ways that preserve divine transcendence and uniqueness in positive terms ('containing things…He is Himself the space which holds Him…that which He Himself has occupied') and in negative terms ('contained by nothing whatever… naught else encloses Him'). There were pre-Philonic theological uses of περιέχειν 'enclose' (translated 'contained' here), some of which defined that which encloses the cosmos in opposition to lesser realities.[28] But a consistently contrastive usage – enclosed/not enclosed – is first attested in Philo, in the interpretation of biblical anthropomorphisms under Greek philosophical and Jewish theological influences; his insistence, due to the latter, on transcendence was distinctive in comparison with the pantheistic tendencies of Stoicism.[29] Here, Philo generates a reverential dialectic that renders God's relation to place non-anthropomorphic while employing the biblical language of place. That God transcends place is a regular theme in Philonic writings (e.g. *Opif.* 20; *Leg.* 1.44; *Conf.* 136; *Post.* 14).[30] Philo elsewhere observes that the motion of earthly creatures, in contrast to God, necessarily indicates a change of place (*Conf.* 135; *Sacr.* 68; *Post.* 30). Philo also includes, in the middle of this passage, a reference to himself ('I, mark you, am not a place, but in a place'; cf. *Leg.* 3.51), which is a personal instance of the first sense, as well as a part of the contrast between God and everything else. There is also a contemplative application of the third sense about God: 'a place for all to flee into' (cf. *Fug.* 75).

> (219) You note the opening words of the self-lover, who in body and soul alike, is the subject of movement and turning and change. "I thought I stood" [Gen. xli. 17], he says, and does not reflect that to be unswerving and stable belongs only to God and to such as

27 Aristotle, *Phys.* 4.4.210b–211a3; *SVF* 2.503, 504–505; Plutarch *[Plac. philos.]* 1.20.1; Sextus, *Math.* 2.3. H.A. Wolfson, Philo, 1:249–250.

28 Aristotle, *Phys.* 3.4.203b11; 8.10.267b6–9; Plato, *Tim.* 33b; *Parm.* 138ab; *SVF* 1:115; 2:439 (cf. Origen, *Cels.* 6.71); Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.35. W.R. Schoedel, Theology, 92–97.

29 Cf. *Leg.* 3.6; 3.51; *Somn.* 1.63; *Sobr.* 63. W.R. Schoedel, Theology, 95–97.

30 The denial of physical place for God recalls Plato, *Tim.* 52b; *Phaedr.* 247c; *Resp.* 6.508e1.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

> are the friends of God. (220) God's unswerving power is proved most clearly by this world which ever remains the same unchanged, and, since the world is firmly balanced, its maker must needs be steadfast. We have other infallible witnesses in the sacred oracles, (221) for we have seen these words with God as speaker: "Here I stand there before thou wast, on the rock in Horeb" (Ex. xii. 6), which means, "This I, the manifest, Who am here, am there also, am everywhere, for I have filled all things. I stand ever the same immutable, before thou or aught that exists came into being, established on the topmost and most ancient source of power, whence showers forth the birth of all that is, when streams the tide of wisdom." (222) For I am He "Who brought forth the fountain of water from out of the steep rock," as it says elsewhere (Deut. viii. 15). And Moses too gives his testimony to the unchangeableness of the deity, when he says **"they saw the place where the God of Israel stood"** (Ex. xxiv. 10), for by the standing or establishment he indicates immutability.

This passage is part of Philo's analysis of the dreams of Pharaoh (*Somn.* 2.215–302) whose profane self-love is readily set in opposition to God and the friends of God. The opening line of the dream, 'I thought I stood [by the edge of the river]' (cf. 2.216), an aspect of the literal setting, enables Philo to contrast Pharaoh's merely mortal standing with various terms for God (unswerving, stable, steadfast) that amount to the attribute of divine immutability. This is defended by an appeal to a brief teleological argument that assigns the unchanging world to a steadfast maker (2.220). There then follow three biblical proof-texts (2.221–222): the first, with God as speaker on God standing (Exod 17:6), indicates universality, immutability and creativity; the second, with God as speaker (Deut 8:15), reinforces creativity; and the third, now with Moses as speaker (Exod 24:10a), returns to that of standing. The last of these is similar to *QE* 2.37 (and *Conf.* 96, below) in that Philo interprets standing as immutability, albeit without any further comment here. The language of 'standing', its connotations (i. e. stability) and potential for philosophical allegory (i. e. immutability), was a staple idea for Philo.[31] It occurs in both books *On Dreams*, not just about God in whom this attribute subsists 'primarily' (1.157–158; 2.237; cf. 2.242, 250) but also in those 'chosen natures' to whom God imparts it. These are the 'friends of God' (2.219): named persons (Noah, Abraham, Moses, Aaron), exemplary types of human (the Sage, 'the man of gradual progress') and the Logos (2.223–37).[32]

31 M.A. Williams, Race, 43. For an earlier interpretation by the 2nd Century Jewish philosopher Aristobulus of divine στάσις 'standing' as signifying (i. e. allegorically) that created things are inalterable, not interchangeable, and are in subjection to God see Aristob. 2.9–12 (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8.10.9–12) in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 2:838; C.R. Holladay, Fragments, 3:139–140, 210 n. 46.

32 On 'immovable humans' in Philo see M.A. Williams, Race, 25–27.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

On the Confusion of Tongues

This book, which might have formed a single book with the shorter 'On Sobriety' (on Gen 9:24–27; cf. *Conf.* 1), presents an allegorical interpretation of the Tower of Babel; it is part of the Allegorical commentary series. Philo opens with a discussion of its literal interpretation, in conjunction with Greek myths such as that about the Aloeidae in Homer, said by others to be very similar. This literalistic approach Philo dismisses, as it results in absurdities: that a tower could reach to heaven; and that disparate languages might have prevented the spread of sinfulness (*Conf.* 1–14). Accordingly, Philo moves on to his own allegorical interpretation (15–198).[33] The passage at hand is in the section on Gen 11:3 (83–106) about the brick-making for the tower, which Philo allegorises as the shaping of evil thoughts that 'menace the soul' (90). The mention of building with bricks takes Philo into the Exodus narrative that recounts Israel having been forced to build strong cities under despotic power, which, for Philo, represents the imposition of evil, passion, folly and vice upon the higher emotions, prudence and virtue. This was a frustration for Israel, who, alone permitted to look on God, was called to the service of God.

> (95) But it is the special mark of those who serve the Existent, that theirs are not the tasks of cupbearers or bakers or cooks, or any other tasks of the earth earthy, nor do they mould or fashion material forms like the brick-makers, but in their thoughts ascend to the heavenly height, setting before them Moses, the nature beloved of God, to lead them on the way. (96) For then **they shall behold the place** which in fact is the Word, **where stands God** the never-changing, never-swerving, **and also what lies under his feet like "the work of a brick of sapphire, like the form of the firmament of the heaven"** (Ex. xxiv. 10), even the world of our senses, which he indicates in this mystery. (97) For it well befits those who have entered into comradeship with knowledge to desire to see the Existent if they may, but, if they cannot, to see at any rate his image, the most holy Word, and after the Word its most perfect work of all that our senses know, even this world. For by philosophy nothing else has ever been meant, than the earnest desire to see these things exactly as they are.

Leading up to this passage, Philo charts an effective way through the Exodus narrative: from the likening of brick-making with other 'earthy' tasks in Egypt – forms of service to which Israel was not called by God – to the continuation of the theme of service in the vision of God at Mt. Sinai in the wilderness: that to which Israel was called (Exod 8:1; *Conf.* 91–95). Philo's mention of the Sinai vision is apposite at this juncture: it is roughly half-way through the commentary, which, if this lends it a natural structural prominence, suggests that Mt. Sinai

33 R. Bloch, Moses, 182 observes on *Conf.* 2–5 that Philo, as part of his 'innerjüdische Mythenkritik', stands in 'der Tradition pagan-allegorischer Mythendeutung'.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

represented for him a significant counterpoint to the ascending tower of Babel. It is, after all, possible to discern other kinds of contrast in later comments: the builders of Babel 'hoped to soar up to heaven in mind and thought, to destroy the eternal kingship' (*Somn.* 2.284–285) whereas here Philo contrasts the 'earthy' with Israel's contemplative (Platonic) ascent 'in their thoughts…to the heavenly height' (cf. *Spec.* 1.37; *Mos.* 1.190). In addition to these thematic observations, and the numerous references to brick-making in Egypt (*Conf.* 1.84, 87, 88, 92; cf. Exod 5:16), the quotation of Exod 24:10 was probably prompted by either πλίνθος 'brick' or λίθος 'stone', given that Gen. 11:3 has both words.[34] Philo's identification of the 'place' as the Logos is, by now, familiar.[35] And so is the mention of God's immutability.

But it is Philo's alterations of the LXX that are most noteworthy here. Instead of εἶδον 'they saw', θεάσονται 'they shall behold' enables a homiletic promise that recalls the Philonic description of Israel as the visionary nation (cf. *Conf.* 72, 77–78, 92, 146). Instead of εἱστήκει 'stood', ἐφέστηκε 'stands' lends itself to Philo's staple of the divine attributes (cf. *Conf.* 29–32, 98, 109).[36] Unlike the other three passages considered there is no concern to interpret anthropomorphic language out of propriety and caution, and nor are the Powers mentioned; rather and quite simply: God 'stands' (cf. *Conf.* 134–41). This all leads to a fresh interpretation of Exod 24:10b. In *QE* 2.37 the firmament is likened to the incorporeal forms of the intelligible heaven, but here it refers to its opposite: the realm of sense. Philo then sets out a hierarchy of cosmological knowledge, which implies a hierarchy of persons whose summit is 'those who serve the Existent' (i. e. Israel), although the lower realms of sensory knowledge still have a positive role to play.[37] Philo's omission of the final LXX phrase 'in purity' (with religious denotation) serves this more general philosophical outlook: a unified hierarchy of knowledge, aided by reading 24:10b as a second complement to 'they saw' (not with an implied 'was': *QE* 2.37). In short, the biblical text is once again read allegorically with a three-tiered philosophical cosmology: the Existent, the Logos, and the world. What was, thus, in its literal sense, a threatening scene for Moses and the elders had become for Philo an opportunity for a confident allegorical discourse. The

34 Philo manuscripts have λίθου 'stone'. L. Cohn / P. Wendland, Opera, 2:237, and F.H. Colson / G.H. Whitaker, Philo, 4:60 n. 4 read πλίνθου 'brick' with LXX.

35 The reading λόγος is conjectural but does not require severe emendation; it is likely in view of the passages discussed and what follows here. F.H. Colson / G.H. Whitaker, Philo, 4:60 n. 2; J.G. Kahn, Confusione, 163.

36 For the verbal variants in LXX manuscripts and ancient commentators see J.W. Wevers, Notes, 385; J.W. Wevers, Exodus, 279; J.W. Wevers, Text, 385. On the different kinds of quotation in Philo see, by way of analogy, D.T. Runia, Text, 261–291, especially 286–288.

37 For positive senses of κόσμος in Philo see C. Anderson, View, 74–102 (*Conf.* 97 at 84, n. 54). On the hierarchy of persons in Philo see S. Mackie, God, 41–42, and C. Anderson, View, 162–167 (*Conf.* 97 at 87).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

laudable desire for a vision of God (cf. *Somn*. 2.220; *Spec*. 1.41–50) and the philosophical 'desire to see things exactly as they are' are thus both capable of rewarding fulfilment.[38]

IV. Philo's Interpretations of Exodus 24:10 LXX in Context

It is useful, at this juncture, to highlight the main features of Philo's interpretations of Exod 24:10 LXX encountered thus far. In all four passages Philo interpreted 'the place where God stood' as an expression of divine immutability to avoid the unwanted literalistic implications of a biblical anthropomorphism: divine motion and change. Another constant in the three treatises was Philo's view that 'the place' signifies a mediatorial substitute for an unseen God: principally the Logos; and in two of the four passages the Powers within the Logos. Philo also understood the nature of the visionary experience at Mt. Sinai in terms of a contemplative (Platonic) ascent, given the impossibility of seeing God directly with natural sight. It seems that these three interpretative features were motivated by a concern to safeguard divine transcendence out of propriety and caution; this was, after all, a likely factor in the translation of the LXX, the Bible that Philo used. It also seems that, for Philo, while the influence of Jewish theological constraint encouraged an avoidance of biblical literalism, Greek philosophical allegory provided a way to reinforce this and to ascribe fresh significance to the biblical text; in other words, interpretation was not merely about what a text could not mean but also about what it might mean for belief and practice. In what follows, Philo's interpretations are placed in their context by comparing them with other ancient translations and selected early Jewish and Christian sources.

'they saw'

All of the main ancient translations (Greek, Aramaic, Latin) state: 'they saw'.[39] Those with expansions in this sentence, whether as a qualification of what they saw ('place', 'glory') or in *Sym.* as a qualification about how it happened ('in a vision'), most likely reflect propriety and caution: Moses and the elders did not

38 *Conf*. 91–98 is evidence that Philo considered the vision of God at Mt. Sinai to be the foundation of philosophy and wisdom. See H. Clifford, Moses, 161–162; and S. Mackie, God, 159–166. On what visionary experience might have entailed in terms of divine and human agencies see S. Mackie, God, 149–158, 178.

39 The exception is *Sam. Tg.* (var.) 'they feared', understanding Hebrew יראו 'fear' instead of ראה 'see'. A. Tal, Targum, 322. A. Salvesen, Symmachus, 105.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

and could not have seen God.[40] Philo agreed that the direct, natural sight of God was impossible – indeed, to claim it would be boastful and arrogant (*QE* 2.37) – but held that a vision of God required the contemplative ascent of the soul. That prospect, according to Philo, is not only desirable and laudable but is possible now, in imitation of the example of Moses, 'the nature beloved of God, to lead them on the way': 'For *then* they shall behold' (*Conf.* 96, emphasis added; cf. *Mos.* 1.158; *Spec.* 1.41). This visionary emphasis is also evident in the very expansive *Tg. Ps.-J.* which, with passages from the opening chapters of Ezekiel as the accompanying reading for Exod 24 in ancient synagogue lectionaries, shows a particular interest in the cloud, glory and angels (cf. Philo *QE* 2.39).[41] Compared to this, and to other translations and their implied interpretations, Philo's was a distinctive Jewish voice in allegorising that aspect in Platonic terms; indeed, the often dualist anthropology of the latter gave Philo a ready way of distinguishing different kinds of sight: the natural and the contemplative.

For early rabbinic commentators, some of whom quoted the Targumic expansion 'glory', Exod 24:10 was a *locus classicus* in translation and understanding.[42] Later medieval rabbinic commentators used the Hebrew text to support this: 24:10 has ויראו 'they saw', but 24:11 has ויחזו 'they beheld'. Thus, Ibn Ezra and Nachmanides, in view of the change in verb, likened the vision to those of the biblical prophets (e.g. Amos 9:1; Isa 1:1).[43] Philo had not been enabled in this regard by the LXX, with ὁράω 'see' in both lines: 24:10 has 'they saw', but the passive 'they were seen' (i.e. 'appeared') in 24:11 had obscured its Hebrew source.[44] But Philo's use of the verb θεάομαι in 'they shall behold' (*Conf.* 96, above) suggests the same distinction; and both verbs are used elsewhere for natural and visionary sight (*Mos.* 1.272; *Post.* 169).[45] In early Christianity, the use of literal translations (*Aq.*; *Vulg.*; *Pesh.*) might imply that a vision of God was not automatically held to be blasphemous.[46] After all, early Jewish-Christian visionary reports, in which Jesus is seen with God present, evoke Exod 24 and its surrounding narrative (e.g. Matt 17:1–13; Acts 7:53–56; 2 Cor 3:12–18), as well as

40 B. Grossfeld, Targum, 29, 72–73; M. McNamara / R. Hayward, Targum, 104–105; A. Salvesen, *Symmachus*, 192.

41 M. McNamara / R. Hayward, Targum, 105 n. 8.

42 R. Judah b. Ilai in *tMeg* 4:41; *bQidd* 49a. M. McNamara / R. Hayward, Targum, 104 n. 7.

43 I. Drazin, Targum, 240 n. 11 cont.

44 J.W. Wevers, Notes, 386, comments that 24:11 LXX implies that the Hebrew חזה 'behold', whose passive (Niphal) is not attested, was translated with ראה 'see' in the Niphal; accordingly: 'beholding God must involve appearing in the place where he stood'.

45 S.D. Fraade, Hearing, 259–261, when comparing Philonic and rabbinic interpretation, describes their different 'historical/cultural contexts and ideological/rhetorical programs', specifying for Philo a depreciation of the senses due to Platonising but still a preference for seeing over hearing. On this Platonic aspect in Philo see S. Mackie, Means, 151 n. 9, 172–173.

46 A. Salvesen, Symmachus, 105.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

other texts (e. g. Dan 7). But patristic evidence also indicates that propriety and caution persisted in later doctrinal controversy. Augustine, who quotes Exod 24:10 LXX, commented: 'Moses may, of course, have seen Him [the Son] with bodily eyes', but after considering this Arian view, that the Word 'stood in His own substance within the space of an earthly place', then retorts: 'May God cleanse the hearts of His faithful from such thoughts!' (*Trin*. 15.25) For Augustine, all of the manifestations of God, including those at Mt. Sinai, were but 'visible and tangible signs' of a divine trinity that remains invisible to natural sight.[47]

'the place where God stood'

The Targumic expansions on Exod 24 reflect a perspective that authorised late antique Jewish beliefs and institutions: temple service, Beth Ha-Midrash, synagogue, and Torah study. The Targums, each in their own ways, present an understanding of 'the events surrounding the giving of the Torah as the revelation of a world normally concealed from human sight'. Thus, for post-destruction Jews, for whom Torah study and prayer had become substitutes for temple service, the divine presence of Mt. Sinai continued.[48] What about Philo, a pre-destruction Hellenised Jew living in Alexandria who prayed and sacrificed at the Jerusalem temple (*Prov*. 2.107) which he also likened to Mt. Sinai (*Somn*. 1.62, above)? The 'place' that Philo interpreted as the Logos was 'conceived of as spiritual space'.[49] The attendant spatial language implies this: the Logos is 'filled' with incorporeal Powers (*Somn*. 1.62; cf. 1.70, 71; *Conf*. 127) and is 'a holy and divine place' (*QE* 2.39). Thus, while Philo used the Logos to explain theophanies it was no mere *ad hoc* substitute, but a substantial mediator of the heavenly, noetic realm. And so, it is no surprise that the Logos is that on which contemplation should be fixed (*Conf*. 97; cf. *Somn*. 1.117).[50] This emphasis continued in later Jewish and Christian spirituality. In the latter, 'the place' could be strongly interiorised. According to Evagrius Ponticus, 'the intellect…will see its own constitution in prayer, like a sapphire or the colour of heaven…what Scripture calls 'the place of God'… For another heaven is printed on a pure heart, because within it so much is seen: the meaning of beings, and the holy angels who sojourn with the worthy'.[51]

47 S. McKenna, Trinity, 81–82.
48 C.T.R. Hayward, Giving, 283–284.
49 H. Köster, Art. τόπος, 202.
50 For a discussion of the varied accounts of visionary experience in Philo see S. Mackie, Logos, 25–47.
51 Evagrius *Ep*. 39, quoted in A. Golitzin, Topos, 221.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The Greek expansions in the LXX are unique; but Philo's interpretations of them may still be compared to early rabbinic thought. The third of Philo's definitions – that God may be called 'place' (*Somn.* 1.62–63) – recalls המקום 'the place', a frequent rabbinic name for God and divine immanence from the Tannaitic period onwards.[52] But for Philo (as in the LXX) 'place' was not a divine epithet as such. And while the leverage for his anti-anthropomorphism was due to a shared, traditional Jewish belief in transcendence, its metaphysical content derived from Hellenistic sources that rabbinic interpreters did not generally absorb. Nevertheless, the more 'rationalistic' comment by R. Yose bar Halafta, the disciple of R. Akiba (on Exod 33:21) is somewhat comparable: 'the Lord is the place of His World, but His world is not His place'.[53] Jewish and Hellenistic influences on Philo explain his consistent interpretation of 'stood' as signifying the attribute of divine immutability, twin-influences that persisted in some early Christian thought. Theophilus of Antioch's comments about the omnipresence of God, unlike the Greek gods that lack it (e. g. Zeus on Mt. Ida), reads similarly to Philo: 'But this is the attribute of God, the Highest and Almighty, and the living God, not only to be everywhere present, but also to see all things and to hear all, and by no means to be confined in a place; for if He were, then the place containing Him would be greater than He; for that which contains is greater than that which is contained. For God is not contained, but is Himself the place of all.'[54]

'and under His feet (was something) like the work of a plinth of sapphire and like the form of the firmament of heaven in purity'

On Exod 24:10b the Targums again reflect a concern to avoid anthropomorphisms for God. Instead of 'under his feet', there is either substitution (*Tg. Onq.:* 'under the throne of His Glory') which removed the anthropomorphism altogether, or expansion (*Tg. Neof.; Ps.-J.*; *Frg. Tg.* (V and P): '[under] the footstool of [his feet]') in an attempt to circumvent it, even if it still implied that God put his feet on something.[55] A contemplative strand is in evidence as well: *Tg. Onq.:* 'precious stone', instead of 'pavement of sapphire', echoes the description of the

52 A. Marmorstein, Doctrine, 92–93, 108–113, 118; H. Köster, Art. τόπος, 201; E.E. Urbach, Sages, 1:66–79; B.J. Copenhaver, Theologies, 489–499.

