Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

322

Anthropologie und Ethik im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament

Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen

Internationales Symposium in Verbindung
mit dem Projekt Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum
Novi Testamenti (CJHNT)
17.–20. Mai 2012, Heidelberg

Herausgegeben von
Matthias Konradt und Esther Schläpfer

Mohr Siebeck

Matthias Konradt, geboren 1967; Studium der evangelischen Theologie in Bochum und Heidelberg; 1996 Promotion; 1999 Ordination; 2002 Habilitation; 2003–2009 ordentlicher Professor für Neues Testament an der Universität Bern; seit 2009 Professor für Neues Testament an der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg.

Esther Schläpfer, geboren 1985; Studium der evangelischen Theologie in Bern und Durham (GB); 2010 Ordination; seit 2010 wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin an der Theologischen Fakultät der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg.

ISBN 978-3-16-152727-2
ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über *http://dnb.dnb.de* abrufbar.

Das Buch wurde von Gulde-Druck in Tübingen auf alterungsbeständiges Werkdruckpapier gedruckt und von der Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier gebunden.

Vorwort

Der vorliegende Band dokumentiert die Beiträge eines Symposiums, das vom 17. bis 20. Mai 2012 in Verbindung mit dem Projekt *Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (CJHNT) in den Räumlichkeiten des Internationalen Wissenschaftsforums Heidelberg (IWH) stattgefunden hat. Seit 2003 sind im Rahmen des CJHNT unter dem Leitaspekt der wechselseitigen Wahrnehmung von frühjüdischen und neutestamentlichen Texten an wechselnden Orten drei internationale Symposien durchgeführt worden. Nachdem der Fokus im Blick auf die frühjüdische Literatur 2003 (Eisenach/Jena) auf Philo,[1] 2006 (Greifswald) auf Josephus[2] und 2009 (Leipzig) auf den Zeugnissen hellenistisch-jüdischer Alltagskultur lag,[3] standen im Heidelberger Symposium die so genannten „Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments" im Zentrum.

Da diese ein wahrhaft weites und in sich äußerst vielgestaltiges Feld darstellen, empfahl es sich von selbst, die wechselseitigen Wahrnehmungen mit der Frage nach der Korrelation von Anthropologie und Ethik unter ein thematisches Dach zu stellen. Leitend war dabei die Überlegung, dass ethische Orientierungen in weltanschauliche Grundüberzeugungen eingebettet und daher nur dann adäquat zu verstehen sind, wenn sie als integraler Bestandteil der jeweiligen Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit analysiert und interpretiert werden. Die Korrelation von Anthropologie und Ethik verdient dabei besondere Aufmerksamkeit. Ethischen Orientierungen liegen – in den frühjüdischen wie neutestamentlichen Texten häufig implizit bleibende – anthropologische Prämissen zugrunde: Die Plausibilität und damit

---

[1] ROLAND DEINES/KARL-WILHELM NIEBUHR (Hgg.), Philo und das Neue Testament. Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. I. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum (1.–4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena), WUNT 172, Tübingen 2004.

[2] CHRISTFRIED BÖTTRICH/JENS HERZER (Hgg., unter Mitarbeit von Torsten Reiprich), Josephus und das Neue Testament. Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. II. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum (25.–28. Mai 2006, Greifswald), WUNT 209, Tübingen 2007.

[3] ROLAND DEINES/JENS HERZER/KARL-WILHELM NIEBUHR (Hgg.), Neues Testament und hellenistisch-jüdische Alltagskultur. Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. III. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum (21.–24. Mai 2009, Leipzig), WUNT 274, Tübingen 2011.

die Affirmationsattraktivität ethischer Überzeugungen hängen ganz wesentlich davon ab, ob diese durch ein entsprechendes Menschenbild getragen und unterstützt werden oder nicht. Auf dieser Basis untersucht der vorliegende Sammelband zentrale anthropologische und ethische Themen, die – in methodischer Anknüpfung an die Anlage der genannten drei CJHNT-Symposien – im Sinne wechselseitiger Wahrnehmungen jeweils paarweise aus einer frühjüdischen und einer neutestamentlichen Perspektive beleuchtet werden. Der thematische Bogen wird dabei vom Motiv der Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen über die Frage nach der Sünde und dem Umgang mit Gewalt sowie über Aspekte der Sexual- und Besitzethik und das Verhalten gegenüber Notleidenden bis hin zum „Ende des Menschen" gespannt. Ergänzend reflektiert der einführende Beitrag von John Barclay methodisch den „Dialog" zwischen frühjüdischen und neutestamentlichen Schriften, indem er Paulus und 4Esra miteinander in ein kritisches Gespräch bringt. In einem weiteren übergreifenden Beitrag erörtert Christfried Böttrich unter dem Leitmotiv „Menschenwürde – Menschenpflichten" Perspektiven universaler Ethik in den Henochschriften und im lukanischen Doppelwerk. Der Beitrag von René Bloch zu Joseph und Aseneth basiert auf dem öffentlichen Abendvortrag, der im Rahmen der CJHNT-Symposien zur guten Tradition geworden ist. Zur bewährten Tradition gehört ferner, dass die Vorträge und deren Diskussion durch originalsprachliche Textlektüren in Arbeitsgruppen ergänzt werden. Die Beiträge von Stefan Krauter und Todd Still sind aus den Arbeitsgruppen hervorgegangen. Allen Referentinnen und Referenten sei an dieser Stelle noch einmal nicht nur für ihren Vortrag und deren Ausarbeitung in Form der vorliegenden Beiträge, sondern auch für die engagierte Diskussion während des Symposiums herzlich gedankt.

Für Hilfe bei der Korrektur danken wir Rahel Brandt, Kathleen Ess und Annette Dosch. Dem Internationalen Wissenschaftsforum Heidelberg und seinen Mitarbeitern und Mitarbeiterinnen danken wir für die Möglichkeit, dass wir das Symposium in dessen Räumlichkeiten durchführen konnten. Unser Dank gilt ferner der VolkswagenStiftung, ohne deren Förderung das Symposium nicht hätte durchgeführt werden können, sowie dem Verlag Mohr Siebeck, der das Symposium durch einen finanziellen Beitrag unterstützt hat. Dem Verlag Mohr Siebeck, namentlich Dr. Henning Ziebritzki, sowie Prof. Dr. Jörg Frey sei darüber hinaus für die Veröffentlichung des Bandes und die Aufnahme in die WUNT-Reihe gedankt. Ilse König, der verantwortlichen Mitarbeiterin des Verlages, danken wir für die freundliche und sorgfältige Betreuung des Projekts.

