Jewish Authors Writing in Greek: How and What They Learned During the Hellenistic and Early Roman Periods

by

Rodney A. Caruthers II

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Near Eastern Studies)
in the University of Michigan
2019

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Gabriele Boccaccini, Chair
Professor Ellen Muehlberger
Professor Raymond Van Dam
Professor Arthur Verhoogt

Rodney A. Caruthers II

rodneyac@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0002-4392-8138

© Rodney Caruthers II 2019

Dedication

For my beloved parents, Rodney and Thelma.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation project is the culmination of many people and events that converged at just the right moments. As with most worthwhile undertakings, this one was not the product of a singular effort but was both conceived and completed with the aid of numerous contributions. I was supremely fortunate to have a phenomenally gifted and personable committee who collectively offered their invaluable advice, individual expertise, and professional experience to enhance my efforts. Professors Gabriele Boccaccini, Ellen Muehlberger, Raymond Van Dam, and Arthur Verhoogt were quintessential guides in every step of this process, from the project's conception to its completion. Although I am grateful for each of their contributions, the conclusions, viewpoints, and therefore any errors are my own.

I have been honored to learn from Professor Boccaccini (my program Advisor and committee Chair), who I believe is one of the foremost authorities on Second Temple Judaism and remain in awe of his impressive reservoir of knowledge. His courses and seminars, particularly on the works of Philo and the Letter of Aristeas, were the laboratories where my theories were further tested and cultivated for this project. The many discussions we shared over the years in class and in Italy at the various Enoch Seminars, challenged and expanded my understanding of Judaism in the Hellenistic and Roman periods and how its literature was read. From the title of this work to specifics regarding terminology, He offered many points of clarification to make the presentation more precise. Professor Boccaccini's scholarship and academic advice are only surpassed by his

gracious humanity. My appreciation for our friendship, his words of encouragement, and insight throughout my matriculation at the University of Michigan will be eternally treasured.

Professor Muehlberger, from the beginning of this project, went above and beyond what was required in offering her expertise and advice. Her meticulous review of the initial drafts of my manuscripts and critical feedback for ways to improve it have led to a higher quality product. Many parts of this project's arguments, structure, and references are a direct result of her consultations. Some of the most valuable advice she shared concerned addressing dissenting voices in my research and improving the organization and readability of each chapter. She helped me to refine my vantage point and clearly see how others might read and interpret my work. As a result of her thoughtful and detailed assessments, many sections of this project have been greatly improved. Along with all that she has shared with me over these years, I will always be grateful for her professionalism, honesty, encouragement, and support.

Professor Van Dam's imprint can also be found throughout this project. The main subject and approach of this work was hashed out during a seminar he offered on Greek and Roman Studies. During this seminar, we met on several occasions to refine what I needed to focus on for this project and how to articulate it. The concept of "reverse engineering a text" as a methodology to understand what Jewish authors learned to write narrative, was conceived during our discussions. Likewise, he also offered vital feedback for clarifying how to communicate ideas, such as "narrative" and "compositional education." His seminar and proficiency in Greek and Roman history were essential components that assisted me with navigating the range of Classical literature required for this project. I am humbled and appreciative for his contributions,

especially because he retired before the completion of this work but continued to avail himself without reservation. His graciousness and listening ear were a blessing throughout this process.

The central concept of “ancient Greek writing techniques” was formulated during my studies and conversations with Professor Verhoogt. His course on Interpreting Papyri, introduced me to the essential practicality of the material writing process in the ancient world. His expertise in Greek and papyrological studies provided me with the conceptual framework to critically analyze how ancient authors learned and practiced composition. Through him, I was made aware of some of the most influential scholarly sources about ancient education and writing during the Hellenistic and Roman eras. Additionally, I am most appreciative to Professor Verhoogt for not only inspiring a major component of this project, but also for positively communicating how to craft it in a way that made it distinctly my own. His timely words of advice and kindheartedness are deeply valued.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Department of Middle East Studies, Rackham Graduate School, the Michigan Center for Early Christian Studies, and the Frankel Center for Judaic Studies for their generous financial support over the years to complete this project.

I am thankful for my fellow University of Michigan colleagues: Deborah Forger, Michail Kitsos, Isaac Oliver, Ronald Ruark, Joshua Scott, Adrianne Spunaugle, and Jason Zurawski. Our fellowship and many shared conversations over courses, seminars, and conferences together has contributed greatly to the ideas and completion this project. A special word of appreciation goes to my dear friend and mentor Dr. J. Harold Ellens who passed away before the completion of this

project. We shared many times together at his personal library of over fifty-thousand volumes, where he either provided me with necessary references or suggested resources I needed to consult. His scholarship, words of wisdom, and encouragement to complete this task will never be forgotten.