53 *Gen Rab.* 68.9, quoted in B.J. Copenhaver, Theologies, 493, 495–496. E.E. Urbach, Sages, 1:74–75, with n. 35 (2:715); D. Winston, Philo, 239–240.

54 *Autol.* 2.3. Theophilus uses χωρεῖν 'contain' not περιέχειν 'enclose' (as in Philo, *Somn.* 1.63), but these were regarded as equivalents in early Christian texts. W.R. Schoedel, Theology, 92–94. For the possible influence of Philo on Theophilus see D.T. Runia, Philo, 110–116.

55 B. Grossfeld, Targum, 72 n. 7; I. Drazin, Targum, 240 n. 12; A. Salvesen, Symmachus, 105–106.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

divine throne in Ezekiel (1:26; 10:1; cf. 1 En. 14:8–24). The very extensive addition in *Tg. Ps.-J.* about the recollection, prompted by 'brick' in Exod 24:10b, of the Hebrews' slavery in Egypt, is similar to Philo (*Conf.* 91–97), whose discussion of this detail in the context of a commentary on the Tower of Babel was apparently original for its time.[56] This kind of homiletic intertextuality continued in early rabbinic and Christian commentary.[57] But significantly for Philonic commentary the LXX has no modifications for 24:10b: perhaps the translator had already made those deemed necessary in 24:10a; after all, the similes applied to what was underneath, and not to the 'feet' themselves. Philo follows this: he was not, in the four passages considered, concerned about the divine feet as such, having already treated the implied anthropomorphism of 'place'. Rather, Philo moved on to the two similes in the two passages where 24:10b is quoted. And once again, it is philosophical allegory, in the service of a three-tiered cosmology, that took Philo in his distinctive directions, whether the similes referred to the pure and divine-like 'incorporeal forms' above (*QE* 2.37) or to 'the world of our senses' below (*Conf.* 96).

It does not seem as if Philo's interpretations of Exod 24:10 LXX were influential in antiquity. Late antique sources do nevertheless indicate that some of their motifs may be seen elsewhere; this echoes the view that Philo's Jewish interpretations fitted into a 'common ancient midrashic pool'.[58] Generally speaking, on 24:10a, the encounter with God at Mt. Sinai was understood as a vision, which gave due weight to the biblical language of sight while safeguarding divine transcendence; and 'the place where God stood' (LXX), and its shorter Hebrew form (MT), were interpreted in the belief that an encounter with God was an on-going contemplative possibility for the communities nourished by these texts. The similes in 24:10b (plinth, firmament) prompted both intertextual homiletic links with the Exodus narrative, and along with 24:10a and other visionary texts (e.g. Ezek 1) their colourfully poetic imagery inspired that contemplative possibility further. Philo's originality as a Jewish commentator was primarily due to his absorption of Hellenistic influence, in terms of both method (allegory) and content (divine immutability, the Logos, the Powers, contemplative ascent, cosmology). This creative combination of influences persisted in some early Christian thought. But whatever the extent of Philo's influence or otherwise, it is clear that traditional Jewish and Christian discourses emerged, whether based upon the Hebrew text in the case of rabbinic commentary or in

56 J.G. Kahn, Confusione, 164–165.

57 Drazin, Targum, 240 n. 13; M. McNamara / R. Hayward, Targum, 104 n. 7; M. Maher, Targum, 233 n. 16. A. Salvesen, Exodus, 60.

58 D. Winston, Philo, 237.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Christian commentary guided by the Christological developments the New Testament writers had first articulated.

V. Conclusions

Compared to the Hebrew MT text type, the expansive LXX translation 'and they saw the place where the God of Israel stood' (Exod 24:10a) has been accounted for in terms of its immediate literary context, intertextual allusions, and propriety and caution so as to safeguard divine transcendence. The latter – a long-standing and the most common explanation – was especially important for Philo, whose four philosophical allegories (*QE* 2.37; *Somn*. 1.62; 2.222; *Conf*. 96) enabled him to avoid the unwanted literalistic implications of the biblical anthropomorphism: divine motion and change. These passages contain three constants: 'the place where God stood' signified divine immutability; 'the place' was the mediatorial Logos (and the Powers within it); and the vision of God at Mt. Sinai that Exod 24:10 describes was understood as a contemplative (Platonic) ascent. Philo's interpretations, when set in their ancient context (ancient translations, rabbinic and Christian commentary), indicate that his philosophical allegories rendered his voice an original contribution to the ancient reception of the vision of God at the holy place of Mt. Sinai. Philo was typically Jewish in terms of theological propriety and caution, but as a philosophical allegorist he was a distinctively Hellenistic Jew. Philo's interpretations of Exod 24:10 were not seemingly influential in late antiquity, but some of their motifs may be seen elsewhere. The contemplative impulse of Exod 24 that Philo detected and encouraged continued in later antiquity as Jewish and Christian thinkers went on to generate their own traditional discourses concerning events that lay at the foundation of their shared religious history.

Bibliography

Abegg Jr., M.G. / Flint, P.W. / Ulrich, E.C., The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible, Edinburgh 1999.

Anderson, C., Philo of Alexandria's View of the Physical World (WUNT 2 309), Tübingen 2011.

Aucher, J.B., Philonis Iudaei Paralipomena armena, Venedig 1826.

Bloch, R.S., Moses und der Mythos. Die Auseinandersetzung mit der griechischen Mythologie bei jüdisch-hellenistischen Autoren (JSJ.S 145), Leiden / Boston 2011.

Charlesworth, J.H. (Ed.), The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (2 Vols.), London 1983–1985.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Clifford, H., Moses as Philosopher-Sage in Philo, in: A. Graupner / M. Wolter (Eds.), Moses in Biblical and Extra-Biblical Tradition (BZAW 372), Berlin / New York 2007, 151–167.

Cohn, L. / Wendland, P. (Eds.), Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, Berlin 1897.

Colson, F.H. / Whitaker, G.H. et. al. (Eds.), Philo with an English Translation (LCL) (10 Vols. and 2 supplement. Vols.), London / Cambridge 1927–1962.

Copenhaver, B.J., Jewish theologies of space in the scientific revolution: Henry More, Joseph Raphson, Isaac Newton and their predecessors, in: Annals of Science 37/5 (1980) 489–499.

Drazin I., Targum Onkelos to Exodus. An English Translation of the Text with Analysis and Commentary, Denver 1989.

Fraade, S.D., Hearing and Seeing at Sinai. Interpretative Trajectories, in: G.J. Brooke / H. Najman / L.T. Stuckenbruck (Eds.), The Significance of Sinai. Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity (Themes in Biblical Narrative. Jewish and Christian Traditions 12), Leiden 2008, 247–268.

Golitzin, A., Topos Theou. The Monastic Elder as Theologian and as Theology. An Appreciation of Archimandrite Aimilianos, in: D. Conomos / G. Speake (Eds.), Mount Athos the Sacred Bridge. The Spirituality of the Holy Mountain, Oxford / New York 2005, 201–241.

Grossfeld, B., The Targum Onqelos to Exodus (The Aramic Bible 7), Edinburgh 1988.

Hanson, A., The Treatment in the LXX of the Theme of Seeing God, in: G.J. Brooke / B. Lindars (Eds.), Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relation to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Manchester 1990 [Atlanta 1992], 557–268.

Hayward, C.T.R., The Giving of the Torah. Targumic Perspectives, in: G.J. Brooke / H. Najman / L.T. Stuckenbruck (Eds.), The Significance of Sinai. Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity (Themes in Biblical Narrative. Jewish and Christian Traditions 12), Leiden 2008, 269–285.

– Understandings of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch, in: J. Day (Ed.), Temple and Worship, London 2005, 385–400.

Holladay, C.T.R., Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors (4 Vols.), Chico 1983–1996.

Joosten, J., To See God. Conflicting Exegetical Tendencies in the Septuagint, in: M. Karrer / W. Kraus (Eds.), Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.d), Wuppertal, 20.–23. Juli 2006 (WUNT 219), Tübingen 2008, 287–299.

Kahn, J. G. (Ed.), De Confusione Linguarum (OPA 13), Paris 1963.

Köster, H., Art. τόπος, in: TDNT 8 (1972) 187–208.

Mackie, S., Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria. Means, Methods, and Mysticism, in: JSJ 43/2 (2012) 147–179.

– Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria. The Logos, the Powers, or the Existent One?, in: SPhilo 21 (2009) 25–47.

Maher, M., Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. Exodus, transl. with introduction and notes (The Aramaic Bible 1B), Collegeville 1992.

Marcus, R., Philo. Supplement 2. Questions and answers on exodus, transl. from the ancient Armenian version of the original Greek (LCL 401), Cambridge 1987.

Marmorstein, A., The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, London 1927.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

McKenna, S., Saint Augustine. The Trinity (FC 45), Washington 1963.
McNamara, M. / Hayward, R., Targum Neofiti 1. Exodus (The Aramaic Bible 2), Edinburgh 1994.
Petit, F., Philon d'Alexandrie, Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum. Fragmenta Graeca (*OPA 33),* Paris 1978.
Royse, J.R., The original structure of Philo's Quaestiones, in: SPhilo 4 (1976–1977) 41–78
– The Works of Philo, in: A. Kamesar (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Philo, Cambridge 2009, 32–64.
– The Spurious Texts of Philo of Alexandria. A study of textual transmission and corruption with indexes to the major collections of Greek fragments (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 22), Leiden 1991.
Runia D.T., The Text of the Platonic Citations in Philo of Alexandria, in: M. Joyal (Ed.), Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition. Essays Presented to John Whittaker, Aldershot 1997, 261–291.
– On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses (Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series), Leiden 2001.
– Philo in Early Christian Literature, Assen / Minneapolis 1993.
Salvesen A., Symmachus in the Pentateuch (JSSM 15), Manchester 1991.
– The Exodus commentary of St. Ephrem, Kerala 1995.
Schoedel, W.R, "Topological" theology and some monistic tendencies in Gnosticism, in: M. Kraus (Ed.), Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig (NHS 3), Leiden 1972, 88–108.
Stählе, K., Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandria, Leipzig / Berlin 1931.
Tal, A., The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch. A Critical Edition. Part I. Genesis, Exodus, Tel Aviv 1981.
Terian, A., Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum I et II. e versione armeniaca et fragmenta graeca (*OPA 34c)*, Paris 1992.
– The Priority of the Quaestiones, in: D.M. Hay (Ed.), Both Literal and Allegorical: Studies in Philo of Alexandria's Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus, Atlanta/GA 1991, 29–46.
Urbach, E.E., The Sages. Their Concepts and Beliefs (2 vols.) Jerusalem 1975.
Wevers, J.W. (Ed.), Exodus (SVTG 2/1) Göttingen 1991.
– Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, Atlanta/GA 1990.
– Text History of the Greek Exodus (*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philogisch-Historische Klasse 3/192 = Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 21)*, Göttingen 1992.
Williams, M.A., The Immovable Race. A Gnostic Designation and the Theme of Stability in Late Antiquity (NHS 29), Leiden 1985.
Winston, D., Philo and Rabbinic Literature, in: A. Kamesar (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Philo, Cambridge 2009, 231–265.
Wolfson, H.A., Philo. Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (2 vols.), Cambridge 1947.
Yonge, C.D., The Works of Philo. Complete and Unabridged, New Updated Edition, Peabody 1993.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Hildegard Scherer

Access Prohibited? Spacing the Kingdom of God in Synoptic Traditions

One conundrum of synoptic traditions on the kingdom of God has become classic: the question of its timing as 'present' and/or 'future'.[1] When we consider the spatial dimensions of the kingdom in the oldest Jesus traditions available to us, we have to add another puzzling question, as we find conceptions of an expanding, centrifugal basileia approaching or metaphorically growing, next to those of a fixed space which is the attractive target of some movement, whereas access is strictly controlled.[2] Both conceptions are represented in Markan materials as well as in double tradition – and neither evangelist seems to have had problems to integrate both of them.

But are these different spatial conceptions not mutually exclusive? How was it possible to pass on both of them, and what was their pragmatic intent?[3] After

1 Cf. e. g. the treatments in H. Merklein, Botschaft; B. Heininger, Testament; G. Theissen/A. Merz, Jesus, 232–241; J.P. Meier, Jew, 289–506. Cf. H. Moxnes, Kingdom, 177.

2 Of course, the question of spatial dimensions has not gone unnoticed before, e. g. L. Schenke, Botschaft, 107–110 ('eschatologischer Heilsraum,' 110); M. Bohlen, Einlasssprüche, 169–171, who systematizes conceptions of the kindom: (a) as space – (b) as good – (c) as content of proclamation – (d) as connected to verbs of movement – (e) as subject of predicates. Under (a) she includes not only the limited space examples, but also the glimpses into the basileia space (e. g. Mt 11,11 par Lk 7,28); in my view her categories (c) and (d) are also to be seen as spatial categories; they include what I call 'expansive' basileia. H. Moxnes, Kingdom, refers to a rather complicated model of space (D. Harvey) and focusses on Lk, but starts from an insight he attributes to B. J. Malina: '"The Kingdom of God is about the transformation of social structure"' (176). B. Bosenius, Raum, 311–359, includes reflections of the relation between household and basileia in Mk 10,10–31 in her treatment of the horizontal spacing of Mk. Cf. also D.A. Smith, Construction, 52–54, on Q 13,28 f.; idem, Dimensions, for apocalyptic spacing in Q. I have to confine myself to a very modest contribution: Abstaining from reflections on spacing theories, I will only treat clearcut examples of expansive/limited basileia texts in Markan and double tradition, although there might be more examples fitting into the scheme. Furthermore, I limit my analysis to texts where the term basileia is clearly named already on the level of tradition.

3 As with the future/present tension, there have been attempts to explain the differences by tradition history: e. g. H. Merklein, Botschaft, 23 f., who assigns the texts of basileia as '*aktiv-dynamische Größe*' (23; containing our expansive basileia) to an earlier time and basileia as 'Inbegriff des *Heilsgutes* oder des *Heilszustandes*' (24, containing our limited basileia) to

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

exploring the conceptions in texts from Markan and double tradition, I will address these questions by refering to the social context and theological heritage of the basileia of God. I assume that for the first Christian writers and audiences, there were bridges connecting these seemingly opposing spatial conceptions.

1. Synoptic Traditions: a Closer Look

First, I will compilate what can be regarded as oldest traditions of expansive and exclusive basileia spacing. The selection is based on Markan priority, i. e., Markan material will be regarded as one stream of tradition, next to the stream of double tradition material which can be interpreted as preceding Mt and to which Lk seems to have had independent access.[4]

1.1 Expansive Basileia

(1) Parables

In Mk as well as in the double tradition, we find basileia parables which connect basileia to agricultural or domestic metaphors accentuating spatial growth.

Mk 4,26–29 is more complex than it seems at first sight: It might be summarized as parable of the sleeping sower or the growing seed, indicating that it has more than one focus.[5] Not only is it ambiguous about the active roles to be played (sower/seed/earth/sickle)[6], it also contrasts the points in time of sowing

younger traditions. M. Bohlen, Einlasssprüche, 180–183, however, pleads against judging whole complexes of texts and emphasizes that already for Jesus, there were multiple ways of talking about the Kingdom of God. This leads into the question whether the differences of the conceptions might be explained by different *Sitze im Leben* in situations of Jesus' life, e. g. M. Heininger, Testament; B.D. Smith, Teaching, who (on a very inclusive textual basis) differentiates between 'non-rejection' and 'rejection'contexts.

4 Of course, the synoptic question is still under significant debate. For reasons of economy, I confine myself here to a position which activates only some very basic hypotheses: that there are traditions next to Mk which Mt and Lk made use of and to which they seem to have had independent access. When discussing double tradition texts, I will have some words about the traditional character of the material and the probability of independent access.

5 Cf. S. Lampe-Densky, Gottesreich, 87. Thus, the interpretations emphasize different pragmatic functions: S. Lampe-Densky, Gottesreich, 101, points to the reliability of natural processes initiated by the Creator; K. Snodgrass, Stories, 188f., to the duration of the process and the inevitability of the outcome; P. Dschulnigg, Mk, 143, reads the text as parable for Jesus' activity; in the context of Mk, D. Dormeyer, Mut, 320f., finds human interaction portrayed (with God's final responsibility, 324); A.J. Hultgren, Parables, 388, e. g., reads it as deemphasizing human effort.

6 Cf. D. Dormeyer, Mut, 320.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

and harvest (V. 26.29) to the duration of growing (V. 27f.). V. 29 contributes judgment discourse, changing the cruel image of the sickle in Joel 4,13 into a peaceful, 'organical' setting, where the fruit is actively allowing the sickle to harvest.[7] As concerns basileia discourse, we find the earth as space where organic development takes place until the point of fulfilment is reached.[8] Both seed and earth actively aim at changing and growing and thus fulfilling the intentions of the sower without being forced into them.