Heidelberg, im September 2013

Matthias Konradt
Esther Schläpfer

Inhalt

Übergreifende Beiträge

Paarvorträge

Das imago-Dei-Motiv im hellenistischen Judentum und entstehenden Christentum

Gewalt als anthropologisches und ethisches Problem

Sünde und Tora

Der Mensch und seine Sexualität

Der Mensch und die Gefahren des Reichtums

Barmherzigkeit mit den Bedürftigen und Notleidenden und ihre anthropologischen Grundlagen

Das Ende des Menschen: Tod – Auferstehung – Gericht

Beiträge aus den Arbeitsgruppen

Abkürzungsverzeichnis

Die Abkürzungen folgen bei deutschen Beiträgen dem Abkürzungsverzeichnis der RGG[4] (Tübingen 2007). Für englische Beiträge gelten die Regeln des SBL Handbook of Style. For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies (Peabody, Mass. 1999). Darüber hinaus finden folgende Abkürzungen Verwendung:

1. Abkürzungen in deutschen Beiträgen, die im Abkürzungsverzeichnis nach RGG[4] fehlen:

ABG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Fortsetzung von: Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums)
SAPERE	Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam Religionemque pertinentia
EHAT	Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament

2. Abbrevations used in English contributions not to be found in The SBL Handbook of Style

LCL	Loeb Classical Library
SAPERE	Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam Religionemque pertinentia

3. Abkürzungen des CJHNT

3.1 Frühjüdische Schriften

3.1.1 Philo

A. Gesetzesauslegung, *Expositio legis*

Opif	De opificio mundi/Über die Weltschöpfung
Abr	De Abrahamo/Über Abraham
Jos	De Josepho/Über Josef
VitMos	De vita Mosis I–II/Über das Leben Moses
Decal	De decalogo/Über den Dekalog
SpecLeg	De specialibus legibus I–IV/Über die Einzelgesetze
Virt	De virtutibus/Über die Tugenden
Praem	De praemiis et poeniis/Über die Belohnungen und Strafen
Praem 79–126	auch: De Benedictionibus/Über die Segnungen
Praem 127–172	auch: De Exsecrationibus/Über die Flüche

B. Allegorischer Kommentar

LegAll	Legum allegoriae I–III/Allegorische Erklärung der Gesetze
Cher	De Cherubim/Über die Cherubim
Sacr	De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini/Über die Opfer Abels und Kains
Det	Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat/Über die Nachstellungen, die das Schlechtere dem Besseren bereitet
Post	De posteritate Caini/Über die Nachkommen Kains
Gig	De gigantibus/Über die Riesen
Imm	Quod deus sit immutabilis/Über die Unveränderlichkeit Gottes
Agr	De agricultura/Über die Landwirtschaft
Plant	De plantatione/Über die Pflanzung (Noahs)
Ebr	De ebrietate/Über die Trunkenheit
Sobr	De sobrietate/Über die Nüchternheit
Conf	De confusione linguarum/Über die Verwirrung der Sprachen
Migr	De migratione Abrahami/Über die Wanderung Abrahams
Her	Quis rerum divinarum heres sit/Über den Erben des Göttlichen
Congr	De congressu eruditionis gratia/Über das Zusammenleben der Allgemeinbildung wegen
Fug	De fuga et inventione/Über die Flucht und das Finden
Mut	De mutatione nominum/Über die Namensänderung
Deo	De Deo/Über die Gottesbezeichnung „wohltätig verzehrendes Feuer“ (nur arm., Siegert 1980)
Somn	De somniis I–II/Über die Träume

C. Fragen und Antworten, *Quaestiones et solutiones*

QuaestGen	Quaestiones in Genesim I–IV/Fragen zur Genesis (nur arm.)
QuaestEx	Quaestiones in Exodum I–II/Fragen zu Exodus (nur arm.)

D. Historische und apologetische Schriften

Flacc	In Flaccum/Gegen Flaccus
LegGai	Legatio ad Gaium/Gesandtschaft an Gajus
VitCont	De vita contemplativa/Über das betrachtende Leben
Hypoth	Hypothetika bzw. Apologia pro Judaeis (fragmentarisch bei Euseb, PraepEv VIII 6,1–9; 7,1–20; 11,1–18)

E. Philosophische Abhandlungen

Prob	Quod omnis probus liber sit/Über die Freiheit des Tüchtigen
Prov	De providentia I–II/Über die Vorsehung
Aet	De aeternitate/Über die Unvergänglichkeit der Welt
Anim	De animalibus/Über die Tiere (nur arm.)

3.1.2 Josephus

Bell I–VII	De Bello Judaico/Über den Jüdischen Krieg
Ant I–XX	Antiquitates Judaicae/Jüdische Altertümer
Vita	Vita Josephi/Selbstbiographie
Ap I–II	Contra Apionem/Gegen Apion

3.1.3 Sonstige jüdisch-hellenistische Schriften

(aufgelistet sind hier auch die sogenannten Apokryphen des LXX-Kanons, die eigentlich den biblischen Schriften zugehören)

Achik	Achikar
ApkAbr	Apokalypse Abrahams
ApkAdam	Apokalypse Adams
ApkDan	Apokalypse Daniels
grApkDan	griechische Apokalypse Daniels/griech. Daniel-Diegese (Berger 1976)
syrApkDan	syrische Daniel-Apokalypse (Henze 2011)
ApkElia	Apokalypse Elias
koptApkElia	koptische Apokalypse Elias (Steindorff 1899)
hebrApkElia	hebräische Apokalypse Elias (Jellnek, Bet ha Midrasch)
ApkEsra	Griechische Apokalypse Esras
(ApkMos)	(Apokalypse des Mose) *siehe* grLAE
ApkSedr	Apokalypse Sedrachs
ApkZef	Apokalypse Zefanjas
(ApkZos)	(Apokalypse des Zosimos) *siehe* HistRech
ApokrEz	Apokryphon Ezechiel
ApokrPs	Apokryphe Psalmen Davids (auch: syrische Psalmen Davids)
AristExeg	Aristeas der Exeget (bei Euseb, PraepEv IX 25,1–4) (AristExeg 1 etc. verweist auf Euseb, PraepEv IX 25,1)
AristobExeg	Aristobulos der Exeget
Frgm. 1	Euseb, HistEccl VII 32,16–18
Frgm. 2	Euseb, PraepEv VIII 9,38–10,17 (Frgm. 2 10,3 verweist auf Euseb, PraepEv VIII 10,3)
Frgm. 3	Euseb, PraepEv XIII 12,1–2
Frgm. 4	Euseb, PraepEv XIII 13,3–8
Frgm. 5	Euseb, PraepEv XIII 12,9–16
ArtapHist	Artapanus der Historiker
Frgm. 1	Euseb, PraepEv IX 18,1
Frgm. 2	Euseb, PraepEv IX 23,1–4 (zur Zitierweise *siehe* AristExeg)
Frgm. 3	Euseb, PraepEv IX 27,1–37
(AssMos)	(Assumptio Mosis) *siehe* TestMos
1Bar	Buch Baruch (LXX)
2Bar	Syrische Baruchapokalypse
3Bar	Griechische Baruchapokalypse
gr3Bar	Griechische Baruchapokalypse
slav3Bar	Sklavische Baruchapokalypse
4Bar	4 Baruch (= Paraleipomena Jeremiae bzw. Jeremiou)
DemetrChron	Demetrius der Chronograph (zur Zitierweise *siehe* AristExeg)
Frgm. 1	Euseb, PraepEv IX 19,4
Frgm. 2	Euseb, PraepEv IX 21,1–19
Frgm. 3	Euseb, PraepEv IX 29,1–3
Frgm. 4	Euseb, PraepEv IX 29,15
Frgm. 5	Euseb, PraepEv IX 29,16
Frgm. 6	ClemAlex, Strom I 21,141,1–2
EldMod	Eldad und Modad