Lastly, but certainly not least, I must express my deepest love and appreciation for my family: my parents, Dr. Rodney Caruthers (DBA) and Dr. Thelma Caruthers (D.Min.), my sister April Caruthers, and brother DeWayne Harris. Along with trying out my ideas and soliciting their feedback, their love, support, and encouragement over these years has meant the world to me. Conversations with my parents, in particular, were incredibly helpful as they questioned my topic and methods from the viewpoints of their own fields of specialty in business administration and Christian ministry and theology. Their own research and interest in my subject often became the impetus for lengthy discussions at the dinner table where my ideas were sharpened. Watching them complete their doctoral studies gave me a template for how to approach a work of this magnitude. Simply put, this project does not come to fruition without each of them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
I. *Status quaestionis*	4
II. Methodological Considerations	8
III. How the Study Will Progress	10
CHAPTER 1 Scribes and Jewish Education in the Pre-Hellenistic Period	13
I. Research on Ancient Israelite Education	15
II. Education in Israel	17
III. Scribes and Writing	39
CHAPTER 2 Jewish Education in the Hellenistic Era	50
I. Introduction	50
II. Methodology	53
III. Greek General Education: Stages and Curriculum	54
IV. Greek General Education (Macro Level)	55
VI. Later Authors on Stages of Education and Curriculum	64
VII. Greek Education: Teachers and Locations	68

VIII. Greek General Education: Conclusions and Next Steps 72

IX. Literature Review of Jewish Education 73

X. Jewish Education: Stages of Development 76

XI. Jewish Education in Greek 84

CHAPTER 3 What Did They Mean By Narrative? 109

I. Rationale and Critical Methodologies 110

II. Narrative: Terminology and Genre 123

III. Novel as Genre 129

IV. The Status of Novelistic Literature 142

V. The Jewish Novel 146

CHAPTER 4 Jewish Mimesis of Greek Narrative Rules 156

I. Narrative Curriculum 158

II. Narrative Writing Styles 165

CHAPTER 5 Elements of Greek Narrative 180

I. Sources 180

II. What Narrative Should Include 184

III. Theon's Narrative Elements 210

IV. Theon's Narrative Elements and Virtues 212

V. What Narrative Should Do 218

VI. Esoteric Writing Techniques 222

CHAPTER 6 Narrative Expectations and Function 228

I. Narrative Expectations 228

II. Narrative Function 236

III. Conclusions 246

CHAPTER 7 Philo's *De vita Mosis*: An Exemplar of Hellenistic Writing 249

CHAPTER 8 Rules for Writing Narrative: Explaining the Variant Accounts of the LXX Translation 281

CHAPTER 9 Narrative Authority 320

I. Introduction 320

II. Scholarly Viewpoints 325

III. Narrative Authority, Genre, Function, and Authorial Comments 333

IV. Conclusions 354

CHAPTER 10 Summary and Conclusions 355

BIBLIOGRAPHY 360

ABSTRACT

Innovative kinds of Jewish narrative in Greek began to flourish during the Hellenistic and Roman eras. Traditional Jewish literature was reworked and expanded, often with features that reflected Hellenistic writing practices, and new accounts were also created. The production, genre, function, and authority of these texts, however, is difficult to determine because of the lack of explicit evidence or descriptions for how they originated. Most scholars agree that Jews learned Greek rhetorical techniques in their writings, but questions remain about which specific rules were followed, under what circumstances they were learned, and what this tells us about a text's status.

This study seeks to answer these questions by reconstructing the educational curriculum by combining narrative comments from classical and Jewish authors and writing exercises. The nuance of the study is that the reconstruction is based on the author's perspective; that is, how writers (such as Philo, Josephus, Theon, and Quintilian) from roughly the same time periods experienced and understood composing narrative. These sources describe the instructions students learned as well as what they thought or expected about writing Greek narrative, which was not always included in school exercises. The comparison of classical and Jewish authors is diachronic and represents multiple locations, which offers a panoramic view of education. Additionally, how writers thought about the content of their work is deduced from collective comments about literary research, manipulating texts, and the inclusion of supernatural or embellished material. The results of this project help to explain how Jewish authors learned to

write Greek (e.g., specific rules, stage in curriculum, and location), how it functioned, and what its authority was in several ways. First, the historical background to pre-Hellenistic Jewish education showed how merging cultural patterns from surrounding nations, such as Egypt and Babylon, set a precedent for how they assimilated educational and writing practices under the Achaemenid and Greco-Macedonian empires.

Second, education during the Hellenistic period showed which Jewish and Greek institutions were available to students. Students were taught Torah and Hebrew grammar, while simultaneously studying Greek language or attending the gymnasium. Third, the study showed how "narrative" as a modern genre does not reflect the ancient conception. To prevent miscasting narrative using modern analysis, it should be viewed through ancient categories, which saw it as a broad designation that included multiple subgenres, writing styles, elements, and expectations. Instead of examining the content, status, and function of a Jewish narrative (e.g., Joseph and Aseneth) according to modern conventions, we can now evaluate whether it agrees with ancient styles, authorial intentions, and rhetorical practices. When a Jewish text aligns with features of Greek narrative, it makes it plausible that the author learned the same rules and had similar expectations. One expectation, usually expressed in the introduction of a text or defined in writing exercises, is that narrative had a didactic function. Lastly, a comparison of authors' comments about narrative literature showed that it was dependent on the author's reputation, their belief in divine mediation, or a text's reception history. The case studies on Philo's *De vita Mosis* and the Letter of Aristeas, offered practical examples of how compositional education could be applied to explain writing techniques, as well textual variants.