Mk 4,30–32 par Mt 13,31f. par Lk 13,18f. reads as follows:

Mt 13,31f.		Mk 4,30–32		Lk 13,18f.	
31a	Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων·	30a	Καὶ ἔλεγεν·		
b	**ὁμοία ἐστὶν** ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	b	πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ	18a	τίνι **ὁμοία ἐστὶν** ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
		c	ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν;	b	καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν;
c	κόκκῳ σινάπεως,	31a	ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως,	19a	ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως,
d	**ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος** ἔσπειρ**εν** ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ **αὐτοῦ**·	b	ὃς ὅταν σπαρῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,	b	**ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος** ἔβαλ**εν** εἰς κῆπον ἑ**αυτοῦ**,
32a	ὃ μικρότερον μέν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων,	c	μικρότερον ὂν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,		
		32a	καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ,		
b	ὅταν δὲ **αὐξη**θῇ	b	ἀναβαίνει	c	καὶ **ηὔξη**σεν
c	μεῖζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν καὶ γίνεται **δένδρον**,	c	καὶ γίνεται μεῖζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων	d	καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς **δένδρον**,
		d	καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους,		
d	ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	e	ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν.	e	καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν **ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις** αὐτοῦ.
e	καὶ κατασκηνοῦν **ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις** αὐτοῦ.				

The texts of Mt and Lk differ from the Markan text, not only in some pieces of wording, but in the metaphor itself: Mk's mustard seed parable is rather realistic.

7 Cf. D. Dormeyer, Mut, 322.

8 Cf. L. Oberlinner, Verwirklichung, 204.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

He has in mind a huge plant, the birds sitting or living below in the shadow of its twigs. 'Twigs' is a bit exaggerated for a vegetable plant, but contributes well to the focus of the Marcan parable: In Mk 4,31c and 32c, the semantic opposits of 'smallest' and 'biggest' indicate that the point in question is the growth of the seed: Relative to all other plants, it shows the most voluminous expansion.

Mt, instead of simply taking over the seed parable from Mk, enhances a tension which was not felt as strongly before: His mustard seed turns into a tree, with twigs so big that they can give shelter to the birds. This is botanically awkward, as mustard does not develop wooden parts and thus is hardly well compared to a 'tree' with birds on its twigs.[9] As Mt takes over Mk's interpretation in Mt 13,32ac, there would have been no necessity to alter the picture. It becomes still more probable that he integrated traditional material when we compare Lk's version: Lk has Mt's (awkward) alterations to Mk, but not what Mt took over from Mk – as it seems, a more primitive version which had already inspired Mt.[10] With its insistance on 'mustard' becoming a 'tree,' the parable activates coined metaphorical potential: In biblical (Dan 4,1–24; Ez 31,3–9) as in Roman contexts (Suet., Aug 94,11), the tree is stereotyped as metaphor for basileia or the ruler.[11] With its fantastic botanical move, the parable states that the basileia of God develops out of unexpected beginnings, from an unfitting milieu, but grows to universal kingly power.

In *Mt 13,33 par Lk 13,21*, the sibling metaphor about a woman 'taking' leaven follows in almost identical wording,[12] and it seems most probable that the two parables with their pairing of male/female workspace were handed over to Mt and Lk together.[13] The image of the leaven being kneeded into a huge amount of wheat catches a process of transformation: Starting from a small initiating impulse (or group), the surroundings are contaminated and assimilated to the leaven. The process is controlled by the baker, and there is a period of time when wheat and leaven coexist.

9 Cf. my Habilitationsschrift H. Scherer, Königsvolk, 456f., with references.

10 Matthew himself seems not to be intrinsically interested in the seed parables as such. He has left out Mk 4,26–29 or maybe better has reworked it into Mt 13,24–30, differentiating the 'automatical' growth into wildly growing wheat and weeves, and interpreting human passiveness as leaving judgement over to the Lord. The parable of the mustard seed and of the leaven are transmitted by Mt, but they receive no special attention. Mt places them in between the parable of Mt 13,24–30 and its interpretation (V. 36–43), but without any further comment or connecting devices. This leaves us with the impression that he felt in some way obliged to his tradition when he included them at all.

11 Cf. H. Scherer, Königsvolk, 457f.

12 As for this text, cf. H. Scherer, Königsvolk, 460–463.

13 Cf. M. Ebner, Weisheitslehrer, 377–380.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

(2) Logia

In the logia tradition, the expansion of God's basileia is not described from an outside spectator's perspective, as in the parables, but from the perspective of those involved. The clearest incident is *Mt 12,28 par Lk 11,20,* as it appears in the double tradition material of the Beelzebul controversy: **εἰ δὲ ἐν** δακτύλῳ **θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.**[14]

The Mt version of Jesus' rebuke to the Beelzebul reproach is longer than the Mk one. Moreover, it seems more composite: The Mk context of the two sapiential logia of splitting and robbing is interrupted by two conditional arguments. The first one, Mt 12,27, meets the point of the reproach: If Jesus cooperated with Beelzebul, then any other exorcist would either. But the argument in V. 28 does not fit properly: It is not about superior power, but about the visibility and point in time of the basileia. It states that in Jesus' exorcisms, the basileia of God manifests itself. Of course, this is the mere opposit of the opponents' claim – but, as different from the other logia in Jesus' little speech, it does not contribute at all to convincing them of this position.[15] It seems not very plausible that Mt would have created a logion like this and placed it here, all the more since, in the synoptics, the collocation ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ appears only here. Once more Lk seems to have had independent access, as he has an alternative reading of the prepositional phrase: **ἐν** δακτύλῳ. One might argue whether this was the original wording or whether Lk created the biblical allusion to Ex 8,15. Anyway: the Mt 'spirit' not only fits the exorcist context, but Lk's theological predilections as well. It seems rather implausible that he should have bothered to change the expression if he knew it from Mt.[16]

In 'ἔφθασεν ἐφ,' we find a verb indicating movement. It means: to arrive, to approach; it can be used as a synonym for 'ἔρχομαι.'[17] As its famous correlate 'ἐγγίζω,' it can be used not only in relation to space, but also to time.[18] In our case, a spatial reading recommends itself, as the action at stake has itself spatial connotations: If demons are 'expelled,' they are spatially removed, i. e. the space of God's kingdom is cleared from 'enemies' and God's control over this space

14 When referring to the double tradition, text in bold print is identical in Lk and Mt.

15 As for the difference between Q 11,19 and 20 cf. also J.P. Meier, Jew, 409 f., pointing to the 'flat claim' (409) and the widenend reference of the 'you'-group.

16 Cf. e. g. J.P. Meyer, Jew, 411 f.; it is possible that Lk found a third version and adapted it to biblical terms – but that would still mean independent access.

17 Cf. G. Fitzer, Art. φθάνω, 90.

18 Cf. G. Fitzer, Art. φθάνω, 90; D. Dormeyer, Art. ἐγγίζω, 895 f. As will be seen below from the social background, in practice, basileia is extended over geographic territories. This makes it rather plausible to think of a basileia which has come near in spatial categories, but does not exclude that it might also answer the question of the proper time when the extension of divine basileia takes place. As to the oscillation between spatial and time connotations in Mk 1,15 and also Mk 9,1; 15,43; 12,34, cf. also B. Bosenius, Raum, 322–328, pleading for openness.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

becomes manifest.[19] The direction into which the basileia expands remains ambivalent, however, as the preposition can be used for horizontal and vertical progressions alike.[20]

As mentioned just before, the most popular phrase for expanding basileia is about its having come near, as we read in *Mk 1,15*, where Jesus announces the time to be fulfilled and the basileia having arrived (ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ). The same phrase occurs in the double tradition mission speech *Q 10,9*, where the disciples are instructed to preach: **ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία** τοῦ θεοῦ, immediately preceded (Lk 10,9) or followed (Mt 10,8) by the command to heal the sick.[21]

In the double tradition, we find another example of approaching basileia in *Q 11,2*, where the Lord's prayer reads **ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.**[22] And finally, our last example is *Mk 9,1*, where Jesus promises the bystanders they would not 'taste death' until they saw the kingdom having come in power (τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει).[23] According to this logion, the basileia approaches human beings, and there will be a point in time in the forseeable future, when the movement will have been completed and noticed by the addressees – which means an impression visible in spatial dimensions. It will have filled the void which is experienced at present.[24]

19 For the conception of space controlled by God and exorcism, cf. H. Moxnes, Kingdom, 203–205.

20 Cf. LSJ s. v.: unto, to, even in a hostile sense.

21 Lk has one mission speech close to Mk (9,3–5) and another one containing the elements which Mt had woven into his Mk Vorlage (10,2–16). Sometimes the wording of Lk does not seem to have grown out of Mt (Lk 10,5 f., cf. e. g. M. Tiwald, Wanderradikalismus, 116). Furthermore, there are tensions in Mt: Mt 10,10e has a connecting preposition without the element refered to, cf. Lk 10,7 (cf. M. Tiwald, Wanderradikalismus, 117–119); Mt 10,14 introduces a town while all the communication before had taken place in a house – Mt 10,15 punishes the town, although the misbehaviour had happened in the house.

22 Tradition is close at hand because of liturgical use (cf, e. g. the positions listed in S.D. Anderson, Documenta Q, 27–31).

23 One might wonder where to place Q 16,16 among the spatial dimensions of the basileia: As reconstructed wording as well as the meaning of this verse are very ambivalent, it is not very safe to base any assumptions on it. Mt, 11,12, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται is read as middle, it means 'presses forcefully' (cf. e. g. J. Nolland, Mt, 453.457 f.) – a kind of spacial expansion. But the passive reading as 'to suffer violence' is not ruled out (cf. e. g. M. Konradt, Mt, 180.182). The same medium/passive problem arises in Lk 16,16: people could either violently intrude (limited basileia model) or be pressed into the kingdom (expansive basileia model), cf. M. Wolter, Lk, 555 f., who opts for the passive. It is significant for further discussion that the verse does not imply any military, psychological or bodily violence to be exercised by human beings towards others. Either way, in my opinion it will not alter the overall picture. Thus, I do not include it here.

24 Reading Mt as a whole, it becomes plausible that his expansive basileia material was traditional. While Mt reduplicates only Mt 4,17 in John's preaching in Mt 3,2, he otherwise draws intensively on the idea of limited basileia: He names conditions for entering (Mt 5,20; 7,21; 21,31); describes it as locked up (Mt 16,19; 23,13) or visualizes processes of included or excluded (Mt 13,24–30.36–43.47–50; 22,11–14; 25,1–13; cf. the Matthean additions to the

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

1.2 Limited Basileia

Basileia as limited and exclusive space is only found in the logia tradition. In Mk, we have got several instances, nearly all of them appearing in the strongly parenetic section 'On the way' (Mk 8,27–10,45).[25]

Mk 9,43–48 names opposing alternative spaces, the one being 'life' or 'basileia,' the other 'Gehenna' with its eternal fire.[26] The condition for entering life/basileia is not to 'stumble' or 'be trapped' – and three exemplary parts of the body are said to endanger the human being in this respect. The logia recommend to prefer physical handicap in order to avoid going out into or being thrown into the eternal fires of Gehenna.

In *Mk 10,15*, Jesus' appeal to accept the basileia like a child, we find some reminiscence to expansive basileia, as basileia seems to approach the addressees from the outward and is to be 'taken' or 'welcomed.'[27] At the same time, the positive attitude towards basileia is turned into a condition for 'entering'. The two steps of action are brought in close consequence. Moreover, the addressees wish to 'enter' basileia, as otherwise it would make no sense to inform them about conditions. At the same time, there is the danger of 'not entering' basileia, i. e. to be excluded from some attractive space.

---

double tradition in Mt 25,21.23.30 and Mt 25,34.41.46). He even eliminates Mk's growing basileia of Mk 4,26–29, reformulates Mk 9,1 into coming of the son of man, and stresses the active behaviour in Mt 18,3 par Mk 10,15. Thus he seems not actively interested in 'expanding' basileia, which makes it still more probable that he had inherited the instances from his tradition. In Lk, however, we cannot find any clear preferences concerning spatial basileia: Lk 9,27 also alters Mk 9,1, eliminating the spatial connotation of the 'coming' basileia – but inserts it in Lk 21,31 par Mk 13,29 and Lk 22,18 par Mk 14,25; Lk 10,11 repeats the coming near of Lk 10,9. Lk 17,20 f. adresses the question of the point in time when the basileia 'comes' and leads to Jesus' remark of static basileia ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν. Lk 19,11 characterizes as misunderstanding that the basileia would appear. As for the concept of limited basileia, Lk eliminates Mk 9,43–47 as a whole, but has one of the men crucified next to Jesus plead for reminding him when Jesus enters his basileia (Lk 23,42). In Apg 14,22 'to enter the basileia of God through many troubles' is part of the epitome of Paul's and Barnabas' message to Lystra, Ikonion and Antiochia (Apg 14,21). A far reflection might be Lk 9,62, where some condition for the basileia is named. But all in all, Lk seems much less concerned about decision making and conditions for entering or being excluded from basileia than Mt. This might be due to his reconceptualization of the basileia: As he connects basileia with the presence of Jesus, it is close as long as Jesus is close and after his death returns to heaven and is object of preaching (cf. M. Wolter, Reich, 549–553.561).

25 As concerns structure, cf. M. Ebner, Markusevangelium, 154–159.

26 As for the background of this place of punishment cf. e. g. B. Bosenius, Raum, 94 f.

27 The condition is grammatically ambivalent, cf. B. Bosenius, Raum, 333–338, who finds its solution by the context of Mk 9,37: Stripping the logion from its Mk context, we were in need of a new frame to decide on the interpretation.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

The same concept is found in *Mk 10,23–25*: 'How hard is it for those possessing goods to enter the Kingdom of God!' From the comparison of Mk 10,25 we learn that there is some narrow entrance to the space of basileia.

In double tradition, we find limited basileia space in *Q 13,28f.* The common core of the double tradition constitutes an almost complete logion which announces that the guests of a *post-mortem* banquet with the Patriarchs will be replaced by unexpected newcomers. They are thrown into some unpleasant outside area while the others enter what is qualified in V. 28d as 'in the basileia.' Unfortunately, this logion does not give any information as to why this happens – in Mt and Lk, the different contexts have to account for that. Mt thinks of some quality of belief (Mt 8,10), Lk of the 'doers of evil' (Lk 13,27).[28] In any case, there must have been some incentive for the reversal of roles, and all plausibility points to the conclusion that it must have been some kind of behaviour.

In these verses, it is clearly Mt who has the more authentic version and Lk who has adapted wording and sequence. It is only the position of the sayings which gives us some hint that Lk had independent access to tradition. In Mt, although the topic moves from miracle to eschatological outlook, the logion generalizes a principle exemplified by the Capernaum centurio, who comes from outside Israel, but outdoes Israel's belief and thus changes roles.[29] Lk has a different context, but anyway he struggles to improve a text not yet plausible to him. If he had found it in Mt's context, he might be expected to improve it as to fit the centurio setting.

The basileia to be approached echoes the conception of limited basileia. According to *Mk 12,34*, closing the 'first' commandment debate, one can (and should) approach the basileia space, as the understanding scribe is 'not far from' the kingdom (οὐ μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ).[30] Reflections are also found in *Q 12,31*, where the addressees are asked to look for (**ζητεῖτε**) the basileia.[31]

28 As P.-B. Smit, Fellowship, 213f., rightly notes, the Mt placement alters the perspective – from 'exhortation' of the may-be excluded towards 'legitimization' of the 'inclusion' of Gentiles. Cf. also J.P. Meier, Jew, 310, for the polemic turn.

29 J.P. Meier, Jew, 309f., evaluates the insertion into a miracle story as an indication of secondary use.

30 Cf. also Mk 15,43: Joseph of Arimataia expects the Kingdom, i.e. he waits for its approach.

31 The arguments for the tradition history of the raven/lillies complex as reworked tradition (cf. e.g. M. Ebner, Weisheitslehrer, 250–267) make it probable that it appeared in the double tradition *Vorlage*, though in Q 12,31 Luke's independent access cannot be demonstrated.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

2. Realia and Cultural Backgrounds

The semantics of expanding and limited basileia interact with experiences from and cultural conceptions of basileia. On this background, the contribution of the texts to discourse on basileia sharpens.

2.1 Real Life Expansive Basileia – and Its Counterconceptions

Regarding the context in which the basileia parables and logia originate, the speaker and the audience are part of a political system in which basileia is deeply rooted.[32] In Palestine, Herodian basileia has superseded the Hasmoneans, who themselves gained ground after centuries of Hellenistic basileia. In the milieu of origin it is Roman empire which provides the background for the Herodians, which stretches out into Judaea, and which has – structurally, not nominally – inherited Alexander the Great's worldwide expansive kingdom.

Prototypical features of basileia apply to Hellenstic monarchy as well as to its Roman successor: (1) The defining element of any basileia is the basileus who, by monarchic power, sets the rules (cf. e. g. Sen., Clem I 1, 2 [Rosenbach]). He has the last word in politics and jurisdiction and profits economically. His singular status has to be legitimized and represented by buildings, euergetism, etc.[33] (2) Before dynastic succession takes place, basileia is achieved by military action (cf. 1 Makk 14,31–34). The successful king is owner of the territory he has won by war.[34] (3) Basileia has limited territory marked off by frontiers. If new territory is gained, all inhabitants without exception are forced into the administration and structure of the king's rule. (4) There is permanent struggle about expansion and frontiers of territory. The kingdom wishes to expand to foreign territories, the neighbours threat the borders. At its best, a prototypical kingdom is expansive, and we find plenty of narrations of expansive actions, of which I restrict myself to examples from Josephus and Augustus' *Res gestae:*

Josephus e. g. presents to us the military action of Demetrius against Mesopotamia (Ant XIII 184); Hyrkanos militates against cities in military vacuum in Syria, Samaria and Idumaea and imposes rules on them (Ant XIII 254–258); Cleopatra advances Ptolemais while Ptolemy tries to subdue 'empty' Egypt (Ant XIII 348–351); the Parthians enter Syria and Iudaea (Ant XIV 330.332).

In *Res gestae divi Augusti* 26, we read about the expansion of the Roman empire: Augustus notes that he had expanded the frontiers (τοὺς ὅρους ἐπεύξ-

32 As for the backgrounds of the political constellation, cf. H. Scherer, Königsvolk, 395–426.
33 As for the competences of the basileus, cf. C. Mileta, König.
34 The verb ἐγγίζω is also used in military contexts, cf. e. g. Josephus, Bell V 408; VI 16.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

[ησ]α) of the peoples who are not yet under the empire (τὰ μὴ ὑποτασσ[όμ]ενα τῆι ἡμετέραι ἡγεμονίαι). While in Gallia, Spain and Germania peace is established and peoples wish to gain the friendship of the Romans, Augustus sends his troops to Ethiopia und Arabia, fights and names the final points he could approach. Egypt (27) or the peoples of Pannonia (30) are integrated into or subdued to the empire.

And indeed, forceful expansions like those experienced on earth have influenced expectations of divine basileia: In Dan 2,35, the king in his dream watches a stone which first crushes a composit statue into dust, then becomes a mountain and in the end fills (MT; Th diff. LXX) the whole world: According to Dan 2,44, it symbolizes the eternal and unquenchable kingdom which God will establish and which will annihilate the others. In AssMos 10 God has defeated the devil and stands up in wrath to punish the heathens.

It is not astonishing to find critical reflections on this 'mundane' concept of 'coming' basileia in synoptic traditions: When in Mk 11,10 Jesus enters Jerusalem, his disciples exclaim: 'Blessed be the coming basileia of our father David,' misinterpreting Jesus' understanding of God's basileia and raising expectations that Jesus might occupy city and temple.[35] A more cruel version we find in Lk 19,12–27: When the 'basileia'-occupant comes back to demonstrate his new status, he not only whishes to gain material profits by any means, but he also forcefully extinguishes any resistance.