EpArist	Aristeasbrief
EpJer	Brief Jeremias (LXX, gelegentlich auch 1Bar 6)
3Esra	Apokryphes Buch Esra (LXX)
4Esra	Jüdische Apokalypse Esras = 4Esra 3–14
5Esra	Christliche Apokalypse Esras = 4Esra 1–2
6Esra	Christliche Apokalypse Esras = 4Esra 15–16
EupolHist	Eupolemos der Historiker
Frgm. 1A[1]	ClemAlex, Strom I 23,153,4
Frgm. 1B	Euseb, PraepEv IX 26,1
Frgm. 2A	ClemAlex, Strom I 21,130,3
Frgm. 2B	Euseb, PraepEv IX 30,1–34
Frgm. 3	Euseb, PraepEv IX 34,20
Frgm. 4	Euseb, PraepEv IX 39,2–5
Frgm. 5	ClemAlex, Strom I 21,141,4f.
EzTrag	Ezechiel der Tragiker (Auszüge bei Euseb, PraepEv IX 28f.)
1Hen	Äthiopisches Henochbuch
aethHen	Äthiopische Überlieferung des 1Hen[2]
aramHen	Aramäische Fragmente zum 1Hen (Milik 1976)
grHen	Griechische Fragmente zum 1Hen (Black 1970)
2Hen	Slavisches Henochbuch
3Hen	Hebräisches Henochbuch
HistJosef	Geschichte Josefs
HistMelch	Geschichte Melchisedeks
HistRech	Geschichte der Rechabiter (auch: Apokalypse des Zosimos)
JannJamb	Jannes und Jambres
Jdt	Judit (LXX)
JosAs	Josef und Asenet
Jub	Jubiläen (auch: Leptogenesis)
KleodMalchHist	Kleodemos Malchas
A	Zitat bei Josephus, Ant I 239–241
B	Zitat bei Euseb, PraepEv IX 20,2–4 (übernommen von Josephus)
KlimJak	Klimax Jakobou/Leiter Jakobs
LAB	Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (auch: Pseudo-Philo)
LAE	Leben Adams und Evas
grLAE	Griechisches Leben Adams und Evas/Apokalypse des Mose
latLAE	Lateinisches Leben Adams und Evas (Meyer 1878)
armLAE I	Armenisches Buch Adams (Preuschen 1900)
armLAE II	Armenische Buße Adams (Stone 1981)
georgLAE	Georgisches Leben Adams und Evas (Mahé 1981)
slavLAE	Slavisches Leben Adams und Evas (Jagi 1883)

[1] Die Unterscheidung der Fragmente in A und B erfolgt nach dem Vorbild von C.R. HOLLADAY, Eupolemus, in: Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors I: Historians, SBL.TT 20/SBL.PS 10, Chico, CA 1983, 93–156 im Falle von differierenden Parallelüberlieferungen.

[2] Sprachkürzel nur im Bedarfsfall zur Abgrenzung gegenüber der griechischen oder aramäischen Überlieferung, ansonsten steht 1Hen allein für die äthiopische Fassung.

1Makk	1 Makkabäer (LXX)
2Makk	2 Makkabäer (LXX)
3Makk	3 Makkabäer (LXX)
4Makk	4 Makkabäer (LXX)
MartJes	Martyrium Jesajas (= Ascensio Jesaiae [AscJes] 1–5)
OdSal	Oden Salomos
OrJak	Oratio/Gebet Jakobs
OrJosef	Oratio/Gebet Josefs
OrMan	Oratio/Gebet Manasses (LXX [Odae 12])
OrSynag	Hellenistische Synagogengebete (aus den Apostolischen Konstitutionen 7–8)
(ParJer)	(Paralipomena Jeremiae) *siehe* 4Bar
PhiloEpik	Philo der Epiker (zur Zitierweise *siehe* AristExeg)
Frgm. 1	Euseb, PraepEv IX 20,1a[3]
Frgm. 2	Euseb, PraepEv IX 20,1b
Frgm. 3	Euseb, PraepEv IX 24,1
Frgm. 4	Euseb, PraepEv IX 37,1
Frgm. 5	Euseb, PraepEv IX 37,2
Frgm. 6	Euseb, PraepEv IX 37,3
PseudAisch 1–12	Gefälschte Aischylos-Verse (PseudJustin, Mon 2; ClemAlex, Strom V 131,1–3; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 261f. = Dram.-Gnom. I)
PseudApoll 1–2	Gefälschtes Apollon-Orakel (Euseb, PraepEv IX 10,3; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 276 Nr. XVI)
PseudDiph 1–3	Gefälschte Diphilos-Verse (PseudJustin, Mon 5 [irrtümlich Menandros zugeschrieben]; ClemAlex, Strom V 133,3; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 269f. = Dram.-Gnom. VII)
PseudEupolHist	Pseudo-Eupolemos/Samaritanischer Anonymus
Frgm. 1	Euseb, PraepEv IX 17,2–9
Frgm. 2	Euseb, PraepEv IX 18,2b
PseudEurip	Gefälschte Euripides-Verse
1,1–2	PseudJustin, Mon 2 (irrtümlich Philemon zugeschrieben); ClemAlex, Protr 68,3; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 263 = Dram.-Gnom. III
2,11–20	ClemAlex, Strom V 75,1; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 265–267 = Dram.-Gnom. V
3,1–2	PseudJustin, Mon 3; ClemAlex, Strom V 121,1–3 (irrtümlich Diphilos zugeschrieben); = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 270 = Dram.-Gnom. VIII

[3] Abweichende Zählung der Fragmente von N. WALTER, Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Epik: Philon, Theodotus, JSHRZ IV/3, Gütersloh 1983, 135–172: 148–153, in Übereinstimmung mit C.R. HOLLADAY, Philo the Epic Poet, in: Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors II: Poets, SBL.TT 30/SBL.PS 12, Atlanta, GA 1989, 205–299, indem jede Zitateinleitung als Markierung verwandt wird. Diese Erhöhung der Zahl der Fragmente erlaubt eine präzisere Zitation.

PseudHekatHist I[4]	Pseudo-Hekataios I
Frgm. 1	Josephus, Ap I 183–205
Frgm. 2	Josephus, Ap II 43
PseudHekatHist II	Pseudo-Hekataios II[5]
Frgm. 1	Josephus, Ant I 154–157 (fehlt bei Holladay)
Frgm. 2	Josephus, Ant I 161 (fehlt bei Holladay)
Frgm. 3	Josephus, Ant I 165 (fehlt bei Holladay)
Frgm. 4	ClemAlex, Strom V 113,1–2 (= Frgm. 3 bei Holladay)
PseudHesiod	Gefälschte Hesiod-Verse
1,1–2	ClemAlex, Strom V 107,1–108,1; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 271–273 = Siebener-Verse IX
2,1–2	ClemAlex, Protr 73,3; Strom V 112,3; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 275 = weitere gefälschte Verse XV
PseudHomer 1–4	Gefälschte Homer-Verse (ClemAlex, Strom V 107,1–108,1; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 271–273 = Siebener-Verse X)
PseudKallim 1–5	Gefälschte Kallimachos-Verse (ClemAlex, Strom V 107,1–108,1; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 271–273 = Siebener-Verse XI)
PseudMenand 1–24	Gefälschte Menander-Verse (PseudJustin, Mon 4 [irrtümlich Philemon zugeschrieben]; ClemAlex, Strom V 119–120; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 267–269 = Dram-Gnom. VI)
PseudMenandSyr	Sprüche des syrischen Menander
PseudOrph	Pseudo-Orpheus (Zitierung nach Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 235–243)[6]
Rez. A	PseudJustin, Mon 2/Cohor 15 = Orph. Frgm. 245 (Kern) = version J in OTP II = shorter version; diese Version auch durch einzelne Zitate bei ClemAlex, Strom u. Protr, bezeugt (= version C^1 in OTP II)
Rez. B	ClemAlex, Strom V 123,2–124,1 = Orph. Frgm. 246 (Kern) = version C^2 in OTP II (entspricht weitgehend Rez. C)
Rez. C	Euseb, PraepEv XIII 12,5 = Orph. Frgm. 247 (Kern) = version E in OTP II = longer version
Rez. D	Tübinger Theosophie (Text: Holladay, Fragments IV, 220f.)
PseudPhilem 1–10	Gefälschte Philemon-Verse (PseudJustin, Mon 3; ClemAlex, Strom V 121,1–3 (irrtümlich Diphilos zugeschrieben); = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 265–267 = Dram.-Gnom. V)
PseudPhiloJona	Über Jona, hellen. Synagogenpredigt (arm., Siegert 1980)
PseudPhiloSimson	Über Simson, hellen. Synagogenpredigt (arm., Siegert 1980)
PseudPhok	Pseudo-Phokylides

[4] Die Aufteilung der Hekataios-Fragmente in der Forschung ist umstritten, wobei zwischen einem und drei verschiedenen Verfassern unterschieden wird; eine gute Übersicht über die Zuteilung der Überlieferung bei C.R. HOLLADAY, Pseudo-Hecataeus, in: Fragments I (s. Anm. 1), 292f. Die hier gegebene Aufteilung folgt N. WALTER, Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Historiker, JSHRZ I/2, Gütersloh 1976, 89–164: 144–153.