Reconstruction of compositional education helps to improve our understanding of the production, function, authority and interpretation of narrative texts during this formative period.

INTRODUCTION

To understand the diversity and complexity of religious practices and theological beliefs within Judaism during the late Second Temple period, an acquaintance with how its literary corpus developed is necessary. Various groups of Judaism—regardless of their sectarian preferences—adhered to some form of their religion, which had a textual basis. For some, the sacred text was comprised of the Pentateuch alone, for others, such as Josephus, the number of books was twenty-two, and still for others that number may have also included additional works. The texts and fragments found at Qumran, as well as other writings, represented today by designations such as Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha, also demonstrate the breadth and variety of literature produced by Jewish authors during the pivotal Second Temple Period. These writings represent a wide range of genres, theological content, and rhetorical techniques; however, the ancient process of how and why these texts were produced remains obscured. Questions, such as who wrote certain texts, what was a text's function, what did an author think about their own work and its contents, and how a text was received or meant to be received by the reader/audience, are all inquiries that are difficult to answer without insight into the process of writing literature. The writing process that authors learned, which I refer to as "compositional education," can assist with answering many of these questions. I use the terms compositional and literary education throughout the discussion. By compositional education, I mean specifically how the author learned to create and arrange the structure and content of a text. By literary education, I mean

learning how to read and write (not necessarily creating texts) in general, as well as other elements that were associated with grammatical learning.[1]

The writing process, however, is not often directly described or alluded to for much of the literature available to us. For the most part, we have general comments about writing from Jewish authors, which amounts to the kind of work that scribes did, and texts being attributed to specific figures. Figures, such as Moses and Baruch, for instance, are understood in some cases as being responsible for composing texts through dictation (Jub 2:1; Jer 36:4). Although authorship is sometimes attributed to specific figures and described as being articulated first through divine dictation, how the writer learned to compose texts is not mentioned. Aside from divine dictation (primarily of prophetic or apocalyptic literature) narrative texts do provide some descriptions of what an author learned or expected about writing conventions, which are mainly found in the introductions to historiographies. Even in these instances, however, we are still left wondering *how* an author learned to write in this manner and what specific information shaped their expectations about writing.

Knowledge of Hellenistic compositional education allows the modern reader to carry out exegetical and interpretive tasks with more precision; particularly with Jewish narrative texts written in Greek. By Greek Jewish narrative, I mean texts that are written in Greek by Jews or contain tradition stories or characters broadly associated with Judaism but exhibit Hellenistic

---

[1] Cribiore describes four different definitions for "writing" which include (1) handwriting (tracing letters or words), (2) copying or dictation, (3) crafting rhetorical units of discourse, and (4) authoring original texts for specific audience or purpose. My discussion of learning to write narrative focuses on the fourth definition of writing, while her book deals more with the first and second definitions. We both mention aspects of the other definitions as well. For her full discussion, see, Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 10.

concepts or writing techniques. By Greek literature, I am thinking of texts that are composed in Greek and are written by non-Jewish authors. These Greek texts also reflect ideas and philosophies associated with Hellenistic culture and religion and do not include traditionally Judaic events or figures. These types of texts posed interesting developments in literary production, function, and status. These works, which were primarily composed during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, embodied many of the traits and content of earlier Hebrew narratives but also included rhetorical techniques that were often associated with Greek writing practices. The merger of Jewish concepts with Greek ideas through writing, resulted in new formulations (theological and philosophical) about age-old problems (e.g., sin, evil, suffering) and topics (e.g., *halakhic*, cultic, afterlife). Many of these new narratives, historiographical and "novelistic," demonstrate a familiarity with Greek culture, religion, theology, and philosophy that was appropriated into Jewish concepts (e.g., Sheol to Hades). The use of Greek rhetorical techniques by Jewish authors raises the question of how they learned to produce this type of literature. Knowledge of what authors learned to compose narratives is vital for answering exegetical issues, such as why the same accounts are retold with varying (or contradictory) details and how its purpose and authoritative status was understood; however, it is also valuable for knowing how authors thought about the content of their texts. When they described, for example, miraculous events (e.g., talking animals) or supernatural occurrences (e.g., celestial phenomena), did they actually believe that the details were real or historical, especially regarding texts that included Greek mythological characters (e.g., Zeus) and locations?