Some of the Jesus traditions on expansive basileia only claim that the kingdom will come, but leave open how it will manifest itself – but when reading the expansive metaphors of the synoptic traditions on their cultural background, they gain specific profile: In contrast to military action, organic growth does not face resistance and needs (as far as narrated in the parables) no forceful dispowerment of any opponent. It is no sudden surprising interruption, but a slow, steady, and expectable process. As in the parable of the leaven, 'old' and 'new' rule exist side by side until the end. Thus, the expansive metaphors bear pragmatic potential.[36] They rule out any notion of forceful military expansion and prepare the listeners for a long, uncontrollable process of transformation.

But besides all metaphors, what will be the empirically evident outcome of the basileia manifestation? And what will the new rules look like *in concreto?* The logia of the Beelzebul controversy bear an answer. According to Q 11,20, basileia

35 Cf. M. Ebner, Mk, 117f., refering to 1 Makk 13,43–52; Josephus, Bell II 57–62.

36 Cf. for the pragmatic intent of parables of growth K. Snodgrass, Stories, 188: They 'answer questions and challenges to Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom.' Cf. also J. Hultgren, Parables, 388f., who doubts that Mk 4,26–29 was directed against revolutionary impetusses, but admits '… it could have been addressed to anyone, including the disciples, who had heard Jesus' preaching about the kingdom and then questioned him about the means and manner of its coming' (389). L. Oberlinner, Verwirklichung, 207f., regards the insecure and the active ones as possible addressees; cf. L. Schenke, Botschaft, 121.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

becomes evident whereever 'demons' are 'expelled' and by that, individual human beings are freed from a maleficient rule and subdued to God's power.[37] Thus, the manifestation of God's supreme power is in the human being: It is the individual human being who is altered, maybe as part of a group. And that is what is empirically manifest: There is some change in the individual's thinking or behaviour. A further development of this individual change of rules might be the connection between basileia and healings (Q 10,9): Whatever the unpleasant phenomena might have been which were classified as 'illness,' God's basileia breaks its rules and restitutes the individual to a more pleasant state.

2.2 Limited Basileia

Having said so much about the backgrounds of real life expansive basileia, it seems rather counterintuitive that someone actively wishes to be subjected to a king, the ideal being freedom from the 'yoke' of any dominance (cf. e. g. 1 Makk 13,41; 2 Chron 12,8).[38] As an exception, foreign basileia can seem to be the better option when e. g. the Jewish delegation in Rome wishes to be integrated into the Roman province of Syria rather than to be ruled by Archelaos (Josephus, Ant XVII 314). In our context, however, basileia as an attractive target one wishes to enter by all means is confined to divine basileia.

Traditions on 'entering' an attractive place can be found among the conceptions of the afterlife, without basileia being mentioned explicitly.[39] In the Epistle of Henoch, we hear the promise to some troubled just ones (104,2): 'the doors of heaven will be opened for you,' while the sinners will suffer eternally.[40] In ethHen 25,6, we find the elect in paradise, in a pleasant 'holy space;' in ethHen 45,4f., the sinners will not enter the land where the elect live; in ethHen 62,8.14–16, the elect will dine with the son of man after having passed judgement.

Finally, in some traditions the conceptions have merged: There are accounts of divine basileia where indeed some space is to be entered: In OrSib III 767–795, we

37 Cf. L. Schenke, Botschaft, 133–135; M. Ebner, Weisheitslehrer, 417; for the warlike background of Mk 3,27/Q 11,21 see M. Ebner, Weisheitslehrer, 365–372.

38 To 'go into' basileia is, as far as I can see (cf. TLG Lemma Search within three lines), not attested in literary sources in any spatial sense. Only Josephus, Ant XII 389, mentions the collocation for 'taking over power.'

39 Cf. for a collection of references J.J. Collins, Conceptions; S. Schreiber, Variationen. M. Bohlen, Einlasssprüche, 176–179, sees predecessors in the Septuagint traditions on entering the Land (Dtn 1,37–39 e. a.) or in heavenly journey motifs (grBar 2,1f.; TestLev 2,6f.; TestAbr 10 e.a.).

40 Cf. 1QS 4,6f.11–14, where, without direct recourse to 'entering,' the 'ways' of the good and the wicked terminate in zones of light or darkness and extinction respectively – some last judgement still follows (cf. J.J. Collins, Conceptions, 112).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

find the announcment of God's eternal kingdom for the pious ones: God will open earth, cosmos, the 'doors of the blessed,' joy and eternity (769–771); humans as well as nature will experience eternal peace. In AssMos 10, after the devil is defeated and God has established his kingdom, the just will be translated to heaven, while the enemies remain on earth. And finally, in TestDan 5,12, the holy and the just will remain in Eden, in connection with the basileia of the 'Holy one of Israel' (5,13).

Moreover, the idea of spatial basileia in Q 13,28 f. converges with the notion of the eschatological banquet. This thread of tradition is rather thin in biblical or Jewish texts, but emerges in the Jesus tradition and its insistance on meals.[41]

Thus, from the point of view of cultural traditions, the clash between the two spatial conceptions might not have been felt so deeply. Moreover, it helps to clarify the frame set of the limited-access-traditions: In their eschatological contexts, they promise vindication and reward for those distressed because of their lifestyle and, by that, try to motivate their addressees to keep in line, despite of all hardships. The Jesus traditions now explicitly name the requirements for access – and use the traditions to form (Mk) or to question (double tradition) some particular ethos.[42]

3. Conclusion: Common Core and Different *Sitz im Leben*

I come back to my initial question: How could the two opposing spatial conceptions of expansive and limited basileia exist side by side already in our earliest traditions? From the analyses above, we might draw the following conclusions:

(1) 'Expanding' basileia constituted the political reality in the milieu of origin of our texts. Thus, any basileia proclamation was linked to ongoing basileia discourse, and by drawing on cultural plausibilities framed the Jesus tradition basileia. At first sight, the idea of limited basileia and conditions for access seem counterintuitive, but they could, in spite of all differences, exploit a (thin) traditional link to divine basileia conceptions.

(2) The two types of basileia texts have got two different points to make and from that, two different *Sitze im Leben:* The limited basileia concept has got a

41 P.-B. Smit, Fellowship, 22–26, has worked through evidence for the eschatological banquet. For the type of celebratory banquet, he names the 'victory banquet' of Jes 25,6–8 as 'the only certain […] example of an eschatological banquet' (22); a messianic banquet is found in 1 QSa 2,11–22; ethHen 62,14; slavHen 42,5; and 2 Esdr 2,38 as pre-Christian pseudepigraphic texts (23). One might incline to think in this context of Mk 14,25, but as P.-B. Smit, Fellowship, 108 f., argues convincingly, a banquet context can be implied, but is not necessary.

42 As for the ethical implications of the traditions of entering basileia, cf. e. g. L. Schenke, Botschaft, 116.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

clearly parenetic impetus: In general, it can stimulate motivation by naming the alternative to God's basileia; in particular, it can establish values, rules of behaviour and by that an ethos to be required. On the other hand, the expansive basileia discourse can be used to reshape unfitting stereotypes or alternative understandings of divine basileia. It solves the cognitive dissonance aroused by unexpected moves of Jesus' basileia preaching and thus convinces the hearers to be confident.

(3) Regarding the empirical base of Jesus basileia preaching, the two conceptions have got a common core. When Jesus hints at the basileia empirically, he does so in the context of exorcism, which means: liberating a human being from maleficient influence. Thus, the 'space' where basileia manifests itself is the human being, acting in his or her personal radius, and doing so under the governance of God. Liberation from illness serves as another practical example. Whereas, in this conception, the active side of God and the receiving side of the human being is stressed, the parenetic limited basileia traditions turn the tables: They conceptualize an active human being, decidedly placing him-/herself under the governance of God and putting his rules into real live, as they structure social space. The Jesus traditions present these two aspects of basileia as inseparably intertwined – and place God's transforming power next to the human being's potential.

The concept of altering space 'bottom up', starting from human beings and their social spaces, fits into the concept of growing basileia: There is no sudden universal point when sovereignty changes and institutions are reoriented top down, but there is some undefineably long time when different powers coexist. During this time in-between, the space of God's kingdom in this world is the human being.

Bibliography

Anderson, S.D. (ed.), Q 12,2b–4 (Documenta Q), Leuven 1996.

Bohlen, M., Die Einlasssprüche in der Reich-Gottes-Verkündigung Jesu, in: ZNW 99 (2008) 167–184.

Bosenius, B., Der literarische Raum des Markusevangeliums (WMANT 140), Neukirchen-Vluyn 2014.

Collins, J.J., Conceptions of Afterlife in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: M. Labahn / M. Lang (eds.), Lebendige Hoffnung – ewiger Tod? Jenseitsvorstellungen im Hellenismus, Judentum und Christentum (ABIG 24), Leipzig 2007, 103–125.

Dormeyer, D., Mut zur Selbst-Entlastung (Von der selbständig wachsenden Saat). Mk 4,26–29 (EvThom 21,f.), in: R. Zimmermann (ed.), Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu, Gütersloh 2007, 318–326.

– Art. ἐγγίζω, in: EWNT^3 I (2011) 894–896.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Dschulnigg, P., Das Markusevangelium (ThKNT 2), Stuttgart 2007.
Ebner, M., Jesus – ein Weisheitslehrer? Synoptische Weisheitslogien im Traditionsprozeß (HBS 15), Freiburg i.Br. 1998.
– Das Markusevangelium, in: idem/S. Schreiber (eds.), Einleitung in das Neue Testament (KStTh 6), Stuttgart 2008, 154–183.
Fitzer, G., Art. φθάνω κτλ., in: THWNT IX (1973) 90–94.
Heininger, B., Neues Testament, in: G. Vanoni / idem, Das Reich Gottes. Perspektiven des Alten und Neuen Testaments (NEB Themen 4), Würzburg 2002, 61–117.
Hultgren, J., The Parables of Jesus. A Commentary (The Bible in Its World), Grand Rapids (MI) 2000.
Konradt, M., Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (NTD 1), Göttingen 2015.
Lampe-Densky, S., Gottesreich und antike Arbeitswelten. Sozialgeschichtliche Auslegung neutestamentlicher Gleichnisse, Frankfurt a.M. 2012.
Meier, J.P., A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Vol. 2: Mentor, Message, and Miracles (ABRL), New York (NY) 1994.
Merklein, H., Jesus Botschaft von der Gottesherrschaft. Eine Skizze (SBB 111), Stuttgart 1983.
Mileta, C., Der König und sein Land. Untersuchungen zur Herrschaft der hellenistischen Monarchen über das königliche Gebiet Kleinasiens und seine Bevölkerung (Klio 14), Berlin 2008.
Moxnes, H., Kingdom Takes Place. Transformations of Place and Power in the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Luke, in: J.J. Pilch (ed.), Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible. FS B.J. Malina (BIS 53), Leiden 2001, 176–209.
Nolland, J., The Gospel of Matthew. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC), Grand Rapids (MI) 2005.
Oberlinner, L., Die Verwirklichung des Reiches Gottes. Entwicklungslinien beim Gleichnis von der selbstwachsenden Saat Mk 4,26–29, in: U. Busse / M. Reichardt / M. Theobald (eds.), Erinnerung an Jesus. Kontinuität und Diskontinuität in der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung. FS R. Hoppe (BBB 166), Göttingen 2011, 197–214.
Schenke, L., Die Botschaft vom kommenden "Reich Gottes", in: idem e.a. (eds.), Jesus von Nazaret – Spuren und Konturen, Stuttgart 2004, 106–147.
Scherer, H., Königsvolk und Gotteskinder. Der Entwurf der sozialen Welt im Material der Traditio duplex, Habil.-Schrift Bonn 2014.
Schreiber, S., Apokalyptische Variationen über ein Leben nach dem Tod. Zu einem Aspekt der Basileia-Verkündigung Jesu, in: M. Labahn / M. Lang (eds.), Lebendige Hoffnung – ewiger Tod? Jenseitsvorstellungen im Hellenismus, Judentum und Christentum (ABIG 24), Leipzig 2007, 129–156.
Smit, P.-B., Fellowship and Food in the Kingdom. Eschatological Meals and Scenes of Utopian Abundance in the New Testament (WUNT II 234), Tübingen 2008.
Smith, B.D., Jesus' Twofold Teaching on the Kingdom of God (New Testament Monographs 24), Sheffield 2009.
Smith, D.A., The Construction of a Metaphor. Reading Domestic Space in Q, in: D.T. Roth / R. Zimmermann / M. Labahn (eds.), Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q (WUNT 315), Tübingen 2014, 33–55.
– "But You Will Be Thrown out" (Q 13:28). The Spatial Dimensions of Q's Apocalyptic Rhetoric, in: M. Tiwald (ed.), Q in Context I. The Separation between the Just and the

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Unjust in Early Judaism and in the Sayings Source / Die Scheidung zwischen Gerechten und Ungerechten in Frühjudentum und Logienquelle (BBB 172), Göttingen 2015, 145–168.

Snodgrass, K. Stories with Intent. A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus, Grand Rapids (MI) 2008.

Theissen, G. / Merz A., Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch, Göttingen ^{4}2011.

Tiwald, M., Wanderradikalismus. Jesu erste Jünger – ein Anfang und was davon bleibt (ÖBS 20), Frankfurt a.M. 2002.

Wolter, M., "Reich Gottes" bei Lukas, in: NTS 41 (1995) 541–563.

– Das Lukasevangelium (HNT 5), Tübingen 2008.

Tiwald, M., Wanderradikalismus. Jesu erste Jünger – ein Anfang und was davon bleibt (ÖBS 20), Frankfurt a.M. 2002.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Nikolai Tischler

‘God does not dwell in houses made by human hands’. Cult and Holy Places in the Acts of the Apostles

I.

1. Holy Places as a Topic for Luke-Acts

‘Holy Places in Biblical and Extra-Biblical Tradition’ – It seems an obvious choice to pick the Acts of the Apostles as subject-matter of the analysis for a paper on the New Testament with this thematic guideline. The reasons for this decision are numerous and can be listed quickly: More often than any other book in the New Testament, the stories in Luke-Acts deal with places which are generally attributed with the status of *holy*. Temples (cf. Acts 2,46; 3,1 ff; 7,47; 21,27), altars (cf. Acts 14,13) and set-up idols (cf. Acts 17,16; 19,23–40), to all of which this attribute is mostly ascribed, frequently characterize the scene and are more than once even the occasion for and the topic of the apostles’ speeches. In this context, the spectrum these motives are encountered in is not limited to the Jewish or biblical cultural sphere and its traditions; besides the Temple in Jerusalem – by all means a central element in *corpus lucanum*[1] – there are stated several religious perceptions as well as practised cults within the journeys of Paul which are explicitly outside the Jewish cultural sphere. While the apostle – albeit involuntarily – is at the centre of an offering procession in Lystra (Acts 14,11–13), he also has to deal with the cult about the *holy* image of the goddess Diana in Ephesus (Acts 19,23–

1 On several occasions Luke uses the Temple in Jerusalem as setting and topic for the discussions between the apostles, the Jews of Palestine and the members of the Sanhedrin (cf. Acts 2,46; 3,1; 4,1 ff; 21,27 f). Accordingly to this, the temple is used as a rather polemic topic in the speech of Stephen (cf. Acts 7,47 ff). There are other places and situations in Acts which fit the scheme of *holy* and *holy places* outside the Jewish cultural sphere. Similarly Paul and Barnabas are involved in a sacrificial ceremony for the deities Zeus and Hermes in Lystra (Acts 14,8–20). In Athens (Acts 17,16–34), the fact that the city is characterized by plenty of pagan temples and sanctuaries (κατείδωλον) arouses the anger of Paul (παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θεωροῦντος κατείδωλον οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν). In Ephesus (Acts 19,23–39), the Temple of the goddess Artemis plays a major role in the conflict between the silversmith Demetrius, Paul, and the town clerk.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

40). In Athens (Acts 17,16b), eventually, it is the overwhelming quantity of Hellenistic temples and their worship ([…] κατείδωλον οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν) which sets the scene for one of the most famous speeches in Luke-Acts.

Every one of the mentioned texts, in which many different forms of religious devoutness and worship of places can be observed, would be sufficient for a paper of its own, which could comprehensively fill the given timeframe as well as the thematic scope. However, the following paper will direct its attention to the fundamental matter, which is the conceptional question of whether or not there is any room in Luke's theology for the concept of a *holy place*. Even though this approach may be surprising at first in light of the demonstrated spectrum of usage of the motive of holy places in Acts, the mentioned scenes are all characterized by a critical tone[2] towards the presented cults and places which could be defined as a concept[3] of *temple-criticism* or rather *cult-criticism*. These two terms, not unchallenged in recent years[4], describe the outer limits within which Luke's acceptance or rejection of temples and practised cults can be located. In connection with this, one has to question anew the nature of the demonstrated criticism of temples and cults, in order to finally analyse if the thought of a holy place within the framework of Acts has to be generally rejected, or if it is possible after all.

2. The Problem of the Abstract Term 'holy place'

In the first instance, one has to think about the meaning of the quite far-reaching term 'holy place'[5], and how it is connected to a 'cult' that is practiced in this dedicated space. From the point of view of religious science – and the following will show that this is significant for the evaluation of the two terms – a holy place

2 Acts 7,48 alleges that 'the Most High does not dwell in houses made by human hands' (οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ). At the beginning of his speech to the Athenian philosophers (Acts 17,25), Paul states that '(God) does not dwell in temples made with hands' (κύριος οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ). And in Ephesus (Acts 19,26), the silversmith Demetrius announces that an essential message of the Gospel is the saying that 'gods made with hands are no gods at all' (λέγων ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοὶ οἱ διὰ χειρῶν γινόμενοι).

3 Cf. M. Sabbe, Son, 252; D. Juel, Messiah, 148f; S. Wilson, Gentiles, 149; N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 72; H. Hübner, Theologie, 151; E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 379; M. Simon, Stephen, 153.

4 Cf. E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 379–359; T. Holtz, Beobachtungen, 110f.117.

5 D. Baudy, Art. Heilige Stätten, 1551, mentions that not just temples and other handmade buildings count as holy places. Trees, caves, even boulders could be named holy and be used for a ceremonial purpose. Cf. C. Elsas, Art. Kultort, 33, who states: "Wie es im juristischen Denken der Römer klar festgelegt wurde, sind Orte, die von einem Augur für einen öffentlichen Kult bestimmt wurden, heilige Stätten (loca sacra) und als solche durch priesterliche Weihe (dedication) zu bestätigen."

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

is a defined area[6] which a community (the believers) connects to the power or presence of a certain deity and which, consequently, is different from the surrounding area, which is in turn considered as profane. The resulting separation between holy and profane, however, does not exist unless the aforementioned believers[7] adopt it as their religious benchmark and communicate it accordingly in their society. Apart from the respective area's decoration with regard to architecture and handicraft, this purpose of inner and outer representation is served by the establishment[8] of an *exclusive*, *organized*, and *repeatable* cult. The legitimization of the respective place crucially depends on the latter, as the practised cult – i. e. rites with a clearly regulated sequence – establishes a binding relationship between man and the local deity. With this step, the so defined *holy place* receives immanent meaning in the life of every single believer, who in turn recognizes this relationship[9] and subsidises the place's maintenance.