[5] Abweichende Zählung der Fragmente von WALTER, JSHRZ IV/3 (s. Anm. 3), 158–161.

[6] Zitierung nach der Zählung der 47 Hexameter d.h. PseudOrph 34 und in Klammer dahinter die Angabe der Rezension. Wenn alle Rezensionen übereinstimmen, kann dieser Hinweis entfallen.

PseudPind 1–4	Gefälschte Pindar-Verse (ClemAlex, Strom IV 167,3; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 275 = Weitere gefälschte Verse XIV)
PseudPyth	Gefälschte Pythagoras-Verse
1,1–4	PseudJustin, Mon 2; ClemAlex, Strom V 107,1–108,1; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 273 = Jüd. Pseudo-Pythagorika XII
2	PseudJustin, Cohor 19b; ClemAlex, Protr 72,4; = Walter, JSJRZ IV/3, 274 = Jüd. Pseudo-Pythagorika XIII
PseudSoph	Gefälschte Sophokles-Verse
1,1–9	PseudJustin, Mon 2; ClemAlex, Strom V 113,1–2; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 262f. = Dram.-Gnom. II
2,1–11	PseudJustin, Mon 3; ClemAlex, Strom V 121,4–122,1; = Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 264f. = Dram.-Gnom. IV
(PsDav)	(Syrische Psalmen Davids) *siehe* ApokrPs
PsSal	Psalmen Salomos
(syrPs)	(Syrische Psalmen) *siehe* ApokrPs
QuaestEsra	Quaestiones/Fragen Esras
RevEsra	Revelatio/Offenbarung Esras
SapSal	Sapientia Salomonis/Weisheit Salomos (LXX)
Sib	Sibyllinische Orakel
Sir	Jesus Sirach (LXX)
TestXII	Testamente der 12 Patriarchen
TestRub	Testament Rubens
TestSim	Testament Simeons
TestLevi	Testament Levis
TestJuda	Testament Judas
aramTestJuda	Testament Judas nach der aram. Überlieferung
TestIss	Testament Issachars
TestSeb	Testament Sebulons
TestDan	Testament Dans
TestNaf	Testament Naftalis
hebrTestNaf	Testament Naftalis aus der hebr. Chronik des Jerachmeel
TestGad	Testament Gads
TestAss	Testament Assers
TestJos	Testament Josefs
TestBenj	Testament Benjamins
TestAdam	Testament Adams
TestAbr	Testament Abrahams
TestHiob	Testament Hiobs
TestIsaak	Testament Isaaks
TestJak	Testament Jakobs
TestMos	Testament Moses (auch: Assumptio Mosis)
TestSal	Testament Salomos
TheodEpik	Theodotus der Epiker
Frgm. 1	Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,1
Frgm. 2	Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,2
Frgm. 3	Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,3

Frgm. 4	Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,4–6[7]
Frgm. 5	Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,7
Frgm. 6	Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,8–9a
Frgm. 7	Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,9b
Frgm. 8	Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,10–11
TheophHist	Theophilus der Historiker (bei Euseb, PraepEv IX 34,19)
Tob	Tobit (LXX)
TrSem	Schrift/Traktat des Sem
VisEsra	Vision Esras
VitProph	Vitae Prophetarum

3.2 Frühchristliche Schriften

3.2.1 „Apostolische Väter“

Barn	Barnabasbrief
Did	Didache
Diogn	Diognetbrief
Herm	Hirt des Hermas
HermVis	Hirt des Hermas, Vision/Visio I–V
HermMand	Hirt des Hermas, Gebot/Mandatum I–XII
HermSim	Hirt des Hermas, Gleichnis/Similitudo I–X
Ign	Ignatiusbriefe
IgnEph	Brief des Ignatius an die Epheser
IgnMagn	Brief des Ignatius an die Magnesier
IgnTrall	Brief des Ignatius an die Traller
IgnRöm	Brief des Ignatius an die Römer
IgnPhilad	Brief des Ignatius an die Philadelphier
IgnSmyr	Brief des Ignatius an die Smyrnäer
IgnPolyk	Brief des Ignatius an Polykarp
1Klem	1. Klemensbrief
2Klem	2. Klemensbrief
MartPolyk	Martyrium des Polykarp
Papias	Papias-Fragmente (Zitierung nach der Nummerierung bei K. Wengst, SUC III, Darmstadt 1998, d.h. Papias Frgm. 1 etc.)
Polyk	Brief des Polykarp
Quadr	Quadratus-Fragment

3.2.2 Patristische Quellen

Zur Orientierung sind eine Reihe von Abkürzungen genannt; weitere sind in Entsprechung dazu zu bilden.

ClemAlex	Clemens Alexandrinus
Protr	Protreptikos
Strom	Stromateis

[7] Ab hier abweichende Zählung der Fragmente von WALTER, JSHRZ IV/3 (s. Anm. 3), 167–171 in Übereinstimmung mit HOLLADAY, Theodotus, in: Fragments II (s. Anm. 3), 104.

Epiph	Epiphanius von Salamis
Pan	Panarion
Euseb	Eusebius von Caesarea
DemEv	Demonstratio evangelica
HistEccl	Historia ecclesiae
PraepEv	Praeparatio evangelica
Hier	Hieronymus
Justin	Justinus Martyr
Dial	Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon
PseudJustin	Pseudo-Justin
Cohort	Cohortio ad gentiles
Tert	Tertullian

Übergreifende Beiträge

Constructing a Dialogue

4 Ezra and Paul on the Mercy of God

JOHN M.G. BARCLAY (Durham, GB)

Through its conferences and publications, and the ongoing research which it has spawned, the *Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* project has initiated new ways of putting ancient texts into conversation with one another, tracing not only verbal "precursors" and "parallels," but also conceptual connections and/or contrasts which have the potential to give each text a clearer and sharper profile. In this essay I wish to provide an example of the kind of probing, critical inter-textual dialogue that may emerge as the fruit of this research. For this purpose I will construct a dialogue between *4 Ezra* and Paul's letter to the Romans, two texts which stand in tantalising proximity – and distance – on the subject of divine mercy and justice. But before we stage this conversation, it may be useful to reflect a little on method and goal, to ensure we get the best value out of this exercise.

1. Reciprocal Perspectives/*Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen* – or Dialogue/*Dialog*?

Following its precursors and in line with its originating conference, this volume has employed the phrase *wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen* ("reciprocal perspectives") to characterise the relationship it seeks to foster between the New Testament and Early Jewish literature. This title, and the organisation of the material in chapter-pairs, reflects the fact that the study of Early Jewish (or Second Temple) literature is now a fully fledged and self-sufficient field of scholarship, no longer pursued primarily for the sake of providing "context" or "background" for the New Testament or early Christianity. The fact that there now exists independent and sophisticated academic expertise on Early Jewish literature, which is studied for its own sake and on its own terms, means that there can be genuine "mutuality" between scholarship in these fields in which each can hope to learn

from the other. The question is how to enable beneficial reciprocity between disciplines that have begun to diverge into separate scholarly enterprises. I want to outline three moves that are necessary in this regard, starting from the most obvious, and progressing to what may seem the most difficult.