One of the challenges to identifying what compositional education entailed is the lack of direct evidence from Jewish sources. Scholars, such as Hengel and Schniedewind, have

expressed how difficult it is to know clear details about Jewish education in the Iron Age, as well as how they learned Greek education during the Second Temple Period.[2] Compositional education, of course, falls under Jewish education and is rarely included as a topic of study, unless it is connected to the work of professional scribes in Temple, bureaucratic, or royal capacities. Even then, what they learned to produce narrative literature must be compared to writing practices from surrounding cultures, such as Babylon and Egypt. Aside from rare archeological discoveries, such as those at Kuntillet ʿAjrud, there are few unambiguous material artifacts that offer insight into the writing curriculum for Jewish students.[3] Although the lack of explicit evidence is a significant hurdle, it is not insurmountable. Jewish compositional education for narrative written in Greek, can be reconstructed from authorial comments (Jewish and Greek) about writing and extant exercises for composing literature. These two combined sources provide an educational view of writing, what they expected, and how they thought about its contents from the author's vantage point, which is one of the main exegetical goals of interpreting an ancient text. Accessing the compositional level of writing provides the reader with nearly unfettered entry into the mind of the writer and the actual process behind composing a text.

I. *Status quaestionis*

Part of the challenge, as mentioned, is that compositional education, as a subset of Jewish education, does not consist of much direct evidence in the Second Temple period. Scholars, however, have studied the relationship between Jewish literature and Greek rhetorical practices

---

[2] William Schniedewind, "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel and Judah into the Persian World," in *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*, eds. Jason Zurawski and Gabriele Boccaccini (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 11; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, (London: SCM Press, 1974), 74.
[3] For a discussion of the archaeological significance of the inscriptions at Kuntillet ʿAjrud and their relationship to scribal writing exercises, see, Schniedewind, "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel and Judah into the Persian World," 14–19.

and openly express that they likely received some level of Hellenistic education. Mack, Alexandre, Martin, deSilva, and Wright have masterfully compared Jewish writings, such as Philo's works, 4 Maccabees, and the Letter of Aristeas, and demonstrated their reliance on, use of, and knowledge of Hellenistic rhetorical techniques when composing their texts.[4] Their works are similar to what I present in the case study section, where I examine parts of Philo's *De vita Mosis* and the translation account in the Letter of Aristeas; however, my goal and scope are different. I show how authors used Greek rhetorical techniques, but I do so in comparison with authorial comments about narrative and demonstrate how they fit (as close as possible) within the entirety of narrative compositional training. Their studies, on the other hand, focus on identifying how aspects of the respective Jewish works they cover are similar to, or reflect knowledge of Greek rhetorical exercises. Their studies are more observational, whereas I seek to build a larger framework to show, not only similarities and knowledge of Greek rhetorical practices, but to illustrate exactly which instructions they learned, how, when, and where they learned them, as well as how they connect with actual comments authors made about composing narrative. Instead of focusing on an isolated text, I examine how what they learned fits into an educational (albeit reconstructed) whole for writing narrative literature. The conclusions we reach about Jewish authors learning Greek rhetorical writing techniques are the same, but I take it one step further to identify the process of how they learned the techniques.

[4] Their studies take a similar comparative approach as mine for identifying parts of a text that align with Greek rhetorical practices; however, we do not focus on the same sections of texts and our goals are not always the same. With the Letter of Aristeas, for instance, I examine Greek rhetorical practices to explain how differences occur between textual traditions. For their works, see, Burton Mack, "Decoding the Scripture: Philo and the Rules of Rhetoric," in *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*, ed. Frederick Greenspahn, Earle Hilgert, and Burton Mack (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984); Manuel Alexandre, *Rhetorical Argumentation in Philo of Alexandria,* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1999); Michael W. Martin, "Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other Bioi?," *NTS* 54 (2008): 18–41; David deSilva, "The Author of 4 Maccabees and Greco-Roman Paideia: Facets of the Formation of a Hellenistic Jewish Rhetor," in *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*, eds. Jason Zurawski and Gabriele Boccaccini (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017); Benjamin Wright, "Greek *Paideia* and the Jewish Community of Alexandria in the Letter of Aristeas," in *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*, eds. Jason Zurawski and Gabriele Boccaccini (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017).

Another excellent edited work, *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections*, compares aspects of Greek narrative fiction (including rhetorical elements) to Jewish and Christian literature.[5] Aside from Joseph and Aseneth, however, the comparisons are between Greek novelistic texts and Christian Gospels, Apocrypha, and martyrdom stories. The comparisons demonstrate many intriguing similarities between stories, as well as literary techniques for how they are told. In most of the comparisons, it is thought that the author is modeling their work on well-known compositional frameworks. Part of this collection's value is that it shows how narrative accounts can have similar content, plots, motifs, and structures despite different cultural or religious sources and backgrounds. Like the other studies, however, the aim of the work is more observational and does not include explaining the process for how the authors would have learned to produce their works or what they thought about their content.[6]

New Testament scholars have also long examined similarities—generally through rhetorical criticism—between Greek rhetorical elements and Christian literature, particularly for historiography and biography, categories that some use to classify the canonical Gospels.[7] These, however, are also mainly observational and do not necessarily attempt to reconstruct what compositional education entailed in a wider context. What generally occurs is to acknowledge the commonalities between Jewish or Christian Greek narratives and aspects of Greek literature

---

[5] Marília Pinheiro, Judith Perkins, Richard Pervo, eds. *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections* (Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing, 2012).