The interaction between man, deity and the connected *holy place*, as briefly described above, is remarkable insofar as it ultimately excludes the existence of a so defined area *sui generis.* Man is at the centre of the demonstrated definition, as it depends on him to identify the area with a deity and to communicate this association in his society. Associated elements, like the construction of a temple or the installation of statues, idols or altars, serve this purpose and, viewed objectively, have neither origin in nor part of a divine power. Correspondingly, the accompanying cult is to be understood as a meaningful interpretation of the perceived connection between the object – a place of supposed divine provenance – and the believer. Objectively, this instance also lacks the influence of divine power, as the cult is reflected and established only by man. As a consequence, the beginning and the end of the designation of an area as holy is not a deity, but man, who differentiates the place from the profane surroundings by declaring it as holy. Thus the concept of a *holy place* – at least according to this definition – depends on the subjective perception and evaluation by man. Nevertheless the absolute holiness of an area needs to be questioned in light of the central role of the anthropological component.

6 Cf. C. Elsas, Art. Kultort, 32; D. Baudy, Art. Heilige Stätten, 1551; J.P. Brereton, Art. Sacred Space, 526.

7 Cf. C. Elsas, Art. Kultort, 32; J.P. Brereton, Art. Sacred Space, 526f.

8 Cf. B. Lang, Art. Kult, 475.478; A.F.C. Wallace, Religion, 75; J. P. Brereton, Art. Sacred Space, 526f.

9 See J.P. Brereton, Art. Sacred Space, 526; C. Elsas, Art. Kultort, 32.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

3. The Concept of Temple-Criticism in Acts

The presented definition's critical tendency to evaluate the existence of a *holy place* mainly as an anthropological phenomenon, however, seems attributed to the author[10] of Luke-Acts as well. As a matter of course, psychological interpretation aspects are less significant for the exegetical assessment of the subject-matter than verifiable influences of Jewish as well as Greek culture and philosophy. From this point of view, the evangelist's criticism or rejection does not appear to be limited to the cult of the gentiles alone, but also includes the institution of the Temple in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 6,13f). According to many of Luke's interpreters[11], this temple, which is after all the only place in Acts to be designated as *holy* twice (Acts 6,13; 21,28), would be evaluated as human workmanship which violated God's will and thus was ultimately doomed (cf. Acts 6,14; Joh 2,19; Mt 26,61; Mk 14,58). If one views this last statement, which is mentioned in both the process against Jesus (Mt 26,61; Mk 14,58; not in Luke) and the accusations against Stephen (Acts 6,11ff), analogous to the dramatic experience of Jerusalem's destruction (70 AD), one attributes the author's theological objections to his sources[12] and the tradition discovered within.

As mainly passed on in Stephen's defensive speech (Acts 7,1–53), Luke had adopted the ideas of a Jewish-Christian group which is generally designated as *Hellenists*. These Christians[13] of Jewish ancestry, who did not come from Palestine, but from areas in the erstwhile Diaspora (Egypt, Asia Minor etc.), were mainly open towards Greek culture and participated in the Greek-Roman lifestyle within defined limits. Following this thesis, the significance of the Temple in Jerusalem as Israel's religious centre was regarded more and more critically in context with this cultural opening of a Jewish group to the Greek, i. e. perceptively a gentile culture. Accordingly, Luke adopted this tendency with the inherited speech of Stephen, and intensified[14] it further under the impression of the ar-

10 This impression is conveyed by recent literature. See n.3.

11 Cf. M. Simon, Stephen, 153; H. Hübner, Theologie, 151; N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 77.

12 Scholars see the origin of this literary complex (Acts 6,8–15–7,1–15) in the traditions of the Antiochen church, which took a critical position against the temple and cult in Jerusalem. Cf. J.D.G. Dunn, Partings, 65; R. Pesch, Apostelgeschichte, 246; N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 72; G. Schille, Apostelgeschichte, 177; J. Bihler, Stephanusgeschichte, 170. For the thesis that sees the entire speech as a Lukan composition, see S. Arai, Tempelwort, 405; H.-J. Klauck, Stadt, 146.

13 Cf. D. Marguerat, Art. Hellenisten, 1615. In Acts, the term *Hellenist* may describe one of two groups of Jews from Asia Minor, who became Christians in Jerusalem (Acts 6,1). It also refers to the Jewish enemies of Paul outside of Palestine (Acts 9,29) or pagans out of the Hellenistic cultural sphere. However, a New Testament scholar speaking of *Hellenists* most likely refers to the first designation. See also J. Jeska, Geschichte, 266; N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 65; P. Esler, Community, 137f; C.C. Hill, Hellenists, 5–17; R. Pesch, Apostelgeschichte, 227 n.7.

14 Cf. N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 73.78f; T. Holtz, Stephanusrede, 107f.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

guments between Jews and Christians. The announced downfall of the Temple (cf. Mark 14,58; Matt 26,61; John 2,19; Acts 6,14), in this new context, was to be understood as a means of divine revelation[15] against the Jews' stubbornness and thus as part of God's eschatological plan.

In recent years, however, there has been an increasing number of voices[16] against this evaluation, pointing out that Luke repeatedly falls back on primarily Jewish positions. The accentuation of Jewish-Christian commonalities, in the discussion between Jews and Christians (cf. Acts 4,1–22; 5,17–33) as well as against the gentile outsiders (cf. Acts 14,14–17), makes one doubt any thesis attesting to a complete theological and sociological separation between Jews and Christians for the concept of Luke-Acts. Furthermore, the repeated orientation to the Temple (cf. Luke 24,53; Acts 2,46) is an argument in favour of a positive evaluation of this place. It is notable that the disciples, following the commandment from the risen Jesus (Luke 24,53), went to the Temple every day for prayers and announcements (cf. Acts 2,46). Furthermore, it is significant that the mission's first steps originate from exactly this place (cf. Acts 2,46; 3,1; 5,12), and the apostles adhere to it even in spite of hostilities (cf. Acts 4,21; 5,18f). Moreover, the author repeatedly underlines the unrighteous[17] motives (Acts 6,11.13) of those denouncers who accuse the apostles of preaching against 'this holy place' (λαλῶν ῥήματα κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου). In light of these motives, which put into perspective the tendency of an unambiguous criticism of a temple or a cult, it appears appropriate to question the corresponding theses and the connected classification of Luke as an opponent of holy places in general. The point of origin for a new attempt to understand the Lukan concept should be the lexeme χειροποίητος, as it is significant for dealing with the holy place of the Jews as well as with gentile places of worship. The general reproach 'the Most High does not dwell in houses made by human hands' (Acts 7,48), which connects Stephen's speech (Acts 7,1–53) to the argument between Paul and the silversmiths in Ephesus (Acts 19,23–40) and also his speech at Areopagus (Acts 17,16–34), constitutes the core of the demonstrated problem. It reflects the juxtaposition of

15 So argues N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 73; G. Schille, Apostelgeschichte, 177; J. Bihler, Stephanusgeschichte, 170; M. Simon, Stephen, 167f.

16 Cf. E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 379–395; T. Holtz, Stephanusrede, 110f. It may be an important thought that Luke uses the terms 'Jerusalem' and 'Temple' in a nearly synonymic form. Jerusalem is the place where God has his throne, so it is the Temple. Cf. J. Zmijewski, Stephanusrede, 102f.

17 Correspondingly, Acts 6,11 states that the enemies of Stephen 'secretly induced men' to speak against the Apostle (τότε ὑπέβαλον ἄνδρας λέγοντας). The used lexeme ὑποβάλλω describes a devious act (cf. W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 1681; H. Giesen, Art. ψευδής, 1186f) which clearly shows the corrupt intention of the men from the synagogue (cf. Acts 6,9). The witnesses (Acts 6,13), who shall speak against Stephen, are called 'false' by Luke (μάρτυς ψευδής), so it is clear that the charge is in fact a conspiracy (cf. W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 1777).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

human and divine acts and, within the framework of the stories in Acts, becomes relevant for the Christian as well as Luke's position. While this contrast, which is also included in the above-mentioned definition, refers to different traditions, it judges by one and the same criterion – χειροποίητος. This result requires a clarification of this term with regard to content and theological significance before it can be applied to the given question.

II.

1. χειροποίητος in Greek and Biblical Literature

In Greek literature, the lexeme χειροποίητος[18] can be verified since the 5th century BC (cf. Herodotus II, 149) and originally designated the difference between things originating in nature and things formed by man. However, the differentiation evoked by this usage of the term did not apply to cult objects or holy places. Both were widespread in Greek, Oriental and later Hellenistic culture[19] and were considered as a means of communication between man and God. This view was questioned only when the so-called *Stoic Enlightenment*[20] gained influence and – similar to Jewish argumentation – propagated God's independence of any human actions. However, the Stoic Enlightenment did not lead to a general breach with the traditional view, so both[21] views were still represented since the 2nd century BC.

This fundamentally negative attitude towards holy places or practised cults, however, is mentioned neither in the Old Testament nor in the LXX. The latter includes χειροποίητος continuously as an interpretation of the Hebrew noun אֱלִיל, which is usually translated[22] as *nothingness*, *false god* or simply *idol.* This spectrum of possible meanings for this lexeme makes it easy to deduce its decisive and potentially critical attributes: On the one hand, it exclusively designates deities who are to be differentiated from the God of Israel. On the other hand, these are described as idols[23] and invalid, i. e. as powerless, meaningless or even non-existent (cf. Deut 4,3–9; Jer 16,20; Wis 15,8). A further nuance of χειροποίητος,

18 Cf. E. Lohse, Art. χειροποίητος, 425f.
19 Cf. D. Baudy, Art. Heilige Stätten, 1551; A. Berlejung, Theologie, 321f; J. Woyke, Götter, 87.
20 This understanding may be seen as a result of their concept of God and the world. Cf. W. Weinkauf, Stoa, 55.110f; M. Pohlenz, Stoa, 84f; J. Roloff, Apostelgeschichte, 119.
21 Cf. H. Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, 98; M. Pohlenz, Paulus, 83.
22 See E. Lohse, Art. χειροποίητος, 426 (n.18); W. Gesenius / F. Buhl, Wörterbuch, 42; W. Rebell, Art. χειροποίητος, 1112ff.
23 Cf. J. Woyke, Götter, 69f; N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 79; C.K. Barrett, Acts 1, 373; R. Pesch, Apostelgeschichte, 257.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

which cannot be deduced from the mentioned basic meaning, has to be deduced from the literary context (cf. Isa 19,3[LXX]) in which the lexeme is always used in the texts of the Old Testament. In this context, the differentiation between the living God and the idols is accompanied by the notion that the latter exist only thanks to man's skill at handicraft[24] and thus are ultimately not more than a formed stone or carved wood. This statement is to be understood as a negation of any cultish worship of gods which assumes the presence of a deity in a manufactured idol.

> Of course, this judgement has to be regarded in the context of the cultural and especially religious surroundings, from which Israel differentiated itself with this polemic. The manufacture and installation of a statue or an altar in a holy place was not understood purely as a performance of handicraft in Israel's ancient Near Eastern surroundings. On the contrary, artful handicraft and divine transcendence melted into one object which was perceived as an earthly manifestation[25] of the sacred deity. This deity, according to common belief, was present in the object, which is why not only the object[26] itself, but also the area around it could be considered as *holy*. In this way, a direct connection[27] between the world of men and the divine realms was established, which the former could access via a cult, sacrifices or conjurations.
>
> It suggests itself that the aforementioned perception can be seen as the origin of the Jewish polemic towards idols[28] which is described here. The concept of direct access to the worshipped deity, by which the deity is made subservient to the will of man by a human action, is diametrically opposed to the image of the God of Israel, who is hidden[29] and always independent (cf. Isa 45,15). Therefore the already mentioned material criticism of the gentiles' idols seems to be not so much due to an enlightened view of religions, but rather due to the programmatic violation of the First Commandment (Exod 20,2 ff; Deut 5,6 ff). The reduction of foreign gods to the basic material they were manufactured from ultimately excludes their existence and enhances the uniqueness of the living God, who does not require such worship.

In the New Testament[30], χειροποίητος is usually understood as a basic differentiation concerning human actions towards God. In this context, the field of possible applications is remarkably wide; next to the evaluation of cult objects and holy places (cf. Acts 6,13; 17,16; 19,26b), it can also concern, for instance, the

24 Isa 46,6 states about the deites of Babylon 'οἱ συμβαλλόμενοι χρυσίον ἐκ μαρσιππίου καὶ ἀργύριον ἐν ζυγῷ στήσουσιν ἐν σταθμῷ καὶ μισθωσάμενοι χρυσοχόον ἐποίησαν χειροποίητα.' And Deut 29,16 marks them as 'τὰ εἴδωλα αὐτῶν ξύλον καὶ λίθον ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον ἅ ἐστιν.' Ps 135,15 announces at last that 'τὰ εἴδωλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων.' Cf. A. Berlejung, Theologie, 322.401 f; J. Woyke, Götter, 88; R. Brandscheidt, Gott, 13.

25 Cf. J. Woyke, Götter, 86 f; A. Berlejung, Theologie, 322.401 f.405 f.

26 Cf. D. Baudy, Art. Heilige Stätten, 1551; J.P. Brereton, Art. Sacred Space, 527.

27 See n.9.

28 Cf. R. Brandscheidt, Gott, 12 f; A. Berlejung, Theologie, 322.404 f.

29 Cf. C.W. Stenschke, Portrait, 98 f; H. Külling, Bedeutung, 76 f; J. Woyke, Götter, 71; R. Brandscheidt, Gott, 12 f; A. Berlejung, Theologie, 401–411.

30 Cf. E. Lohse, Art. χειροποίητος, 426; W. Rebell, Art. χειροποίητος, 1113.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

circumcision of Jews (cf. Eph 2,11). However, the argumentative link back to the criteria of the Old Testament, in this context, is beyond question and always emphasized.

2. The Old Testament Concept of χειροποίητος in the Reception of Acts

Luke's already noted recourse to the texts and theology of the LXX suggests an equivalent usage of the lexeme χειροποίητος in the context of the given concept analysis. This assessment corresponds to the frequently repeated accentuation that the apostles were Jews after all (cf. Acts 16,20; 19,34; 22,3), and the Gospel ultimately contained Israel's very own hope for salvation. This correlation becomes apparent, for instance, in the argument between Paul and the silversmith Demetrius (cf. Acts 19,23–40). This episode underlines that the evaluation of manufactured idols as χειροποίητος was part of the apostle's teachings (Acts 16,26b), which is why the public usually perceived him as a Jew (cf. Acts 19,34).

The scene in which Paul talks at Areopagus (Acts 17,16–34) is even more enlightening for the assessment of how Luke uses χειροποίητος in Acts. Due to the provocation of his spirit (Act 17,16), he starts preaching the Gospel about *Jesus and the Resurrection* (ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν εὐηγγελίζετο) to the inhabitants of Athens. This causes an argument with representatives of the Epicureans and the Stoics (V.18a), who dismiss his speech as nonsense (τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν). In his subsequent reaction (VV.22–31), Paul firstly refers back to his received impression about the religious and cultish life of the city dwellers (cf. Acts 17,22b), according to which the city was κατείδωλος, i. e. characterized by idols[31] and their worship. These are generally judged as χειροποίητος, and at the same time compared to the Creator God who does not require such objects or cults. It is notable, however (and questions about the Athenians' ability to recognize God on their own have to be left aside here), that Luke lets his apostle start with a positive remark regarding the altar, dedicated to the ἀγνώστος θεός (V.23), who is introduced as the God of Israel in a further step (VV.24ff). Considering the generally negative attitude of Stoics towards the concept of a holy place, or the reservations of the Jewish idol-polemic against such institutions, Luke appears in this instance to demonstrate a special view towards the altar, which was built by gentiles, but nonetheless stands out from the condemned idols in the introduced interpretation by Paul towards the God of Israel. Although it has become apparent that the evangelist falls back on Jewish tradition in this context, a categorical rejection of such a place cannot be deduced here.

31 Cf. W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 855; F. Büchsel, Art. κατείδωλος, 377; W. Trilling, Art. κατείδωλος, 667.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

This still leaves open the question regarding a general evaluation of Luke's opinion about holy places.

III

1. The Temple, the Law and the Charge of Blasphemy in Acts 6,8–15

The speech of Stephen (Acts 7,1–53) appears to address the issue at hand more significantly than the already mentioned examples (Acts 17,16–34; 19,23–40), as it refers to a place (Acts 6,13) which is explicitly designated as τόπος τοῦ ἁγίου. In this polemically phrased text, the Hellenist Stephen confronts his opponents who, remarkably, are distinguished as Jews from Asia Minor – i.e. Cyrene, Alexandria, Cilicia and Asia (Acts 6,9) – with an outline of Israel's history (Acts 7,1–47) in which patriarchs and prophets are presented as being constantly challenged by Jews (τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἐδίωξαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν; [Acts 7,52]). This timeline, which connects Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses in detail, Joshua, David, and finally Solomon, is concluded with the construction of the Temple in Jerusalem (Acts 7,47), which the speaker appears to call χειροποίητος (cf. Isa 66,1 f) in the subsequent verse, which is usually read[32] in immediate dependence. The following statement (Acts 7,51) to the effect that Israel was obstinate (σκληροτράχηλος) and its people had obdurate hearts (ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις) rounds off the established impression that Stephen, and in the end Luke as well, were in harsh opposition[33] to the holy place of Israel.

The recent criticism of this thesis has already been mentioned, which is why it appears necessary to have a look at the framework the speech is embedded in. The point of origin is an argument between the apostle, who features the attributes of one of God's messengers[34], and Jews from provinces in Asia Minor. This group, which Stephen himself[35] ultimately belongs to, and which furthermore has to be categorized as tending to be temple-critical, eventually instigates men to accuse the apostle of having spoken blasphemous words (ῥήματα βλάσφημα) against Moses and God (Acts 6,11).

Even though βλασφημία in the LXX is used as a translation for many different Hebrew words, these words are connected nonetheless by a common tendency

32 See n.11.

33 See n.14.

34 See about this matter R. Pesch, Apostelgeschichte, 236; J. Roloff, Apostelgeschichte, 113.

35 As for the valuation of the charge, the ironical moment in this setting should not be overlooked. The Jews of Asia Minor argue against Stephen with topics, which are most likely close to their own opinion. See for that n.13. Furthermore N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 66.84; J. Roloff, Apostelgeschichte, 107; M. Simon, Stephen, 167; C.C. Hill, Hellenists, 44–49.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

with regard to content. This lexeme, in the end, always describes a relationship[36] to God which is damaged in some way (cf. Isa 52,5; 66,3; Ezek 35,12). Consequently, Stephen does not at first (Acts 6,11) consider himself to have been confronted with a concrete accusation, but rather with the suggestion that he had turned against God himself in his speech. A specification of the accusation follows immediately afterwards (Acts 6,13), stating that he had spoken against 'this holy place, and the Law' (λαλῶν ῥήματα κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου καὶ τοῦ νόμου). In essence, this statement certainly does not change the underlying facts, as it only identifies Moses with his task (mediator of the Law), which is decisive and relevant for Israel, as well as God with the Temple. However, this juxtaposition[37] of Law and the place where God lets only his name live (cf. 1Kings 3,2; 6,13), vis-à-vis Moses and God in the previous statement, implies a theological intensification that would probably barely have found acceptance even in Judaism. While Moses is legitimately designated as mediator of the Law, and thus of the covenant between God and Israel, the supposed concretion of the accusation makes exactly this covenant dependent on the Temple in Jerusalem.