1. *From Genealogy to Comparison*. This first move is now almost routine. There was a time when Christian scholars saw the study of pre-Christian (including early Jewish) literature as the search for the roots of Christian language and ideas – a genealogical exercise concerned first and foremost with tradition-history, founded on the capacity to set texts in a clear chronological sequence. In order to know what Jesus meant by "the kingdom of God" scholars went to earlier Jewish texts (in the Hebrew Bible, the LXX, at Qumran, or elsewhere in Second Temple Judaism) to unearth the traditions that Jesus or the gospels might have drawn upon.[1] The hermeneutical traffic in this exercise was always one-way: one travelled from earlier sources to illuminate later texts or traditions. There was always a temptation to *underplay* difference, in order to discover similarity and thus connection, or to *overstate* it, for the sake of preserving the "novelty" and "uniqueness" of the later text – the notion of "uniqueness" sometimes masking a religious claim to superiority, as Jonathan Z. Smith has noted.[2] In moving beyond genealogy to comparison this project is, I think, rejecting the limitations of this tradition-history approach, whatever its value in other contexts. The point here is not to ask who influenced whom, but to set texts alongside one another as partners in an ancient conversation, hoping to shed light not just in one direction but in two. I take *wechselseitige* to mean that we aim to learn more about Early Jewish literature from the New Testament, as well as learning more about the New Testament from Early Jewish literature.

2. *From Fragments to Wholes*. This second move is more demanding but equally necessary. The tradition-history approach tends to isolate items of vocabulary, or particular motifs, in order to trace how one tradition developed from another. This has produced, and continues to produce, enormously valuable results, but its atomising tendency carries the danger of misinterpretation. No word or phrase, and no single motif, operates in isolation: it acquires its meaning from the context it inhabits, the network of associations that surrounds it, the links between one motif and another, and (crucially) the connections between a cluster of motifs and their social con-

[1] For an analysis and critique, see J.K. RICHES, *Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1980).

[2] See J.Z. SMITH, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

text and use. The word χάρις has a set of connotations in Philo different from those in the letters of Paul – the same word endued with different senses from the different conceptual and social contexts in which it is used.[3] We have known the limitations of word-studies ever since the Kittel *Wörterbuch* project came under sustained criticism.[4] But motif-research can suffer from similar problems if comparisons fail to take a wholistic view of the similarities and differences between the *comparanda*. It is for this reason that the "ethical" topics studied in the volume are rightly placed in the larger matrix of anthropology, as evidenced in the relevant texts. Difficult as it is, the most satisfactory comparison is always between wholes and wholes: to understand any word, or any single motif, we need to see the total picture – the whole ideology of the text and, where possible, how this was correlated with practice and experience in its original social context.

3. *From Juxtaposition to Dialogue*. At a number of points the invitation to our Symposium spoke of bringing texts not only into juxtaposition with one another – placing them side by side – but into conversation (*Gespräch*) or dialogue (*Dialog*). What might this mean, in methodological terms? Juxtaposition can be useful in sharpening the profile of each text: as they stand alongside one another, we can see more precisely where texts look similar and different. But the metaphor of a conversation suggests that we hope for more than simply one monologue followed by another: it suggests that each text is allowed to probe the meaning of the other, to test its consistency and adequacy, to bring it under the critical light of another perspective, to expose its strengths and weaknesses, its obscurities and illogicalities. The dialectical method was, of course, a common educational exercise in the ancient world, playing off one opinion against another. From Plato onwards, the philosophical tradition is replete with examples of imagined dialogue between different traditions, in which a repeated to-and-fro of challenge and reply helped to expose what each was saying, and why. Can we create a friendly dialogue between our texts in which they challenge and test each other, in which they require the other to respond to questions or criticisms, and in which the common *Sache*, the subject-matter under discussion, is genuinely illuminated through such conversation?

What this requires is a willingness to situate the New Testament texts *within* the debates of Second Temple Judaism, not outside of them or in a

[3] See J.M.G. BARCLAY, " 'By the Grace of God I am what I am': Grace and Agency in Paul and Philo," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Context* (ed. J.M.G. Barclay et al.; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 140–157.

[4] J. BARR, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

privileged position immune from critical testing of their adequacy and coherence. We need to put the New Testament in the mix *as* early Jewish literature, not just *alongside* it. In the multi-sided dialogue that would ensue, on any particular topic a New Testament author might line up with another Jewish voice against a third (thus, in their apocalyptic expectations, Paul with *4 Ezra* against Philo), while from another perspective it might stand out against them both (Paul's view of the Torah, against both *4 Ezra* and Philo).[5] In this complex interweave of conversation, one could expect that every Jewish voice will be at some points unique, and at other points generally in agreement with others. The crucial prerequisite for staging such a conversation is the willingness to listen with empathy to all voices in the debate – to listen as attentively and sympathetically to *4 Ezra* as to Paul, for instance. No-one can be entirely neutral, but if we are to stage these conversations, as, for example, Cicero staged debates in his *De natura deorum*, we need to be as fair as possible to all the conversation partners. Of course, to conduct this exercise properly would require at least a monograph, but in this context I will limit our conversation to the topic of mercy and justice, and hope at least to open a debate which could proceed in several directions.[6]

Of course *4 Ezra* and Paul (I will focus here on Romans) stand about 50 years apart and reflect very different contexts and goals.[7] Romans 9–11 is pervaded by a sense of crisis, perplexity and (finally) hope regarding the fate of Israel, and in this respect is closely parallel to the mood of *4 Ezra* with its progressive transformation of emotions. The crisis in *4 Ezra* is occasioned by "the desolation of Zion" (*4 Ezra* 3:2), that is, the destruction

[5] See the fully worked examples in F. WATSON, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T&T Clark, 2004). For a three-way comparison between Sirach, the Qumran Hodayoth and Romans 7–8 on the topic of agency, see J. MASTON, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul* (WUNT 2/297; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

[6] A good comparison between these two texts was offered by B.W. LONGENECKER, *Eschatology and the Covenant. A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1–11* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); he modified his reading of *4 Ezra* in IDEM, *2 Esdras* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995). I have offered a fuller reading of *4 Ezra*, with other Second Temple texts, in my forthcoming book, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, forthcoming).

[7] The dating of *4 Ezra* (at the end of the first century C.E.) relies less on the opening notice of "the thirtieth year after the destruction of Jerusalem" (3:1, echoing Ezek 1:1) than on the "three heads" of the (Roman) eagle, the last precise feature of the eagle vision (11:29–35; 12:22–28) and probably a reference to the three Flavian emperors; see J. SCHREINER, *Das 4. Buch Esra* (JSHRZ V/4; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981), 289–412 (291–306); M.E. STONE, *Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 9–10, 363–365.

of the Jerusalem temple (10:19–23), but for the author this is connected to a deeper crisis, the persistence of the "evil heart" that has drawn Israel away from obedience to God (3:4–36). Paul also begins Romans 9 with lament on behalf of Israel (Rom 9:2–3) and like "Ezra" he eagerly prays for the salvation of Israel (Rom 10:1). Paul shares with *4 Ezra* a pessimistic view of the capacity of humans to resist the power of sin, but for him the event that occasions the sense of crisis is not the destruction of Jerusalem but, paradoxically, the arrival of Israel's Messiah, placed by God as a "stumbling-stone" (Rom 9:30–33). In the midst of their respective crises, both authors appeal to the promises and privileges accorded to Israel. Ezra appeals to the covenants and to the special status of Israel among the nations (*4 Ezra* 5:23–30; 6:55–59); Paul clings to the fact that his kinsmen are "Israelites, and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law," etc. (Rom 9:4–5). These are for Paul, as in *4 Ezra*, non-negotiable entities. It is in articulating how those promises will be fulfilled that the two texts diverge, and it is that difference within this common framework that I wish here to probe.