[6] They do, however, offer explanations about how they think some authors expected their narratives to function or impact their readers (e.g., as a message of chastity among believers).

[7] Christopher Bryan, *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Settings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

(e.g., novels and historiography) and to mention that Jewish or Christian authors probably learned Hellenistic techniques, usually at the gymnasium, but stopping short of what *specific rules or instructions* they learned, how they learned them, and what they thought about their use. Scholars are typically conscientious and cautious here because of the lack of direct and unambiguous literary or material evidence that could inform us about Jewish education in general or specifically about compositional education during the Second Temple period. Although Philo, for instance, demonstrates clear knowledge of Greek philosophy and writing, he does not offer explicit information about how, when, or where he acquired his skills. Based on his own admission, we know he learned grammar at an early age, but he is silent about the circumstances for how he learned to compose such a vast amount of complex literature (*Congr.* 74–76).

The goal of this study is to not only identify similarities in isolated texts but to reconstruct what writers learned within the wider scope of compositional education for Greek narrative. The wider scope of compositional education primarily includes: specific writing instructions that account for literary content, how the instructions were learned, when (i.e., at what juncture in the curriculum) they were learned, and plausible locations where training in writing took place. Implementing a comparative methodology, beginning with ancient Jewish narrative texts and reverse engineering what was said and learned from their contents and structure, makes a reconstruction of the curriculum and other details possible. The comparative reconstruction uses Jewish and Greek comments about writing narrative from literary sources that are roughly contemporary to their counterparts. These results are combined with Hellenistic writing exercises and how they compare to the structure and content of Jewish narratives. Together, from

comments and exercises, what they learned and thought about composing narrative can be discerned. This knowledge helps to answer the last two parts of the inquiry, which is what the status and function of Jewish narrative entailed.

II. Methodological Considerations

The reconstruction of the writing curriculum is not meant to be exhaustive; instead, it provides a malleable framework for gaining insight into compositional tactics and, more importantly, how authors thought about the content of their literary creations. The comments and exercises also assist with uncovering how writers expected their narratives to function, as well as how they and their audiences probably understood or received their authoritative status. Although other types of education and writing existed, the focus here is on training to write narrative. This assists with filling a gap for what we know about education. Additionally, it also helps to resolve questions about the authority and function of narratives for authors and readers during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

Selectively using ancient literature to reconstruct the real-world educational curriculum and expectations from an author's perspective, is not a flawless approach. Using ancient texts to explain existing conditions can be problematic because the sources may describe biased, idealistic, or hypothetical scenarios, instead of what took place in reality. This problem is assuaged in this study because the literary sources used for comparison are from practitioners' descriptions and not fictitious or novelistic texts. The sources are from actual writers who express their own expectations and experiences when composing narrative literature, primarily in historiographical introductions. Their comments, combined with practical exercises found in

writing handbooks meant for teachers and students, form the comparative basis for what was learned and how they considered their works. Together, these sources provide a connective balance for reconstructing what was learned (theoretical) and executed (practical) when composing narrative texts.

The two-fold question of the function and status of Jewish narrative is also resolved using a comparative model. Both authorial comments and exercises provide explicit insight into how narratives were intended to function and how its status was viewed by writers and readers. For function, classical and Jewish authors, for example, typically express the purpose of their works in the introduction (*prooimion*). Historiography and myth, for instance, are either described directly by authors or in writing exercises as having a didactic function. These assertions (especially the alignment of instructions from exercises), along with what an author communicates in their introduction, demonstrate common thinking and expectations for how narrative functioned.

Status, on the other hand, must be deduced from authorial comments. Classical and Jewish authors express their favor or ridicule of other authors and their written works. These descriptions, along with didactic function, support the notion that narrative had a fluid status in the community. Some understood the authoritative status of a text based on an author's reputation, common traditions about a text's authorship, and their belief in an author as a transmitter and mediator of divine oracles.