This fateful relationship is made even more apparent when the subsequent statement from the opponents is added (Acts 6,14b), which they ascribe to Jesus. Luke takes the originally eschatological wording[38], according to which Jesus will destroy the Temple to rebuild it within three days, from the context of the accusations against Jesus (cf. Mark 14,58; Matt 26,61; John 2,19) and conveys it to the accusation against Stephen in adapted form. According to this, Jesus – and this is the difference to the eschatological approach, which sees this act as part of God's fulfilment of the covenant – will demolish the Temple and thereby (causally)[39] change the Law (ἀλλάσσω). Thus, the apostle's opponents no longer see the Law, but the *holy place* as the guarantor for the preservation of Israel's election.

36 Cf. K. Haacker, Stellung, 1522; H.W. Beyer, Art. βλασφημία, 620; W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 284f; O. Hofius, Art. βλασφημία, 529.

37 Cf. F.D. Weinert, Luke, 89; K. Haacker, Stellung, 1523; S. Arai, Tempelwort, 409f; S.G. Wilson, Gentiles, 148f.

38 Cf. J. Gnilka, Matthäusevangelium, 426f; R. Schnackenburg, Johannesevangelium, 364; E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 390; G. Schille, Apostelgeschichte, 177. N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 73 n.51, argues that 'it would seem more likely that Luke is here, as in the trail narrative, avoiding the identification of Jesus as the agent of destruction.'

39 So J. Roloff, Apostelgeschichte, 114.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

2. The Construction of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7,1–53)

With regard to form, the speech has to be divided into an argumentative (Acts 7,1–46) and a concluding, or rather accusing part (Acts 7,47–53). Not only do these have to be put in relation to each other – independent of its status as a source, the text does not exist in a vacuum – but they also have to be understood as a reaction[40] to the reported accusation against the apostle. When regarded in such close relation, the aforementioned indications, according to which Stephen talks with strength and wisdom (Acts 6,8), his opponents cannot withstand him (Acts 6,10), and the instigated men are false witnesses (μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς), do not only show the defendant's innocence[41], but impart to the reader a premonition that the subsequent speech[42] will contradict the accusations, as well as disprove them in terms of a defence.

The speech starts with Abraham (Acts 7,2–8), the progenitor of all of Israel, with whom God made a covenant, independent of a connection to property of land (cf. Acts 7,3ff).

> As a side note, one can mention at this point the argumentation Paul presents with reference to Gen 15,6 in the letter to the Galatians and Romans (cf. Gal 3,6ff; Rom 4,3). In this instance, Abraham's unconditional obedience, with which he reacts to God's word and leaves his homeland into the unknown, is stylized to a precondition[43] for the covenant and, consequently, for Israel's election.

The transition from the progenitor to Moses, i. e. the part of the argumentation that is explained in most detail in the historic outline (VV.20–44), derives from Joseph. For the first time, this paragraph draws a dividing line[44] between the servant, and thus God's will, and the Israelites, who are represented by their tribal ancestors. This discrepancy is elaborated further in the following. Moses acts against the injustice committed against his people, who are not only unjust

40 The main speech (Acts 7,1–53), together with the controversy and accusation (Acts 6,8–15) and the stoning (Acts 7,54–60), generates a thematic complex around the character of Stephen which stands out from the main story. This form most likely evokes the literal concept of the so-called 'dramatische Episode' (dramatic episode), which is one of the most impressive stylistic instruments used by Luke (cf. E. Plümacher, Lukas, 80–136). Its purpose is to provide just this form of protrusion to introduce a special thought into the story (op.cit., 92).

41 Cf. E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 382; H. Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, 45; F.D. Weinert, Temple, 89.

42 Cf. R. Pesch, Apostelgeschichte 1, 244.

43 For a theological analysis of this picture by Paul see M. Wolter, Paulus, 343f.

44 So Acts 7,25 mentions ὅτι ὁ θεὸς διὰ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ δίδωσιν σωτηρίαν αὐτοῖς· οἱ δὲ οὐ συνῆκαν. This idea becomes clearer if it is understood that Luke stands for a chronological concept, which sees the fathers, prophets and finally the apostles as tools under the guidance of God. About this thought cf. J. Jeska, Geschichte Israels, 262f (n.13); N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 78; M. Wolter, Doppelwerk, 288f.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

among one another (V.26) but also accuse him of being a murderer; he leads Israel from Egypt (V.36) and is the mediator of Covenant and Law (VV.38f), but his people turn away from God and have an idol manufactured (V.41). Eventually, the *tabernacle of Moloch* is confronted with the *tabernacle of testimony* (VV.43.44). While one construct symbolizes Israel's denunciation of God, the other is part of God's promise of salvation[45] conveyed by Moses and leads over to the land appropriation and David's kingship. Constructed in a complex of two verses, the latter is first declared as willed by God (V.46a) and concluded in a second step (V.47) with the construction of the Temple by Solomon.

3. Stephen's Argumentation

Before one can deal with the speech's conclusion (Acts 7,48–53), one first has to make a few comments regarding the historic outline. First of all, the description of Israel's history is formally an enumeration[46] which ends only when the Temple's construction is mentioned. In such a literary construct (cf. Gen 5; Deut 1; Matt 1,1–17), the particle δέ, which preludes V.47 and which is occasionally used to deduce a qualitative contradiction[47] between the Temple and God's will, is supposed to indicate the completion[48] of the chain of events. The contrary character this lexeme can (optionally) have is only of a rather weak nature[49], which is why it is barely suitable to demonstrate an unambiguously negative position. To the contrary, the Temple is seen as the ultimate expression of the Law[50] like the tabernacle of testimony (Acts 7,44), the land appropriation (Acts 7,45a) and the kingship (Acts 7,45b) before it. The tone adopted towards the Temple is consequently rather positive and not to be assessed as rejecting.

Furthermore, an inclusive wording[51] is used in those passages of the speech that mention the ancestors or the people of Israel, including the Jewish accusers as well as the speaker Stephen. This aspect is meaningful when one tries to

45 Cf. J. Roloff, Apostelgeschichte, 123f; R. Pesch, Apostelgeschichte 1, 256.

46 Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, Acts, 364; J. Zmijewski, Stephanusrede, 94; J. Roloff, Apostelgeschichte, 117; J. Jeska, Geschichte, 28–43; T. Holtz, Stephanusrede, 106.

47 About this problem cf. S. Arai, Tempelwort, 408 n.33.

48 Cf. F. Blass / A. Debrunner / F. Rehkopf, Grammatik, § 447.1.d.f; W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 340, states that the lexem δέ is in most cases used as a particle to combine phrases.

49 Cf. F. Blass / A. Debrunner / F. Rehkopf, Grammatik, § 447,1.f: "δέ steht sehr häufig als bloßer Übergangspartikel, ohne irgendwie bemerkbaren Gegensatz"; likewise W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 340, states that the lexeme δέ may express a connection with a "kaum empfundenen Gegensatz" (op.cit., 340).

50 Cf. F.D. Weinert, Temple, 90; E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 359; T. Holtz, Stephanusrede, 112f.118; S. Arai, Tempelwort, 408f.

51 Most of the time, Stephens refers to the ancestors as 'our fathers' (cf. Acts 7,2.4.11. 12.15.19.38.39.44.45. 51.52).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

transfer the verbalized criticism of Israel to a level that strictly differentiates[52] between Jews and Christians. Before the speech, Stephen was confronted with an accusation that questioned[53] his status as an Israelite and thus as part of God's chosen people. As the indicting conclusion (VV.48ff) shows, he returns this accusation to his opponents, to whom he proves[54] by means of the historic facts that Israel itself has always opposed God and his servants. At the same time, the apostle, who – as already mentioned – announced God with strength and wisdom, assumes the role[55] of the prophet discarded by his people (Τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἐδίωξαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν;), who is not only in the right, but who also acts in obedience to God according to the Law.

4. The Temple as an Aspect of the Fulfilment in God's Eschatological Plan

This leaves the charge of the blasphemous talk about the Temple (Acts 6,13). Beyond the established separation between the two paragraphs, the Isaiah quote (Isa 66,1f) preluding the speech's conclusion (Acts 7,49f) is barely suitable to making plausible a fundamental criticism of the place that is repeatedly called *holy* in Acts. As indicated above, the lexeme χειροποίητος, in the context of the Old Testament, acts as a collective term for any kind of cult[56] involving the worship of an idol. With regard to the long enumeration of Israel's history (VV.1–46), the people's repeatedly described denunciation of God, the call for the Golden Calf (V.41) or the reference to the tabernacle of Moloch (V.43) appear to be more obvious targets of the judgement than the Temple of Solomon (V.47).

Furthermore, the Amos quote in Acts 7,42f (Amos 5,25–27), already included in the historic outline, also suggests that Stephen aims his counterclaim at Israel's continuous service to idols. In this instance, Luke uses his template so skilfully that it meets his thematic requirements. While the prophet originally asks the question of whether Israel had sacrificed to God even once during the forty years of walking through the desert (μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι ἔτη

52 See W. Manson, Epistle, 36.86; E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 394.

53 This situation in mind, it is not surprising that Stephen's response aims at the question of the election of Israel. See E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 386; K. Haacker, Stellung, 1522.

54 Cf. H. Hübner, Theologie, 149; D.D. Sylva, Meaning, 274.

55 It is striking that Stephen does not make any direct reference to Jesus or the Gospel. Instead, he stresses the accusation, the relationship between Israel, God and the Apostle.

56 So argues J.L. McKenzie, Isaiah, 203: 'If this poem (Is 66,1–4) is to be treated as a unity […], it is hostile to the cult.' And J.W. Watts, Isaiah, 356, states in reference to Isa 65,4 that Israel 'fixed their choice on things that meant nothing to God (sacrifices, etc.).' See further R. Brandscheidt, Gott, 13.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμω, οἶκος Ἰσραηλ;), Luke intensifies[57] it insofar as stating that the people had never sacrificed to God, but always to the idols. The same tendency to criticism of cults, already with regard to a possible guarantee of salvation, can be deduced from the literary environment the mentioned Isaiah quote (Acts 7,49 f) is taken from. In this context (Isa 66,3 ff), it is emphasized that God does not care for sacrifices or cults, but only for the faith[58], i. e. Israel's steering towards him.

The significance of the Temple, which can definitely be considered as holy in direct connection to the tabernacle of testimony, remains untouched despite all these statements. Against the accusation's tendency (Acts 6,11.13), it is not equated with God, but considered rather as an aspect of the *covenant's fulfilment*, subject to the Law. In essence, this cancels the earlier postulated interdependence of Temple and Law. However, this step not so much touches the place's status, but rather its cultish evaluation by Stephen's opponents. Their conception that the Temple is ultimately an institutional guarantor[59] for the preservation of the Law, and thus holy, is not shared; on the contrary, Stephen demonstrates that its position stands for a part of the Law's fulfilment, which in the end is congruent with the one represented by the prophets and the chosen Israel.

IV.

Holy Places in Acts (Conclusion)

So what is Luke's position on the concept of a holy place? In the first instance, the analysis of the individual texts relevant for this question has revealed that the generally represented position is always complementary to the views and reasoning in the Old Testament. It enhances God's uniqueness and also rejects the existence of other gods as well as their institutionalized cults. At the same time, it has been shown that a causal connection between the cultish appraisal of a deity and a predictable certainty of salvation is rejected even in the context of the

57 Cf. H. Hübner, Theologie, 150; H. Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, 55; T. Holtz, Stephanusrede, 108 f; G. Stählin, Apostelgeschichte, 110.

58 J.W. Watts, Isaiah, 356, stresses that Isa 66,1 ff is to be understood as an eschatic vision, which shows a forecast of the way, which God intends to go in his way of salvation. The people who turned towards him will be saved. All men who turned away are shown that everything they relied on, like temples, idols or sacrifices, are less than nothing in front of God. See also J.L. McKenzie, Isaiah, 203, who states that God showed in the vision that he is 'hostile to the cult.' Cf. G.I. Davies, Destiny, 118; T. Holtz, Stephanusrede, 110 f; R. Brandscheidt, Gott, 17 f.

59 See n.37.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Temple in Jerusalem. Consequently, at least according to the above postulated definition of a holy place, this can be interpreted as criticism of this concept.

Even though the criticism of an interdependent triad between cult, sanctuary and acquired salvation is consistently postulated by Luke, the description of the Temple in Jerusalem is remarkably positive at the same time. Not only is it put on the same level with the Law and the tabernacle of testimony in Stephen's speech, both of which emphatically go back to God's will; the deliberate devaluation of the opponents also shows that the voiced accusations against Stephen do not reflect reality, i. e. that he supports God, Moses, the Law and the Temple. One could easily mention other passages in Luke-Acts which give the impression that the Temple played a major role in the life of the Christians Luke introduces. Apparently, the author represents a concept of holiness which, detached from the criticised regularities, tolerates the existence of holy places. To follow up on this thought, a second look at Stephen's speech suffices: While he describes the vocation of Moses (Acts 7,33), the angel of God talks to him and unexpectedly explains that he is standing on holy ground (γῆ ἁγία). This indication is dispensable for the argumentative progress of the enumeration, which is to show the discrepancy between Israel and God's prophets. With regard to the question of the possible existence of a holy place, however, it reveals its worth; obviously this possibility is affirmed[60] in this instance, if only under the premise of a direct address between God and man. If the criterion of assuming a holy place where God and man interact is applied to the Temple in Jerusalem, several scenes, statements and facts in Luke-Acts come to mind which support this thesis. During the so-called cleansing of the Temple (Luke 19,45 ff), for instance, Luke's Jesus exposes by means of an Isaiah quote (Isa 56,7) that 'My (God's) house shall be a house of prayer' (γέγραπται· καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς) – the most insistent form of communication[61] between God and man. Apparently following this insight, the community in Jerusalem meets in the Temple for prayers every day (Acts 2,46), but no longer participates in the cult. Consequently, while Luke distances himself from the cult in Jerusalem, the Temple as a place of prayer[62] and imploration to God (cf. 1Macc 7,37) remains a *holy place.*

60 E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 388, went even further and notes that any place where God is encountered has to be called a *holy place.* This disregards, however, the connection between God and man as a meaningful element for the definition of this subject.

61 Cf. G.D. Alles, Art. Gebet, 483; M. Wolter, Lukasevangelium, 653 f; E. Larsson, Temple-Criticism, 386; H.-J. Klauck, Stadt, 142.

62 M. Wolter, Lukasevangelium, 636, uses 1Macc 7,37 as an argument to open a passage for the connection between the temple as a holy place and the cult. Nevertheless, this Old Testament verse (1Macc 7,37) highlights the communicative relation between man and God via prayer as a main characteristic of the Temple in Jerusalem. See about that F.D. Weinert, Temple, 90; J. Jeska, Geschichte, 264; S. Arai, Tempelwort, 409; N.H. Taylor, Stephen, 73; R. Pesch, Apostelgeschichte, 246.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

At the end of the analysis, there is a two-part result. First, it was possible to show that the thesis that Luke criticised cult and temple is right, as he focuses on a certain view or rather a function of holy places, which he generally rejects. Second, it can be seen that Luke sets the stage for a new understanding, putting the focus on the relationship between God and man to deduce a possibility of calling a place *holy*, or – in the case of the Temple in Jerusalem – of maintaining this status even for Christians.

Bibliography

Alles, G.D., Art. Gebet, in: RGG[4] 3 (2000) 483–485.
Arai, S., Zum 'Tempelwort' Jesu in Apostelgeschichte 6.14, in: NTS 34 (1988) 397–410.
Barrett, C.K., The Acts of the Apostles I. Preliminary introduction and commentary on Acts I–XIV (ICC 5,1), Edinburgh 1994.
Baudy, D., Art. Heilige Stätten I. Religionswissenschaftlich, in: RGG[4] 3 (2000) 1551–1552.
Bauer, W. / Aland, K. / Aland, B., Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, Berlin [6]1988.
Berlejung, A., Die Theologie der Bilder. Herstellung und Einweihung von Kultbildern in Mesopotamien und die alttestamentliche Bilderpolemik (OBO 162), Göttingen 1998.
Beyer, H.W., Art. βλασφημία, in: ThWNT 1 (1953) 620–624.
Bihler, J., Die Stephanusgeschichte im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte (MThS 16), München 1963.
Blass, F. / Debrunner, A. / Rehkopf, F., Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, Göttingen [18]2001.
Brandscheidt, R., Tragen, schleppen und retten. Der Gott der Führung und die Entmachtung der Götzen nach Jes 46,1–7, in: TThZ 112 (2003) 1–18.
Brereton, J.P., Art. Sacred Space, in: EncRel 12 (1987) 526–535.
Büchsel, F., Art. κατείδωλος, in: ThWNT 2 (1954) 376–377.
Conzelmann, H., Die Apostelgeschichte (HNT 7), Tübingen 1963.
Davies, G.I., The Destiny of the Nations in the Book of Isaiah, in: J. Vermeylen (Ed.), Le Livre D'Isaïe. Les Oracles et Leurs Relectures. Unité et Complexité de L'Ouvrage (BEThL 81), Leuven 1989, 93–120.
Dunn, J.D.G., The Partings of the Ways. Between Christianity and Judaism and their significance for the character of Christianity, London 1991.
Elsas, C., Art. Kultort, in: HRWG 4 (1998) 34–43.
Esler, P., Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts. The social and political motivations of Lucan theology, Cambridge 1987.
Fitzmyer, J.A., The Acts of the Apostles. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AncB 31), New York 1998.
Gesenius, W. / F. Buhl, Wilhelm Gesenius' Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, Berlin / Göttingen / Heidelberg [17]1962.
Giesen, H., Art. ψευδής, in: EWNT[3] (2011) 1186–1187.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Gnilka, J., Das Matthäusevangelium. Bd. 1. Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1–13,58 (HThK I/1), Freiburg / Basel / Wien 2001.
Haacker, K., Die Stellung des Stephanus in der Geschichte des Urchristentums, in: ANRW 26/2 (1995) 1515–1553.
Hill, C.C., Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church, Minneapolis 1992.
Hofius,O., Art. βλασφημία, in: EWNT[3] (2011) 527–532.
Holtz, T., Beobachtungen zur Stephanusrede Acta 7, in: Id., Geschichte und Theologie des Urchristentums. Gesammelte Aufsätze (WUNT 57), Tübingen 1991.
Hübner, H., Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. III. Hebräerbrief, Evangelien und Offenbarung, Epilegomena, Göttingen 1995.
Jeska, J., Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht des Lukas. Apg 7,2b–53 und 13,17–25 im Kontext antik-jüdischer Summarien der Geschichte Israels (FRLANT 195), Göttingen 2001.
Juel, D., Messiah and Temple. The trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark, Missoula 1977.
Klauck, H.-J., Die Heilige Stadt. Jerusalem bei Philo und Lukas, in: Kairos 28 (1986) 129–151.
Külling, H., Zur Bedeutung des Agnostos Theos. Eine Exegese zu Apostelgeschichte 17,22.23, in: ThZ 36 (1980) 65–83.
Lang, B., Art. Kult, in: HRWG 3 (1993) 474–488.
Larsson, E., Temple-Criticism and the Jewish Heritage. Some reflexions on Acts 6–7, in: NTS 39 (1993) 379–395.
Lohse, E., Art. χειροποίητος / ἀχειροποίητος, in: ThWNT 9 (1973) 425f.
Manson, W., The Epistle to the Hebrews. An Historical and Theological Reconsideration, London [4]1961.
Marguerat, D., Art. Hellenisten, in: RGG[4] 3 (2000) 1615.
McKenzie, J.L., Second Isaiah. Introduction, Translation, and Notes (AncB 20), New York 1979.
Pesch, R., Die Apostelgeschichte. Tlbd. 1. Apg 1–12 (EKK V/1), Zürich / Neukirchen-Vluyn 1986.
Plümacher, E., Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte (StUNT 9), Göttingen 1972.
Pohlenz, M., Paulus und die Stoa, in: ZNW 42 (1949) 69–104.
Pohlenz, M., Stoa und Stoiker. Die Gründer, Panaitios, Poseidonios, Zürich [2]1964.
Rebell, W., Art. χειροποίητος, in: EWNT[3] (2011) 1112–1114.
Roloff, J., Die Apostelgeschichte (NTD 5), Göttingen [17]1981.
Sabbe, M., The Son of Man Saying in Acts 7,56, in: J. Kremer (Ed.), Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie, Duculot / Leuven 1979, 241–279.
Schille, G., Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas (ThHK 5), Berlin [2]1984.
Schnackenburg, R., Das Johannesevangelium. Bd 1. Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1–4 (HThK IV/1), Freiburg / Basel / Wien 1979.
Simon, M., Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple, in: Id., Le Christianisme antique et son context religieux. Scripta Varia I (WUNT 23), Tübingen 1981, 153–168.
Stählin, G., Die Apostelgeschichte (NTD 5), Göttingen [11]1962.
Stenschke, C.W., Luke's Portrait of Gentiles prior to their Coming to Faith (WUNT 2 108), Tübingen 1999.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Sylva, D.D., The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46–50, in: JBL 106 (1987) 261–275.
Taylor, N.H., Stephen, the Temple, and Early Christian Eschatology, in: RB 110 (2003) 62–85.
Trilling, W., Art. κατείδωλος, in: EWNT[3] (2011) 667.
Wallace, A.F.C., Religion. An Anthropological View, New York 1966.
Watts, J.W., Isaiah 34–66 (WBC 25), New York 1987.
Weinert, F.D., Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts, in: BThB 17 (1987) 88–90.
Weinkauf, W., Die Stoa. Kommentierte Werkausgabe, Augsburg 1994.
Wilson, S., The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts (SNTS.MS 23), Cambridge 1973.
Wolter, M., Das lukanische Doppelwerk als Epochengeschichte, in: Id., Theologie und Ethos im frühen Christentum (WUNT 236), Tübingen 2009, 261–289.
Wolter, M., Das Lukasevangelium (HNT 5), Tübingen 2008.
Wolter, M., Paulus. Ein Grundriss seiner Theologie, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2009.
Woyke, J., Götter, 'Götzen', Götterbilder. Aspekte einer paulinischen 'Theologie der Religionen' (BZNW 132), Berlin / New York 2005.
Zmijewski, J., Die Stephanusrede (Apg 7,2–54). Literarisches und Theologisches, in: Id., Das Neue Testament. Quellen christlicher Theologie und Glaubenspraxis. Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und seiner Auslegung, Stuttgart 1986, 85–128.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Ian Boxall