One central topic that exposes the difference between these two Jewish authors is the relation between divine mercy and divine justice, a topic on which *4 Ezra* itself stages an internal debate, between Uriel and Ezra. These are central concerns for both authors, who even appeal to some of the same Scriptural texts (Deut 30; Exod 33–34). Since I am not here concerned with questions of source or genealogy, I will treat *4 Ezra* first, out of chronological order. After letting this text articulate its views on mercy and justice, I will let Paul put forward his perspective, and then invite the author of *4 Ezra* to comment in reply. The debate is of course open-ended, but I am hoping at least to make a start in exploring its *Sache*.[8]

2. *4 Ezra* on Divine Mercy and Justice

Ezra's laments over the destruction of the temple and the prosperity of "Babylon" articulate not only despair in the wake of national tragedy but also a profound attempt to wrestle with questions of theodicy. With most modern scholars, I take the work to be a unity, which moves by progression from the earlier anguished dialogues between Ezra and Uriel, through

[8] It is generally agreed that all the versions of *4 Ezra* (Latin, Syriac, Georgian, Ethiopic, Armenian, etc.) derive from (a number of) Greek versions, which probably themselves derive from a Hebrew original; see STONE, *Fourth Ezra* (n. 7), 1–11. The Latin text cited here is that reconstructed in A.F.J. KLIJN, *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983).

the visions of the second half of the book to the point where Ezra becomes competent to instruct his fellow Jews on the importance of Torah-observance.[9] But the early dialogues, in chapters 3–9, are not merely preparatory, nor are Ezra's complaints to be dismissed as an "heretical" viewpoint.[10] The space allotted to Ezra's pleas indicates that we are meant to take both viewpoints with equal seriousness, though not, I think, with equal finality.[11]

Ezra's despair regarding Israel's history broadens into a profound pessimism about the human condition, where the *cor malum* or *cor malignum* has led humanity into disobeying God's commandments (3:4–36). Uriel's programme is to induct Ezra into a vision of time divided into *two ages*. The present world is indeed corrupt, "for a grain of evil seed was sown in Adam's heart from the beginning, and how much ungodliness it has produced until now!" (4:30). But this age is hurrying swiftly towards its end, and will be succeeded by an utterly different era from which evil will be banished. Ezra will not be able to understand the present world unless he views it, as it were, in retrospect, from the perspective of the future. The present age will be nothing but *Unheilsgeschichte*, but this is merely the entrance to the world to come (7:3–16). The threshold between the two and the event that gives meaning to all history is the just judgement (*iudicium*) of God. Uriel agrees with Ezra that there is very little justice in the present world, and predicts that conditions will get still worse (5:1–13). But justice

[9] The source-critical hypotheses of earlier generations have been superseded by readings which trace a progression of thought through the seven episodes of the text. This trend is most fully exemplified in E. BRANDENBURGER, *Die Verborgenheit Gottes im Weltgeschehen. Das literarische und theologische Problem des 4. Esrabuches* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981); STONE, *Fourth Ezra* (n. 7). For a survey of scholarship, see ibid., 11–23, concluding that the book is a sophisticated unity, though it incorporates pre-existent materials.

[10] Harnisch detected in Ezra's complaints a contemporary sceptical, fatalistic and dualistic (Gnostic-like) stream of thought, with which the author was in polemical dialogue (through Uriel); see W. HARNISCH, *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte. Untersuchungen zum Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis im 4. Buch Esra und in der syr. Baruchapokalyse* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 19–60. For the latest discussion, see K.M. HOGAN, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution* (JSJ Supplements 130; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

[11] WATSON's fine reading of episode III (*Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* [n. 5], 475–503) rightly resists talk of Ezra's "conversion" (477–478), but wrongly concludes that the text leaves the clash between the views of Ezra and of Uriel unresolved (502–503). Ezra's farewell address (14:28–36), in appealing to the final judgement of the "just judge," indicates that he has adopted Uriel's vision of reality. And since Uriel speaks not only for, but often as God (e.g., 6:1–6; 9:17–22), this is precisely what we would expect.

will finally be established, and in that definitive rectification of the cosmos, planned from before all time, God's purposes will be secured (6:1–6).

Uriel's assurance that the final word is divine justice is not good news to Ezra. Given the virulence of the "evil heart," it is hard to see how anyone can survive that final day of judgement. "Who is there among the living that has not sinned, or who is there among mortals that has not transgressed your covenants?" (7:46). Placing himself among these sinners, he anticipates the day of judgement with fear and despair. In reply, Uriel insists on the perspective of justice: there are in fact some righteous souls (among whom Ezra should count himself, 8:47–49), and the day of judgement will consist of their ultimate vindication, together with the humiliation and torment of the unrighteous (7:76–101). Justice will finally be done, and will be seen to be done, when those who have struggled in the contest with sin (not necessarily the perfect, but at least the valiant) will receive their reward (*merces*, 7:35).[12] In their faith and works they have chosen Moses' option of "life" (7:129) and in disciplining their hearts they will be kept alive, and after death will obtain mercy (14:34). Because he views the world through this prism of justice, Uriel's assurance of God's love for Israel (5:40) is subtly transformed into assurance of God's love for the righteous.[13] Uriel cannot promise salvation to Israel *qua Israel*, but he can assure Ezra that *the righteous* will get the reward they deserve as God will spare one grape from a cluster and one plant from a forest (9:21).

Looking at this prospect from the perspective of the present world, Ezra is appalled at the fact that the vast majority of humanity (7:45–48) will miss out on the future world, enduring suffering in this life only to receive torment in the next. Uriel is unrepentant about that fact: the question before the Judge is not quantity but quality. "When you ask the earth, it will tell you that it provides a large amount of clay from which earthenware is

[12] References to repentance (7:82; 9:11) indicate that "perfection" in law-keeping (7:89) need not be taken literally (so rightly R.J. BAUCKHAM, "Apocalypses," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism. Vol. 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (ed. D.A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 135–187 (171–172).

[13] In his appeals on behalf of Israel in Dialogue III (6:55–59; 8:15–19, 26, 45) Ezra placed Israel in the context of humanity as a whole, and her sinfulness makes it problematic to treat her as a special case. But Uriel's framework, which views present history (including Israel's history) from the standpoint of the age to come, alters the categories of analysis, so that the decisive labels are, in his discourse, "the righteous" and "the ungodly." This does not mean that Israel is forgotten (7:10), or that the text shifts from covenant/national interests to the individualised plight of humanity as a whole (*pace* E.P. SANDERS, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* [London: SCM, 1977], 409–418). Rather, what may be said concerning the salvation of Israel is said within the framework of the salvation of the righteous.

made, but only a little dust from which gold comes; so is the course of the present world. Many have been created but only a few will be saved" (8:2–3). The whole of Dialogue III (6:36–9:25) is taken up with challenge and explication of this point. Ezra's question, whether the righteous can intercede for the ungodly on the day of judgement (7:102–103), receives a brusque but revealing reply: each must bear his own burden (7:104–105). This is not a general preference for individualism over ethnic solidarity, but a function of Uriel's legal framework; individual accountability is exactly what we would expect in a courtroom judgement. Moreover, this is no ordinary judgement but the final, definitive settling of justice: "the day of judgement is decisive (Latin: *audax*) and displays to all the seal of truth" (7:104). If the full facts are finally revealed, as justice requires (cf. 7:34), there can be no hiding under the cover of another's virtues. Intercession for mercy would not reveal but cover the truth (7:102–105).