III. How the Study Will Progress

The study will progress through six phases. The initial phase (Chapter 1) will situate the background and preliminary understanding of Jewish education and its relationship to compositional education prior to the Hellenistic and Roman periods. This section will discuss how education, and learning to write in particular, was understood and practiced, as well as how it was set to change as Jewish students transitioned into the Persian and Hellenistic periods. The second phase (Chapter 2) deals with one of the major questions of what Jewish education encompassed during the Hellenistic period. This is one of the open questions for scholars of the Second Temple period, who question under what circumstances Jewish students and writers encountered Greek culture. The major focus of this study, of course, is what specific instructions and exercises Jewish writers learned to produce their narrative texts in Greek. This section will address the cultural transition, plausible scenarios, and institutions that prompted literary innovations. The third phase (Chapter 3) narrows the scope by addressing some of the terminological issues related to studying ancient literature, which is how to delineate and categorize ancient literature. This section will focus on what ancient narrative literature was comprised of and how crucial it is for understanding the written exercises and authorial expectations that comprised compositional education. Ancient narrative as a genre is often miscast because of modern designations, such as novel, romance, or fiction, which did not exist as viable Greek classifications in the Hellenistic period. This section argues that the ancient understanding for narrative (e.g., its rules and expectations) and its constituent subsets, such as myth and history, should be used to define Jewish narrative written in Greek. When examining ancient texts, it is more useful and efficient to categorize and interpret Greek and Jewish

narrative according to the designations and characteristics of narrative literature operative at the time. This will demonstrate how ancient narrative had different boundaries, rules, and expectations than what is meant by modern classifications. The proper understanding of narrative, from an ancient perspective, validates connecting a Jewish text that exhibits Greek rhetorical elements with authorial comments and exercises about Greek composition. The fourth (and most significant) phase (Chapters 4–6) presents the actual reconstruction of the compositional curriculum for writing narrative and how it fits within the wider boundaries of compositional and general education. This section considers the stages of learning, the curriculum for writing, and how this knowledge informs our understanding of the various ways that narrative literature functioned. The reconstruction, built from classical and Jewish sources, offers a detailed approximation of what was learned to compose narrative and how it functioned. It also resolves a major gap in our understanding of education, as well as how authors thought about the content of their texts. Both are questions that have not been adequately explored in totality together. The fifth phase (Chapters 7–8), directly connected to the fourth, presents two case studies (dealing with Philo's *Moses* and the Letter of Aristeas) that incorporate what has been presented and demonstrates how knowledge of compositional education can practically contribute to the exegetical and interpretive process. These studies will offer insight into how problems and questions about Jewish narrative written in Greek can be resolved by knowing what the author learned to compose the text. The sixth and final phase (Chapter 9) addresses how the authoritative status (i.e., a text's reception and influence) of Jewish narrative written in Greek was determined by its authors and audience. This is another question that is often raised about Jewish literature of the Second Temple period that is difficult to answer due to the anonymous or pseudonymous nature of some texts. Knowledge about writing practices and how authors

discussed other narratives, provides tangible parameters for how a text's sacred or inspired nature was understood. Each chapter is self-contained with its own set of goals and methodology; together they will answer the overarching questions of how Jewish authors learned to write Greek narrative and what it tells us about the function and status of their literary works.

CHAPTER 1

Scribes and Jewish Education in the Pre-Hellenistic Period

Before attempting to reconstruct compositional education for Jewish authors during the Second Temple period, it is helpful to first survey Jewish education in the pre-Hellenistic era and how it eventually led to Hellenized structures. This chapter will explain the historical background for how general education, scribes, and writing were understood during the pre-Hellenistic period. Essentially, the two questions are: who were authors and what educational opportunities were available before the Hellenistic period and how did this situation change for them to begin writing in Greek? The focus will be on the broad category of Jewish education as it relates to writing and what research has shown about teachers, terminology for education, students, subjects for instruction, and pedagogical methods. The section on scribes will further situate how writers and the compositional curriculum were conceived before transitioning into the Hellenistic era. Both general education and scribal precursors will help to contextualize how compositional education was practiced. The goal, however, is to identify the circumstances for how and why some Jewish authors began to shift from Hebraic (and Aramaic) styles of narrative writing to Greek rhetorical techniques. The pre-Hellenistic structure for education and writing, as we shall see, reflected the practices of Israel's ancient Near Eastern neighbors. The pattern of assimilating, or at least participating in, foreign cultural and writing practices would continue under the Greco-Macedonian regime and result in innovations for composing narrative texts. Understanding earlier educational structures for scribes and writing—which did not completely

cease under foreign rule—helps to explain how Jewish scribes/authors later blended Hebrew and Greek literary (as well as religious and philosophical) concepts together.

The development of the educational process over the centuries, both for ancient Israel and its later forms of Judaism, is one of the crucial aspects for identifying how, and maybe more importantly, why modifications were made to the educational curriculum. The subject of Jewish education is too broad and complex to deal with every aspect in detail, so focusing on specific issues that aid in answering questions related to the production of narrative documents and their use in Jewish communities is necessary. Four questions that aid in guiding the inquiry into education and its structure are: (1) Who received education, (2) who offered instruction, (3) what did the educational curriculum consist of, and (4) how were narrative texts produced? These four questions are relevant for getting under the compositional layers of a text because they address the training of the author, as well as the expectations of the readers. By asking, "Who received education?" we are concerned with the recipient level of instruction. Identifying who sought and was privy to various levels of education helps to answer who the audience was that read or listened to narratives. Similarly, the question regarding the identification of the teachers helps to situate their role in the educational process and relationship to students. Teachers, both in the Pre-Hellenistic and Hellenistic periods are essential for understanding the broader educational process and compositional training. The question of the content and implementation of the educational curriculum helps to clarify not only the means of education but more importantly the intended goals of the curriculum. The question of what students learned and the intention behind education, especially compositional, helps to reveal how Hellenistic concepts (language and

images) began to appear in Jewish texts, how these concepts were intended to affect the reader, and what authors felt about their use.