Patmos as Holy Place in the Apocalypse

The year 1088 was a significant one in the identification of the island of Patmos as a holy place in the Christian imagination. It marked the foundation of the Monastery of St John the Theologian by the monk Christodoulos, who had been granted the island by the Byzantine Emperor Alexios I Comnenos, thus ensuring its future as place of pilgrimage in the Orthodox East. Yet, although the island had been depopulated for several centuries, due not least to pirate activity in the Aegean, Christodoulos's monastic foundation represented the revival rather than inauguration of a Christian presence on Patmos. Christodoulos discovered there the remains of a small chapel of St John, and a surviving fourth-century inscription testifies to the consecration by a certain Bishop Epithymitos of an altar to 'the esteemed apostle and Theologian'.[1]

Whether one dates the significant moment to the fourth or the eleventh century, few would dispute the identification of Patmos as sacred place in subsequent Christian history. Its popularity among Greek pilgrims as the 'Jerusalem of the Aegean' continues to the present, whilst its importance even for Western visitors is reflected in pilgrim guides and accounts from the Middle Ages onwards.[2] However, the further proposal which will be the subject of this essay – that Patmos functions as 'holy place' already within the biblical text, or for John the seer – is hardly considered in the scholarly literature.[3] Many commentators are content to explore the social situation of the first recipients of John's apocalyptic-prophetic letter, the seven churches of Asia (Rev. 1:4, 11).[4] They explore specific challenges faced by these early Christian congregations (whether external pressure from synagogue authorities or internal divisions provoked by

1 M. Angold, Church, 360; A.K. Orlandou, ΤΟΙΧΟΓΡΑΦΙΑΙ, 311.
2 E.g. L. von Suchem, Description, 29; Saewulf, Pilgrimage, 32; J. Mandeville, Travels, 53.
3 Rare exceptions who attend to the location of the implied author include H.D. Saffrey, Apocalypse, 385–417; D. Aune, Revelation, 76–80; F.W. Horn, Johannes, 139–59; E.-M. Becker, Patmos, 81–106; I. Boxall, Apocalypse, 22–33.
4 E.g. W.M. Ramsay, Letters; C.J. Hemer, Letters.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

the Nicolaitans or 'Jezebel').[5] By comparison, the island location of the author, and its significance for the wider interpretation of the Apocalypse of John, receives little attention from recent scholars.[6]

Yet there are at least two reasons for thinking that the theme of 'holy place' offers a fruitful avenue to be explored by commentators. First, closer attention to Revelation's literary antecedents (Jewish apocalypses and other visionary texts where visionary experience is closely tied to specific locations) reveals a strong interest in sacred geography, and on specific places as the terrestrial location for heavenly visions, or as 'gateways' into the heavenly realm. Second, although the archaeological and inscriptional evidence for Patmos from antiquity is not substantial, what has survived highlights its sacral character, at least among pagans, prior to John's stay on the island. This essay will therefore attempt a reading of the Apocalypse which prioritises the motif of place, and specifically Patmos as island of revelation and encounter with the holy throughout the book (and not simply for the inaugural vision of Rev 1:9–20 which contains the one canonical reference to John's island). It will seek to locate this discussion against the wider backdrop of Jewish and early Christian visionary texts, and to argue that the explicit identification of Patmos as an 'island' is of greater hermeneutical significance than often recognized. It will prioritize particular passages (Rev. 1:9–20; 10:1–11:3; 21:9–14) which may be especially illuminated by a strategy of 'reading for holy place'.

Patmos as Place in the Apocalypse

Our discussion begins with a reconsideration of the text of Revelation as a whole. What indications might there be for a more prominent role for Patmos as place, and specifically as holy place, within the Apocalypse? On the surface, the evidence does not appear promising, given that the biblical text mentions Patmos only once (at Rev 1:9). This stands in sharp contrast to places such as Babylon (Rev 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2, 10, 21), Jerusalem (Rev 3:12; 21:2, 10), and even the River Euphrates (Rev 9:14; 16:12), which play a more prominent role in the unfolding geography of John's book. Moreover, as some recent narrative critics have maintained, the identification of 'place' in the Book of Revelation is far from straightforward. James Resseguie, for example, talks of the various topographical

5 Recent examples include: P.B. Duff, Beast; S.J. Friesen, Cults.

6 This is in sharp contrast to the significant interest in Patmos shown by earlier, 'pre-critical' interpreters: see I. Boxall, Patmos.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

settings of the Apocalypse as 'symbolic, spiritual places that cannot be found on a physical map, although they may allude to well-known historical places.'[7]

However, the latter recognition may actually heighten the implicit role of Patmos in John's visionary narrative. Although Patmos, along with the seven churches of Asia, is often *differentiated* by commentators from those places (e.g. 'the great city', Babylon, Armageddon) which are given a more symbolic or mythic interpretation,[8] there is little hermeneutical justification for doing so. Jewish and Christian apocalypses tend to blur the distinction between literal and mythic geography, a point well made by Martha Himmelfarb.[9] Riverbanks provide the mundane setting for the in-breaking of the heavenly realm (the Chebar, Ezek 1:3; the Ulai, Dan 8:2; the Tigris, Dan 10:4), such that their significance is transformed as a result of what is seen there. Ezra's field of Ardat, whose precise location is uncertain, becomes the visionary location for the glorious rebuilding of Zion, 'of huge foundations' (*4 Ezra* 10:25–27). For Baruch, an oak in the Kidron Valley functions as the point of connection between his ordinary world and a visionary world. It is from there that he is lifted up by a 'strong wind' or 'powerful spirit' to be carried over the wall into Jerusalem. Yet the description of his journey – with four angels standing at the city's four corners – suggests a visionary Jerusalem invisible to the city's ordinary residents (*2 Baruch* 6:1–10). The two tours of Enoch in the Book of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 17–19; 20–36), particularly difficult to correlate with known geography, further blur the boundary between the literal and the symbolic.

Furthermore, the phrase τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ (Rev 1:9) invites a more symbolic interpretation of the geography of Patmos. This may be read in the light of the similar phrase at Rev 11:8, widely accepted as describing a geography which is non-literal: 'the great city, which is called allegorically [ἥτις καλεῖται πνευματικῶς] "Sodom" and "Egypt", where their Lord also was crucified.' Indeed, the passive voice of the participle καλουμένῃ at Rev 1:9 might suggest a divine passive, inviting even closer attention to the significance of this placename: if *God* has called this place 'Patmos', what might Patmos mean?[10] In this way, the text raises certain expectations for its readers: that Patmos, although potentially locatable on a physical map, is an integral part of that mythic geography which the remainder of the book presupposes, and might therefore feature in the visionary section of the book which begins at Rev 4:1 rather than being restricted to its opening frame. A mythic geographical location can be transformed as a result of what has been witnessed there, or even expand its boun-

7 J.L. Resseguie, Revelation, 32.
8 E.g. J. Sweet, Revelation, 15, 64.
9 M. Himmelfarb, Temple, 63–78.
10 I. Boxall, Patmos, 19–22. Other probable divine passives in Revelation include Rev 6:2, 4, 8, 11; 11:19; 12:5; 15:5; 19:11.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

daries in order to incorporate places which, on a literal map, might be located elsewhere.

An appreciation of the narrative flow of the Apocalypse strengthens the probability that Patmos functions (however implicitly) as narrative setting for more than just the inaugural vision of Rev 1:9–20, confirming but moving beyond David Barr's claim that on 'the first narrative level' of Revelation 'all the action takes place on the island of Patmos on the Lord's day'.[11] Given that John is expected to dictate the Son of Man's seven prophetic utterances while 'in the Spirit' on that day (Rev 2–3), he is still on Patmos when commanded to 'Come up here' at Rev 4:2. From that moment, he ascends 'in the Spirit' to the heavenly throne-room, and it is probably from heaven that he witnesses not only the slaughtered Lamb but also the sequences of seal and trumpet visions (Rev 6:1–9:21).

Nevertheless, his return to earth, presumably to the place from where he ascended, is assumed in Rev 10.[12] He does not simply witness the mighty angel descend to stand on both land and sea (Rev 10:2); he is able to approach this angel in order to take and devour the 'little scroll' at 10:8–11. A number of critical commentators comment explicitly on this shift of scene. Beckwith notes, for example: 'the Apocalyptist has, as it were unconsciously, changed his place from heaven (4[1]) to earth again; though this is not announced, it is clear that he is no longer in heaven; the angel descends from heaven and stands upon the earth when the Seer goes to him to take the roll (vv. 8f.), and the voice which directs the Seer comes to him *from* heaven (vv. 4, 8).'[13] That the most obvious terrestrial location is Patmos is a conclusion drawn by many artists in depicting the scene. Albrecht Dürer's classic woodcut illustrating the passage is modelled on German depictions of John on Patmos. Earlier still, Hans Memling's Bruges altarpiece portrays not only 'terrestrial' Patmos on which John sits, but also a smaller 'visionary Patmos' in the background where John receives the book.[14]

The geographical relationship of the 'temple of God' (Rev 11:1) to Patmos remains unclear, given that John is simply told to 'Rise and measure …', without any reference to an Ezekiel-like journey 'in the Spirit' (e.g. Ezek 11:24; 37:1; cf. Rev 4:1; 17:3; 21:10; *2 Baruch* 6:3). It is possible that this symbolic sanctuary is

11 D.L. Barr, Tales, 19. This narrative-critical point is valid, irrespective of whether John was still on Patmos when the Apocalypse was written, or indeed whether the book describes a series of visionary experiences occurring over several months or years, now framed as part of John's 'Patmos vision'.

12 Indeed, if the visionary John has undergone what modern psychologists call an 'altered state of consciousness', he has never physically left Patmos while witnessing the intervening heavenly visions 'in the Spirit'.

13 I.T. Beckwith, Apocalypse, 579–580; also W.J. Harrington, Apocalypse, 147.

14 For Dürer's woodcut, see e.g. R.H. Smith, Apocalypse, 52; on Memling, see N.F.H. O'Hear, Images, 87–104.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

located on Patmos itself, the island's boundaries suitably expanded to incorporate the vision.

Certainly, the most natural reading of Rev 13:1 is that John views the emergence of the sea beast from his island retreat, surrounded as it is by the Rome-dominated Aegean.[15] Indeed, the wider imaginative world of the Apocalypse presupposes the kind of vantage-point gained from an island such as Patmos, where the visible world is reduced to sea, islands, and mountains (e. g. Rev. 5:13; 6:14; 7:1–3; 8:8–9; 10:2–8; 12:12, 18; 13:1; 14:7; 16:3, 20; 18:17, 19, 21; 20:8; 21:1). Another possible candidate for a Patmos location is Mount Zion (Rev 14:1–5). This appears to be a terrestrial rather than heavenly location, given that John hears a voice 'from heaven' at verse 2. Yet no explicit change of location has been mentioned since 13:1, implying that John remains on Patmos as he sees a visionary Zion, rather than being transported to literal Jerusalem.

The evidence is more ambiguous regarding John's vision of the harlot Babylon 'in a wilderness', or his ascent to the 'exceedingly high mountain' to which the new Jerusalem will descend (Rev. 17:3; 21:10). In both cases, the parallels to Ezekiel might support a journey 'in the Spirit' to another part of the earth. Yet, although even more tentative, there are two reasons why a Patmos location might not be ruled out. First, the phrase ἐν πνεύματι is not accompanied by a reference to a specific location, in contrast to Ezekiel's visionary journeys (to Chaldea, Ezek 11:24; to the land of Israel, Ezek 40:2). Second, in the obvious parallel to Rev 21:20 in Ezek 40:2, the 'high mountain' to which Ezekiel is transported is clearly Mount Zion, the Temple Mount.[16] But if John has been able to see Mount Zion without the need for a journey elsewhere (Rev 14:1), there is no necessity for one here either. The new Jerusalem, prepared by God, need not descend to the site of the earthly Jerusalem.[17] An alternative is that the boundaries of John's tiny island expand in order to embrace a greater visionary world, just as Patmos also serves as the gateway to the even more expansive heavenly realm. Leonard Thompson's assertion that apocalyptic visions '*expand* the boundaries of the known world through esoteric knowledge'[18] can apply not simply to the integral relation between the heavenly and earthly, but also to the terrestrial and mythic dimensions of Patmos itself.

15 This interpretation is not dependent upon the minority reading ἐστάθην at Rev 12:18, rather than the better-attested ἐστάθη referring to the dragon. Thus John would witness the 'beast from the earth' (13:11) on Patmos itself.

16 M. Himmelfarb, Temple, 64. Its height testifies to Ezekiel's imagining of the Temple as located on the cosmic mountain of Canaanite myth.

17 Indeed, the claim of the Montanists is that it would descend upon the city of Pepuza in Asia Minor.

18 L.L. Thompson, Mapping, 114–127 (quotation from 119, italics in the original).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Not all these examples may be as convincing as others. Yet a careful reading of the Apocalypse in the light of other visionary texts supports the case for Patmos functioning as visionary location for more than the inaugural vision at Rev 1:9–20. If the heavenly throne-room represents the theologico-ethical perspective from which the reader is to interpret the unfolding visions (hence John's regular return to this scene: e. g. Rev 4:1; 7:9; 8:2; 11:19; 15:5), the island of Patmos functions as that terrestrial, and somewhat marginal, perspective which enabled John the seer and possible exile to penetrate the boundaries of the heavenly realm in the first place.

Patmos as Island

The specific claim for the 'marginality' of Patmos invites some consideration of John's explicit statement that he was 'on the *island* which is called Patmos [ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ]' (Rev. 1:9). Modern commentators tend to pass over this phrase too quickly, perhaps pausing simply to locate Patmos on a terrestrial map of the Aegean world, or to comment on the island's rocky, barren character. Yet, as already noted, the passive participle καλουμένῃ may convey more than is often acknowledged. Moreover, there is a second pertinent point to be made about this phrase: the fact that the island status of Patmos is explicitly highlighted invites exploration of the associations of islands for the wider biblical tradition, and of this particular island in the Graeco-Roman world.

I begin with the first point. For a Jewish-Christian prophet like John of Patmos, steeped in the prophetic literature of Israel, an 'island' would be primarily associated with the 'islands of the Gentiles' located in the far west of a world with Jerusalem at its centre.[19] In the LXX, the plural νῆσοι regularly refers to the 'islands of the nations' (e. g. LXX Gen 10:5, 32; Zeph 2:11; 1 Macc 11:38). When the LXX gives οἱ νῆσοι a more precise geographical location, they are often identified as islands to the west of the holy land, in the Mediterranean world (e. g. Tubal and Javan, i. e. Greece: Isa 66:19; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 1.124; Dan 8:21; 10:20; 11:2; Rhodes: Ezek 27:15; Kittim, i. e. Cyprus: Jer 2:10; Ezek 27:6). The phrase 'the islands of the sea' (e. g. LXX Isa 24:15; 1 Macc 14:5; 15:1) similarly refers to the Great Sea, the Mediterranean. Hence to a Palestinian Jew of the first century, references to the islands would imply 'all the lands to the west, beginning with Crete and Cyprus, which we would call islands, from the small marine rocks of the Aegean to Sicily, and to the lands over the sea to the West – Greece, Italy, and Spain.'[20]

19 For a discussion of the mythic geography implied by Jubilees 8–9, centred on Jerusalem, see e. g. J.M. Scott, Geography, 23–43.

20 E.F. Lupieri, Commentary, 29.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

This marginality in the Jewish mindset (though holding out the possibility that the islands would come to acknowledge the God of Israel in the last days, e. g. LXX Ps 71:10; Isa 42:10; 49:22; 66:19; Zeph 2:11) stands in stark contrast to the perspective of the classical world. The second-century CE Greek orator Aelius Aristides described the Aegean islands, which included Patmos, as lying at the very centre of the *oikumene* (Aelius Aristides 44.3–4). John's apocalyptic vision reflects the Jewish rather than the classical view. Patmos is one of the 'islands of the nations', marginal rather than central. Yet the strong influence of John's visionary predecessors – notably the Babylonian exiles Ezekiel and Daniel – enables an 'unveiling' in which the marginal becomes the central, and the profane the sacred. These prophetic visionaries had also encountered the holy in a place of the Gentiles, far from the sanctity of the holy city. John's own holy place is an equally unlikely location: an island under the sway of Rome, the world's new 'Babylon' (Rev 17).