Ezra then appeals to a number of biblical instances of intercession by the righteous for the sinful, from Abraham through to Hezekiah, and asks why this is permissible now (*modo*), when corruption is so great, but not then (*tunc*), on the day of judgement (7:106–111). His distinction between "now" and "then" already invites the answer (cf. *tunc* in 7:115). Uriel does not deny the propriety of mercy *within the conditions of the present world*: the present corrupt world, lacking the full glory of God, is the appropriate arena in which the strong may pray for the weak (7:112). "But the present world is not the end" (7:112). As the hinge between "this age" and "the immortal age to come," the day of judgement cannot permit any trace of sin to contaminate the glorious future. As a day of absolute justice and truth (7:114), it cannot allow any modification of justice: there can be no mercy on those justly condemned, and no penalty for those properly justified ("victorious," 7:115). The logic is clear: mercy would represent a compromise with sin. Such compromise is necessary in this imperfect world, but it has no place in a future world where justice and truth take maximal effect.[14]

Ezra returns to the theme of mercy in each of his next three speeches (7:132–140; 8:4–36; 8:42–45), which appeal to God's own character and constitute the most intense *theo*logical moment in the text. The first (7:132–140) is an exposition of the depiction of God in Exod 34:6–7, a text often employed in the Jewish tradition to define the character of God.[15] Ez-

[14] For this reason, while repentance is always possible in this life (7:133; 9:11), it is impossible after death (7:82).

[15] For 7:132–140 as commentary on Exod 34:6–7, see STONE, *Fourth Ezra* (n. 7), 256; WATSON, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (n. 5), 500–502; for its connection with Jewish liturgy, see D. BOYARIN, "Penitential Liturgy in 4 Ezra," *JSJ* 3 (1972): 30–34.

ra selects, highlights and glosses key terms from that text and manages to turn even its final statement about God's judgement into a mark of God's mercy: he is "the judge, because if he did not pardon those who were created by his word and blot out the multitude of their sins, there would probably be left only very few of the innumerable multitude" (7:139–140). Ezra here insists that God's merciful character, as endorsed by Scripture, is displayed precisely *in the face of human sin*, and is the only means by which the sin-ridden world is sustained at all. However, Ezra has conceded everything in his very first sentence: "I know that the Most High is now (*nunc*) called merciful, because . . ." (7:132). For Uriel, "now" is one thing, "then" is another (cf. above on 7:111–15). "The Most High made *this world* for the sake of the many, but *the world to come* for the sake of only a few" (8:1). To be sure, *this world* is sustained by God's mercy: its multitude of sinners is permitted to live only because within these conditions God is as gracious as Ezra insists. But *the world to come* operates by different conditions, in which quality (like gold-dust) counts for everything (8:2). In the world to come, divine justice requires that mercy, in the sense of *mercy on the unworthy*, must be left behind.

This prospect propels Ezra into prayer (8:20–36) and a powerful appeal to mercy, based on the virtues of the righteous (8:26) and on the character and reputation of God: "In this, O Lord, your goodness will be declared, when you are merciful to those who have no store of good works" (8:36).[16] Uriel's reply is by now predictable. Looking at reality through the prism of the future, he does not concern himself with the sinners and their destruction,[17] because all that matters is the righteous, "their pilgrimage, their salvation, and their receiving their reward (*merces*)" (8:39). If the *telos* of the cosmos is indeed the reward of the righteous (few though they be), God cannot be expected to fret about unfruitful elements that fail along the way.

[16] Reading *bonitas tua* without *iustitia tua* (with STONE, *Fourth Ezra* [n. 7], 270). Ezra is pressing God's goodness/mercy: he should know by now that "justice" is on the other side. Ezra's arguments are often judged inconsistent since his statements about the universality of sin (e.g., 8:35) seem incompatible with his talk about the righteous (e.g., 8:33); see STONE, *Fourth Ezra* (n. 7), 271–272. But his claims that sin is universal are always rhetorical exaggerations, since from the start he acknowledged the presence of a righteous few (e.g., 3:11; 7:45–48). As Uriel points out, such rhetoric is a commendable sign of humility, but is not to be taken literally (8:47–49).

[17] Uriel gives a subtle twist to Ezra's words: God will not indeed "look on" people's sins, but not in Ezra's sense (that he will ignore them) but in another (that he will not be troubled by their judgement). The closeness of the verbal interchange here (and in the following passage, 8:41–44) indicates the fine crafting of this text, matching its theological sophistication.

Ezra's emotional appeals in this dialogue are consistently feisty, and scholars with modern liberal sentiments are apt to side more with him than with Uriel.[18] But at every point Uriel gives a carefully reasoned justification for his apparently "harsh" viewpoint, and Ezra raises no complaint that this is unfair. In fact, fairness or justice is at the core of Uriel's vision: "You are not a better judge than the Lord, or wiser than the Most High. Let many perish who are now living rather than that the law of God that is set before them be disregarded" (7:20–21). The maintenance of the law – the Torah or commandments of God – is the anchor-point of this whole treatise: human beings, its containers, may perish, but the Law itself will last for ever (9:30–37). This is why *4 Ezra* can be relatively unconcerned about the godless nations of the world – the Gentiles are like spittle and a drop from a bucket (6:56) – and can focus its interest in Israel only on those who remain faithful to the law. The text therefore climaxes in an exhortation to keep the law (14:27–36). In the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., *4 Ezra* dampens expectations of revenge on Rome or a restoration of Israel's political fortunes, bidding Jews to focus on the quotidian struggle to keep the law and thus remain faithful to the divine justice that will finally prevail. *4 Ezra*'s vision of cosmic order has as its practical correlate the demand that the Jewish people stay loyal to the Torah. The moral order of the cosmos is in this way upheld here and now, as a representation of the justice that will ultimately prevail in the age to come.

3. Paul on Divine Mercy and Justice

To this Jewish debate on divine mercy and justice, which we could trace also in the Wisdom of Solomon and elsewhere, let us now add the voice of Paul.[19] The theme of God's mercy (ἔλεος) or favour (χάρις) is prominent in Paul's letter to the Romans, as also is talk of God's righteousness or justice (δικαιοσύνη).[20] For Paul God's favour/gift is enacted first and foremost in an event, the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. While he can trace the operation of God's mercy all the way through Israel's history

[18] See, e.g., A.L. THOMPSON, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 137, 143.

[19] For the thematic in *Wisdom of Solomon*, see M. MCGLYNN, *Divine Judgement and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom* (WUNT 2/139; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

[20] For the use and background of the first two terms, see C. BREYTENBACH, " 'Charis' and 'eleos' in Paul's letter to the Romans," in *The Letter to the Romans* (ed. U. Schnelle; BETL 226; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 247–278.

(Romans 9–11), God's favour is not a general divine characteristic, but is given primary and definitive instantiation in a specific event, the gift of God in Christ, or the self-gift of Christ (Rom 3:24; 5:6; 8:32; cf. Gal 2:20; 2 Cor 8:9; 9:15). If in *4 Ezra* the judgement day forms the focal point of time, and the caesura which divides this world from the world to come, for Paul the Christ-event has reshaped history and eschatology, opening the door to "the new creation" (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15).