I. Research on Ancient Israelite Education

Several scholars, including Drazin, Ebner, Lemaire, Crenshaw, Heszer, and Carr, have presented detailed studies about Jewish education in general. Their works focus on various aspects of the existence, formation, and curriculums of education during the Iron Age and Post-Exilic periods.[8] Interest in the subject of Jewish education arises from and is often associated with attempting to locate the historical backgrounds and etiological elements of Judaism. Several pertinent questions are often associated with this inquiry: (1) Who serves as teachers, (2) who are students, (3) where are people educated, and (4) what was the content of their education? The question of who ancient Israel's teachers were, involves identifying who in the community actually served in a teaching capacity. Were family members, perhaps, parents or extended family, the primary educators? Were designated individuals in the community specifically trained and tasked with ensuring the education of laypeople and community leaders? Likewise, what was a teacher's social standing in the community and did they have additional roles, such as administrative clerks, to fulfill? The second question asks, similarly to the first, who was identified as a pupil,

[8] These scholars present arguments for what education entailed, its origins and content, as well as the extent of its existence in the community. In some cases, such as Lemaire, arguments for the existence of schools is claimed through biblical texts, while others, such as Crenshaw, oppose how clearly the literary and archaeological evidence demonstrates what can be known about education and schools. Ultimately, the arguments and evidence for how well we can understand education and schools for these time periods has to be approached with caution because of the subjectivity of the archaeological evidence and the ambiguity of the literary (mainly biblical) evidence. For their works, see, Nathan Drazin, *History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E. To 220 C.E. During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins press, 1940); Eliezer Ebner, *Elementary Education in Ancient Israel During the Tannaitic Period 10-220 C.E.* (New York: Bloch Pub. Co., 1956); André Lemaire, *Les Écoles Et La Formation De La Bible Dans L'ancien Israël*, (Fribourg, Suisse: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981); James Crenshaw, "Education in Ancient Israel," *JBL* 104, (1985): 601-15; Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001); David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004).

and is interested in finding out who in the community was eligible for receiving education. This question is concerned with whether some or all community members (e.g., youth, adults, male, female, or servants) were eligible to receive education, and if so to what extent? The third question, regarding the location of education, entails answering where the physical site (if there was one) was located and what its arrangement looked like. Here, scholars consider whether learning took place in the home, in various spontaneous environments with an itinerant teacher, or in some specialized "schoolhouse."[9] The fourth question, and most relevant to the overall inquiry, asks what the educational curriculum was comprised of. While the first three questions adequately set the historical background and situation for education in ancient Israel, the fourth question takes aim at the heart of the matter, which is to find out what exactly was taught to the learner, particularly the aspiring scribe. This is vital to understand both in the early period and into our main subject area of the Second Temple Period, precisely because what has been drilled into the student during his/her stages of learning will be displayed in the final literary product. The educational training that a student receives influences ontological issues, such as how they perceive the world (e.g., political and religious), their own existence, the nature of the divine, as well as the expectations of written or spoken literature. An assessment of the educational curriculum not only benefits our understanding of historical and contextual details, but it further helps to illuminate the rhetorical designs used in the text itself. While the ancient writers in Israel were not saying "rhetorical" in the manner meant by the Greek Sophists, they still knew how to make use of literary conventions, such as acrostics or parallelism.[10]

[9] For further discussion about possible locations for Israelite education, especially in the home, see, David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004), 129–130.
[10] For some examples of Hebrew alphabetical acrostics, see, Ps 25, 111, 112.

These four questions from scholars, and their suppositions, will be addressed each in turn by considering what evidence can be yielded from the Hebrew Bible (Tanakh), archaeology, as well as other Jewish literature leading up to the Second Temple Period. The Jewish literature of this period serves as the most valuable evidence, mainly because we do not have much else to tell us about what ancient Israelite culture looked like with regard to education and writing. Despite the shortcomings of direct evidence, the outlook on education, teachers, and writing, by authors of these texts provides some insights, however biased or embellished they may be, on the practices under question. After surveying the literary evidence for a pattern of the educational structure, we will then move on to the offerings of the archaeological evidence, followed by a summation of what education (particularly the writing curriculum) looked like in the developmental stages prior to the Hellenistic era.