Patmos as Pre-Johannine Holy Place

'In passing from Samos to Patmos we leave a land of classical archaeology for one the interest of which is wholly Biblical and ecclesiastical.'[21] So wrote the Revd Henry Tozer, nineteenth-century Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, describing one of a series of journeys undertaken by him to the Aegean islands. Yet this brief statement is profoundly misleading in its assertion that Patmos is of interest for 'wholly Biblical and ecclesiastical' reasons. When Christodoulos arrived on Patmos in 1088, his choice of the site for his monastic foundation seems to have been motivated by more than the presence there of a ruined Christian chapel. It was also the site of an ancient temple to the goddess Artemis, just one indication of the sacred significance accorded to Patmos in John's own day.

This memory of the island's sacred associations, predating the arrival of the Judaeo-Christian tradition, is attested by inscriptions surviving from antiquity. An undated inscription on a marble altar refers to Artemis under her local title of Artemis Patmia,[22] interpreted by Saffrey as evidence for a rival tradition (to that associated with Delos) of Patmos as the birthplace of Artemis.[23] More substantial is a second century CE honorific inscription to Vera, the ὑδροφόρος or priestess of Artemis, describing Patmos as 'the most august island of the daughter of Leto'.[24] This inscription gives an account of the establishment of the cult of

21 H.F. Tozer, Islands, 178.

22 D.F. McCabe / M.A. Plunkett, Patmos, inscription 003.

23 H.D. Saffrey, Apocalypse, 407–410. Naxos and Ephesus were other rival claimants to the privilege.

24 D.F. McCabe / M.A. Plunkett, Patmos, inscription 004.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Artemis (here Artemis Scythia) on Patmos: it links it to the son of Agamemnon, Orestes, as an act of recompense for his act of matricide. In the version of the story in Euripides, Orestes rescues a statue of Artemis, believed to have fallen from heaven, from barbarians and brings it to Athens. The Patmos inscription suggests that this cult statue would have been brought by Orestes to this island instead. It goes on to speak of a procession and hymns in honour of the goddess, and a reference to the 'temple of Artemis Scythia': [ἐν] αὐλαῖς Ἀρτέμιδος Σκυθίης.[25]

There is also some evidence, though less prominent than that relating to Artemis, that Patmos had a thriving cult of her brother Apollo.[26] This is unsurprising given the connections between Patmos and the mainland city-state of Miletos. In the Hellenistic period, Patmos served as one of a number of 'fortress' islands, protecting Miletos from invasion from the sea.[27] Linked as it was to the oracle-shrine of Apollo at Didyma (ten miles to the south) by a Sacred Way, Miletos claimed particular association with Apollo, whose image regularly appeared on the city's coins.[28] Didyma's Apollo was pre-eminently the god of prophecy, and his high priest was known by the title of 'the prophet', ὁ προφήτης.[29] Some indeed have located this prophetic motif, and other echoes of Apollo's cult, within the web of associations and allusions open to first audiences of John's Apocalypse.[30] John's book of true prophecy (e.g. Rev 1:3; 22:18–19) would then function in part as an antidote to the false prophecy emanating from cult centres such as Didyma.

Yet, whilst modern scholars might wish to highlight the potential of this pre-Christian tradition of holy place – perhaps to explain why this location might be especially appropriate for one seeking visionary experience – this can hardly be claimed for the author of the Apocalypse, nor for the text's 'point of view'. From the perspective of the Jewish-Christian prophet John, Patmos is doubly profane. It is a profane place first in its location among the 'islands of the nations', far removed from Jerusalem and its Temple located at the 'navel of the earth' (*Jub* 8:19; cf. Ezek 5:5; 38:12; Josephus, *Bell.* 3.52). Moreover, its position as an island sacred to the goddess Artemis, and possibly also associated with the cult of her brother Apollo, further accentuates its profane character. The Apocalypse leaves

25 V. Guérin, Description, 59; H.D. Saffrey, Apocalypse, 407–410; D.F. McCabe and M.A. Plunkett (D.F. McCabe / M.A. Plunkett, Patmos, Inscription 004) render this in terms of Vera returning to Patmos 'by the will [βουλαῖς] of Artemis Scythia'.

26 T. Stone, Patmos, 6. John's clash with the priests of Apollo on Patmos features prominently in the fifth-century CE apocryphal Acts of John by Prochorus.

27 Along with Lade in the Gulf of Latmos, Leros, Ikaria and Lipsi: A.M. Greaves, Miletos, 3–4.

28 J. Fontenrose, Didyma, 112–116.

29 M. Dillon, Pilgrims, 91–93.

30 A. Kerkeslager, Apollo, 116–121; I. Boxall, Apocalypse, 27–29.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

the reader in no doubt as to its attitude to idolatry: it is tantamount to 'playing the harlot' (e.g. Rev 2:14, 20; 17:2), deserving of the lake of fire and exclusion from the new Jerusalem (Rev 21:8; 22:15). Yet the breaking in of the heavenly realm as described in Revelation transforms this doubly-profane marginal location of Patmos into a holy place. If later traditions about the erection of the monastery on the site of Artemis' temple are reliable, then this pagan shrine would have been as prominent for inhabitants of Patmos in John's day as is the Monastery of St John the Theologian for visitors to the island in the present.

Prioritising Holy Place: Patmos as Temple

This 'local colouring' adds further support to the interpretation of John's inaugural vision (Rev 1:9–20) as a Temple vision, albeit one far removed from that central 'holy place', the holy city of Jerusalem 'at the navel of the earth'.[31] One of the main grounds for such an interpretation is the identification of the heavenly 'one like a son of man' as the heavenly high priest.[32] John describes this figure as 'dressed in a long robe with a golden girdle around his breasts [ἐνδεδυμένον ποδήρη καὶ περιεζωσμένον πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην χρυσᾶν]' (Rev 1:13). The description of his clothing recalls that worn by the high priest on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:4; cf. *Ep. Arist.* 96; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.153–55, 159; Philo, *Leg. All.* 2.56), a point noted by early commentators.[33] For Irenaeus, the long robe reaching to his feet symbolized his priestly office (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 4.20.11). Similarly, Victorinus's third-century Latin commentary describes the son of man as clothed 'in priestly garment [*in ueste sacerdotali*]', interpreted figuratively as 'his flesh which was not corrupted by death and which possesses through his death that eternal priesthood that was given to it.'[34] The same interpretation of the foot-length robe is followed by the sixth-century exegete Apringius and the eighth-century Bede the Venerable. For Apringius, it is 'the robe of the priesthood'; Bede identifies it as the priestly vestment which the Latins call the *tunica talaris.*[35]

31 The Book of Jubilees, building on the Table of the Nations in Genesis 10, identifies three holy places, all located in the territory of Shem: the Garden of Eden (identified as the 'holy of holies'), Mount Sinai in the wilderness, and Mount Zion at the 'navel of the earth' (Jub 8:17–19).

32 Or a figure who bears the characteristics of both high priest and king, 'the long robe of priesthood' and 'the golden cincture of royalty': W.J. Harrington, Apocalypse, 79. For the royal reference, W.J. Harrington points to 1 Macc 10:89.

33 C. Wolff, Gemeinde, 186–197; C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, Jesus, 57–79.

34 W.C. Weinrich, Texts, 2. Latin text from Victorin de Poetovio, L'Apocalypse, 48.

35 W.C. Weinrich, Texts, 116.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

More recently, some scholars have disputed this high priestly interpretation, or are at least equivocal. H.B. Swete, for example, regards the ποδήρης as denoting high office, usually though 'not necessarily' that of the high priest.[36] David Aune, whilst acknowledging that all the occurrences of ποδήρης in the LXX refer to a high priestly garment (Exod 25:7; 28:4, 31; 29:5; 35:9; Ezek 9:2, 3, 11; Zech 3:4; Wis 18:24; Sir 27:8; 45:81), nonetheless points out that it is used to translate five different Hebrew terms. Thus, he argues, it cannot be regarded as a technical term for the garment of the high priest. He also notes the lack of reference to other high priestly vestments: the ephod, trousers, turban and crown.[37] The same ambiguity is noted about the gold sash which the Son of Man wears around his breast: this is perhaps closer to Dan 10:5 than to the girdle of the high priest (Exod 39:29 = 36:37 LXX; though see Josephus, *Ant.* 3.153).

Yet, whilst the high-priestly identification of the 'one like a son of man' would strengthen the interpretation of Rev 1:9–20 as a temple vision, the latter is not dependent upon it. Even those who reject a high priestly interpretation of the ποδήρης acknowledge the 'temple' ambiance of the vision, with the sacral furniture of the seven golden menorahs in the midst of which the Son of Man stands (cf. Exod 25:31–40; Num 8:1–4; Josephus, *Ant.* 3:114–146).[38] The heavenly temple, on which the earthly is modelled, has descended to this remote section of the earth 'on the Lord's day'. It leaves open the possibility of reading the vision of Mount Zion at Rev 14:1, or the descent of the new Jerusalem (which combines the features of the Temple, the holy city, and that other 'holy place', the Garden of Eden) at Rev 21:10, in the same light.

But what has been noted above about biblical associations of 'the islands', and the identification of Patmos itself as a sacred island, offers a further dimension for interpreting this temple vision beyond the contrast with Jerusalem's Temple (whether still standing or now fallen).[39] First audiences across the water on mainland Asia Minor might also be expected to know (as would John) of the sacral associations of Patmos for contemporary pagans. The cultic interpretation of the vision – as the appearance of the one true temple on the island of Artemis – also allows a contrast with that rival temple of Artemis dominating John's island in the first century. Once this dimension is acknowledged, further echoes of Patmos's pagan present might be detected as part of the 'texture' of the vision: the contrast with Hecate, sometimes associated with Artemis, in the 'keys of death

36 H.B. Swete, Apocalypse, 15–16.

37 D. Aune, Revelation, 93–94; see also I.T. Beckwith, Apocalypse, 438; P. Prigent, Commentary, 136. For ποδήρης describing clothing other than that of the high priest, see e. g. Ezek 9:2, 11; Barnabas 7:9.

38 E. g. D. Aune, Revelation, 88–90.

39 The Apocalypse has been variously dated to the late-60s or mid-90s: see I. Boxall, Revelation, 7–10.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

and Hades' held by the Son of Man (Rev 1:18);[40] a sideswipe at the Apollo cult in the appearance of Christ as a divine being, uttering oracles through the mouthpiece of his 'prophet' John (Rev 2–3).[41]

Conclusion

The potential for treating Patmos as holy place in the interpretation of the Apocalypse is all but ignored in scholarly discussions of the book. The purpose of this essay has been to suggest that 'reading for holy place' offers a fruitful avenue for further exploration. Patmos as location may be more significant in the unfolding narrative of John's apocalyptic visions than is generally recognized. Moreover, these implicit allusions to Patmos describe scenes reminiscent of the Temple, or of the penetration of the boundary between heaven and earth, which transform the terrestrial location as a consequence: John's inaugural vision of the 'one like a son of man' as a temple vision, perhaps of the heavenly high priest (Rev 1:9–20); the descent of a mighty angel with a little scroll of revelation, enabling John to prophesy the divine word (Rev 10); the appearance of the Lamb standing on Mount Zion (Rev 14:1). It is even possible that Patmos serves as the vantage-point from which John views both the demise of the great city Babylon (Rev 17), and the descent of the temple-garden-city, the new Jerusalem (Rev 21).

What makes the identification of Patmos as 'holy place' so significant, as our exploration of the wider context has revealed, is that terrestrial Patmos is a 'doubly profane' location. As an 'island of the nations', far removed from Jerusalem and the holy land, it is marginal to the mythical map of Second Temple Jews and early Christians. Moreover, it is further profaned by the presence of its own temple to the goddess Artemis, dominating the skyline in a prominent position overlooking the main centre of population. Yet, through divine revelation and heavenly vision, this most 'unholy' of unholy places has become the location for the Holy of Holies itself. It may be that the roots of Patmos's sacred future – the monastic foundation by Christodoulos in 1088, its centrality as pilgrimage island for Orthodox Christians, and the popular designation of Patmos as the 'Jerusalem of the Aegean' – are more firmly embedded in the biblical text itself than has often been allowed.

40 D. Aune, Revelation, 104.

41 There may also be echoes of Artemis herself, as well as the birth of her brother Apollo to Leto, in the vision of the woman clothed with the sun, standing on the moon (Rev 12:1).

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Bibliography

Angold, M., Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni 1081–1261, Cambridge 1995.

Aune, D., Revelation 1–5 (Word Biblical Commentary 52a), Dallas 1997.

Barr, D.L., Tales of the End: A Narrative Commentary on the Book of Revelation, Santa Rosa CA 1998.

Becker, E.-M., Patmos – ein utopischer Ort? Apk 1,9–11 in auslegungs- und kulturgeschichtlicher Hinsicht, in: Saeculum 59/1 (2008) 81–106.

Beckwith, I.T., The Apocalypse of John. Studies in Introduction with A Critical and Exegetical Commentary, Michigan 1967.

Boxall, I., Patmos in the Reception History of the Apocalypse (Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs), Oxford 2013.

Boxall, I., Reading the Apocalypse on the Island of Patmos, in: Scripture Bulletin 40/1 (2010) 22–33.

Dillon, M., Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece, London/New York 1997.

Duff, P.B., Who Rides the Beast? Prophetic Rivalry and the Rhetoric of Crisis in the Churches of the Apocalypse, Oxford / New York 2001.

Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T., Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah. Part 2, in: Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus 5 (2007) 57–79.

Fontenrose, J., Didyma. Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions, Berkeley et.al. 1998.

Friesen, S.J., Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John. Reading Revelation Among the Ruins, Oxford / New York 2001.

Greaves, A.M., Miletos. A History, London / New York 2002.

Guérin, V., Description de l'île de Patmos et de l'île de Samos, Paris 1856.

Harrington, W.J., The Apocalypse of St John. A Commentary, London et.al. 1969.

Hemer, C.J., The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in their Local Setting (Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplements 11), Sheffield 1986.

Himmelfarb, M., The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira, in: J. Scott / P. Simpson-Hously (Eds.), Sacred Places and Profane Spaces. Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (Contributions to the Study of Religion 30), New York et.al. 1991, 63–78.

Horn, F.W., Johannes auf Patmos, in: F.W. Horn / M. Wolter (Eds.) Studien zur Johannesoffenbarung und ihrer Auslegung. FS Otto Böcher 70, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2005. 139–159.

Kerkeslager, A., Apollo, Greco-Roman Prophecy, and the Rider on the White Horse in Rev. 6.2, in: Journal of Biblical Literature 112 (1993) 116–121.

Lupieri, E.F., A Commentary on the Apocalypse of John (Italian Texts and Studies on Religion and Society), Grand Rapids et.al. 2006.

Mandeville, J., The Travels of Sir John Mandeville, transl. by C.W.R.D. Moseley, London 2005.

McCabe, D.F. / Plunkett, M.A., Patmos Inscriptions: Texts and List, Princeton 1985.

O'Hear, N.F.H., Contrasting Images of the Book of Revelation. A Case Study in Visual Exegesis (Oxford Theological Monographs), Oxford / New York 2011.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Orlandou, A.K., Η ΑΡΧΙΤΕΚΤΟΝΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΑΙ ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΑΙ ΤΟΙΧΟΓΡΑΦΙΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΜΟΝΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΟΥ ΠΑΤΜΟΥ, Athens 1970.

Prigent, P., Commentary on the Apocalypse of St John, Tübingen 2004.

Ramsay, W.M., The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, London 1904.

Resseguie, J.L., The Revelation of John. A Narrative Commentary, Grand Rapids 2009.

Saewulf, Pilgrimage of Saewulf to Jerusalem and the Holy Land, ed. by J.H. Bernard, London 1986.

Saffrey, H.D., Relire l'Apocalypse à Patmos, in: Revue Biblique 82 (1975) 385–417.

Scott, J.M., Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity. The Book of Jubilees (Society of New Testament Studies. Monograph Series 113), Cambridge 2002.

Smith, R.H., Apocalypse. A Commentary on Revelation in Words and Pictures, Collegeville 2000.

Stone, T., Patmos, Athens 1984.

Suchem, L. von, Description of the Holy Land, London 1985.

Sweet, J., Revelation (SCM Pelican Commentaries), London 1979.

Swete, H.B., The Apocalypse of St John. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices, London ^{2}1907.

Thompson, L.L., Mapping an Apocalyptic World, in: J. Scott / P. Simpson-Hously (Eds.) Sacred Places and Profane Spaces. Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (Contributions to the Study of Religion 30), New York et.al. 1991.

Tozer, H.F., The Islands of the Aegean, Oxford 1890.

Victorin de Poetovio, Sur l'Apocalypse suivi du Fragment chronologique et de la Construction du Monde, ed. M. Dulaey (Sources Chrétiennes 423), Paris 1997.

Weinrich, W.C. (Ed.), Ancient Christian Texts: Latin Commentaries on Revelation. Victorinus of Petovium, Apringius of Beja, Caesarius of Arles and Bede the Venerable, Downers Grove 2011.

Wolff, C., Die Gemeinde des Christus in der Apokalypse des Johannes, in: New Testament Studies 27 (1981) 186–197.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

List of Contributors

Dr. Ian Boxall is Associate Professor of New Testament at the Catholic University of America, Washington DC. He previously taught New Testament at St Stephen's House, University of Oxford.

Dr. Hywel Clifford is the Tutor in Old Testament at Ripon College Cuddesdon, Oxford; and a member of the Faculty of Theology and Religion at the University of Oxford. Hywel's research interests are in the areas of monotheism, early Greek philosophy, the thought of Philo of Alexandria, and the history of biblical interpretation.

Rev. Dr. Megan Daffern continues her post-doctoral research in the Psalms and the intersection between Biblical Studies and Linguistics, while teaching Old Testament Studies as a member of the Faculty of Theology and Religion in the University of Oxford. She is also the Chaplain of Jesus College, Oxford.

Dr. Jochen Flebbe is Privatdozent für Neues Testament at the Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Bonn University, and Lehrkraft für besondere Aufgaben at the Institut für Evangelische Theologie, University of Cologne.

Dr. Axel Graupner is Privatdozent für Altes Testament and Lehrkraft für besondere Aufgaben at the Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Bonn University.

Dr. Dominik Markl is Professor of Hebrew Bible Studies at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. Previously he taught at Heythrop College (University of London), Hekima College (Nairobi, Kenya), and Jesuit School of Theology (Berkeley, CA).

Dr. Andrea Spans studied Catholic Theology in Nijmegen and Münster/W. and the interdiciplinary Master 'Antike Kulturen des östlichen Mittelmeerraumes' in Münster/W. Since 2010 she is at the Alttestamentliches Seminar der Katholisch-

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919

Theologischen Fakultät, Bonn University, where she did her doctor's degree in 2014 with a thesis on Isa 60–62.

Dr. Hildegard Scherer is Privatdozentin für Neues Testament at the Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät, Bonn University, and Lehrstuhlvertretung at the Lehrstuhl für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaften, Theologische Hochschule Chur (CH).

Dr. Johannes Nikolai Tischler is Pastor at the Ev. Johanneskirche in Düsseldorf (Germany).

Dr. Till Magnus Steiner is working as a Research Assistant for Prof. Dr. Shimon Gesundheit at the Benno-Jacob-Edition-Project in Jerusalem (Israel) and he is Research Associate of the Department of Old Testament Studies, Faculty of Theology, at the University of Pretoria (South Africa).

Dr. Casey A. Strine, is Vice–Chancellor's Fellow and Lecturer in Hebrew Bible at the University of Sheffield. His research focuses on how the study of migration, especially, involuntary migration, aids interpretation of the Hebrew Bible and the reconstruction of ancient Israelite and Judahite history.

ISBN Print: 9783847105916 – ISBN E-Book: 9783847005919