Paul's letter to the Romans begins with a traditional distinction between the sins of the Gentile world and the special advantages of Jews, but by 3:20 it has become clear that no distinction can be found between them.[21] Thus Paul would agree with *4 Ezra* that Israel's history is part of the whole story of humankind, and like *4 Ezra* he traces the problem back to Adam (5:12–21). For Paul, however, the problem of sin – what *4 Ezra* describes as the *cor malignum* – is absolutely universal, reaching to a depth that even the most "righteous" cannot resolve.[22] There are many parallels between Paul and *4 Ezra* on the scope and seriousness of sin, but where Uriel insists, and Ezra eventually agrees, that there is a tiny number of righteous, as rare as gold, Paul will allow no exceptions. In dialogue with the author of *4 Ezra* (of course, an anachronistic idea, but still of heuristic value) he might have pressed this point hard. *4 Ezra* speaks of a struggle, a "contest" with evil, which is immensely difficult, but where a victory is imaginable – for the nine-and-a-half tribes in their previously uninhabited territory (13:39–45), and for others who "rule over their minds and discipline their hearts" (14:34). Paul declares this impossible (Rom 3:10–20) and in Romans 7 offers an analysis of why this is so.[23] This may not have quite the depth that Augustine thought he found there, but it does give the sort of anthropological analysis of the *cor malignum* which *4 Ezra* never provides, and it results in an unremitting pessimism applicable even to those who

[21] Placing these chapters in dialogue with *Wisdom of Solomon*, with which there is a close relation, one may find even in Rom 1:18–2:11 a levelling of the condition of Gentile and Jew; see J.A. LINEBAUGH, "Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship between the Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11," *NTS* 57 (2011): 214–237.

[22] For Paul's pessimism in comparison with other Second Temple Jews, see T. LAATO, *Paul and Judaism: An Anthropological Approach* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) and S. WESTERHOLM, "Paul's Anthropological 'Pessimism' in its Jewish Context," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Context* (ed. J.M.G. Barclay et al.; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 71–98.

[23] The modern discussion of this passage begins with W.G. KÜMMEL, *Römer 7 und das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament* (München: Kaiser Verlag, 1974); for insightful recent analysis, see S.J. CHESTER, *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2003), 183–195.

have every intention of keeping the Torah. If Ezra is an exception to the power of sin, Paul's "I" most certainly is not. In other words, Paul would consider *4 Ezra* insufficient in not analysing in the necessary depth the corruption caused by the *cor malignum*, and in thus imagining, without justification, the possibility of human victory over sin.

The event at the centre of cosmic history is, for Paul, an event of mercy, or gift, to the wholly undeserving and the wholly unfit. If Adam's sin led to death and condemnation, the χάρισμα of God leads not from righteousness to reward, but from many trespasses to an incongruous justification (Rom 5:16). It is this incongruity that is the characteristic shape of Paul's theology and which at the formal level bears many similarities to the pleas of Ezra in Dialogue III which are finally (and for good reason) rejected by Uriel. "God shows his love for us," writes Paul, "in that *while we were yet sinners* Christ died for us" (Rom 5:8). The justification that Paul announces is the justification not of the righteous or the repentant but of the ungodly (Rom 4:5), as effected by the God who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist (Rom 4:17).[24] This misfit between the gift and the status or work of the recipient is the theme that unites Romans 9–11, running all the way from God's declaration that he will have mercy on whom he has mercy (Rom 9:15, citing Exod 33:19) to Paul's assertion that God has consigned all people to disobedience that he may have mercy on all (Rom 11:32).[25] The thread that has sustained Israel from the start, according to Paul, and that will effect her redemption in the end, is the single thread of God's mercy on the undeserving: Paul is confident that "all Israel will be saved" (11:26) not because all Israelites will eventually become righteous, but because God's call and God's χαρίσματα are irrevocable (11:29).[26] Just as the figure Ezra in *4 Ezra* insists that God's mercy is properly considered to be "mercy" when it is exercised on those who have no works of righteousness (*4 Ezra* 8:32), Paul insists that χάρις is properly so called not as the reward for works but in the absence of works (Rom 11:5–6; cf. 4:4–5). In fact, the motif of "mercy" or "favour" does not have to be interpreted in this way, as *4 Ezra* shows when it talks of God's mercy *on the righteous* (14:34). But Paul would find in the

[24] On the significance of this phrase in Pauline theology, see E. KÄSEMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; 4th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980), 115–17.

[25] On God's mercy in Romans 9–11 in the context of Second Temple Judaism, see J.M.G. BARCLAY, " 'I will have mercy on whom I have mercy': The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9–11 and Second Temple Judaism," *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 82–106. See also S. EASTMAN, "Israel and Divine Mercy in Galatians and Romans," in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11* (ed. F. Wilk et al.; WUNT 257; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 147–70.

[26] See N. WALTER, "Zur Interpretation von Römer 9–11," *ZTK* 81 (1984): 172–195.

Christ-event precisely what Ezra was pleading for at the last judgement in Dialogue III, an act of mercy *on the entirely undeserving*.

In Paul's view this act of mercy or favour in Christ is also at the same time the enactment and display of God's justice (δικαιοσύνη).[27] Although it was revealed apart from the Torah, this, he claims, was the divine δικαιοσύνη witnessed to by the Torah and the prophets (Rom 3:21): through the death of Christ God displays that he is both "just" and justifies those who have faith in Christ (Rom 3:24–26).[28] At several points Paul indicates an awareness that what he is claiming borders on a denial of the justice of God (e.g., Rom 9:14) or involves such a strong redefinition of that "justice" that it must be said to have been previously unknown (Rom 10:3). It appears that he wants to redefine God's justice not as something *other than* God's mercy, something more ultimate or more foundational, but as enacted precisely *in* God's mercy, such that for him the anchor-point of the cosmos lies not in the fair distribution of justice at the final judgement, but in the mercy itself, enacted in the Christ-event. It is for this reason, as we have seen, that Paul has hope for Israel beyond the preservation of a remnant. While at present there is only a remnant (those saved, Paul insists, by χάρις, not because of their worth, 11:1–6), the salvation of the remnant is not the end of the story, but only the prelude to the salvation of "all Israel" when even the branches presently cut off can be grafted back in, by a mercy that is the ultimate purpose of the cosmos (11:17–32). By the same token, Paul has as much hope for non-Jews as he does for Jews, for if the thread that holds God's purposes together is his mercy on the disobedient, Jews and Gentiles are in exactly the same position and have exactly the same hope.[29]

It is at this point that the correlation between theology and social practice becomes important in understanding how Paul compares to *4 Ezra*.[30] *4 Ezra* reflects a political context post-70 C.E. when Gentile nations are figured as "domineering" and "devouring" Israel (*4 Ezra* 3:28–36; 6:57–59), and the author shows nothing but hostility towards them in their general

---

[27] See E. KÄSEMANN, "Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus," *ZTK* 58 (1961): 367–378. Cf. P. STUHLMACHER, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (FRLANT 87; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965).

[28] Among the extensive literature on this passage, see D.A. CAMPBELL, *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21–26* (JSNTSup 65; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

[29] See D. ZELLER, *Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus: Studien zum Römerbrief* (FB 8; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973).

[30] For the importance of this correlation in understanding Paul, see F. WATSON, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

Stellenregister

1. Bibel

1.1 Altes Testament (einschließlich Apokryphen)

Die Anordnung der biblischen Bücher folgt der Septuaginta.

1.2 Neues Testament

2. Frühjüdische Literatur

2.1 Philo von Alexandrien

2.2 Flavius Josephus

2.3 Jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur

2.4 Qumran

2.5 Rabbinisches Schrifttum

3. Griechische und römische Literatur

4. Antikes Christentum

Autorinnen- und Autorenregister

Sach- und Personenregister

Subject and Person Index

Register griechischer Begriffe