II. Education in Israel

A clearer depiction of pre-Hellenistic educational standards and writing practices is necessary to understand the, at times, stark differences in theological and religious content between pre-Hellenistic and late Second Temple narratives. The writing expectations of the Jewish narrative literature under review for the Hellenistic period should be contrasted with what we know about Jewish education from the Monarchic to the Persian periods, as a way of tracing and contextualizing the developments that took place, which led to the variations we find in later Jewish writings. Without detailing and explaining this important aspect of a text's origins, we are left with the all too familiar sense that literature was produced in essentially the same manner under generally similar conditions of learning across time and location. Even more tenuous is the idea that texts prior to the Hellenistic period were conceived and written with congruent

understandings of religious and educational life. This misconception is often the byproduct of an anachronistic belief or assumption that the religious texts, that are presently accepted as canonical or authoritative, were written by authors who shared the same worldview and experiences. While this may be true to some degree in later times, it is a mistake to think that every author of the separate books of the Hebrew Bible and New Testament collections held consistently homogenous ideas about writing, let alone about theological or interpretive issues. The differences found in religious concepts and theological ideas are not difficult to show. The texts themselves provide plenty of evidence of variation when explaining solutions to issues, such as the problem of evil, the reasons for the Babylonian exile, or the rational for why the Israelites suffer at the hands of gentile nations.[11] More often than not, these ideas, and many others, are explained as being a part of the shared monotheistic tradition and belief system that Jews held during the time. The image is one of a strongly held solidarity in thinking, which is presumably carried over into the narrative traditions. Despite the apparent differences in the narrative traditions of the Hebrew Bible, the texts, and more importantly the writers, are made to appear harmonious, as if they are in collaboration with one another in presenting an official history of the tradition. Another explanation that supports the ideology of a shared writing experience is the notion of biblical inspiration. We will deal with this topic more specifically in chapter nine but suffice it to say that the inspiration of scripture is traditionally connected to its reception history, which makes claims of divine origin and transmission. Most documents of the Hebrew Bible do not feature any internal attributions to inspiration, aside from texts associated

[11] The book of Job offers some philosophical assumptions about the relationship between evil, sin, and punishment through Job's companions (Job 11:1–20). Concerning one outside view of the rationale for the Babylonian exile (neglecting to worship the Queen of Heaven), see Jer 44:17–19, and for one instance of why Israel suffers at the hands of Gentiles (in this case Assyria), see Isa 10:5–7.

with prophetic activity, such as Jeremiah dictating what YHWH has told him to his scribe Baruch who writes it on a scroll (Jer 36:1–4). Texts, however, such as Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Genesis, and Chronicles, among others, do not offer any authorial details. The view of the writers being under divine compulsion is espoused more directly during the Hellenistic and Roman eras.

The Achaemenid (530-330 BCE) period does not offer much explicit evidence for education or learning how to write. There are no extant Persian school curriculums or handbooks that precisely inform the institutions or processes for learning.[12] Most information that describes education during this period comes from the secondhand knowledge of later Greek writers, such as Herodotus and Xenophon. Their descriptions, however, are conspicuously similar to Greek and Spartan methods of education, which include horseback riding, using the bow, and leading a life predicated on truthfulness and justice.[13] One of the most well-known descriptions of Persian education is found in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, which narrates Cyrus the Elder's (the Great) education, especially as a young man. Xenophon's description of education—which is generally a staple of aristocratic male youths—includes militaristic training, religious songs, oral renditions of founder's myths, as well as valuing study and justice.[14] The veracity of the work, however, is difficult to assess duet to the challenge of distinguishing between its legendary and historical elements.[15]

---

[12] For an excellent presentations of the educational structures, processes, and the pertinent sources during the Persian period, see, Elspeth Dusinberre, *Empire, Authority, and Autonomy in Achaemenid Anatolia*, (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 245–258 and Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, trans. Peter Daniels (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 327–330.
[13] Dusinberre, *Empire, Authority, and Autonomy in Achaemenid Anatolia*, 246; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 329.
[14] Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 327, 329–330.
[15] Ibid., 329.

Historical or fictional Jewish characters, such as Nehemiah or Ezra the priest-scribe (Ezra 7:6, 11), who worked (or supposedly worked) in or for the Persian administration, must have received some degree of education and training (e.g., in language and writing) to function efficiently.[16] Certainly, the use of Aramaic would have been needed to communicate with or on behalf of Persian officials. Perhaps elite Jews or those working in administration had their children learn in Persian institutions, which would likely have included writing and religion, as described by Greek authors. This scenario could account for why some Jewish texts (e.g., Daniel and Ezra) had portions written in Aramaic. Scribes, like Ezra, perhaps received training in Aramaic writing and language and that compositional knowledge was eventually transmitted to later generations. Ultimately, unlike the Hellenistic period, we lack specific Persian evidence about education. We can only postulate from later sources and some inscriptions what Jewish education entailed and under what circumstances authors were trained to compose texts during this time.

Despite the common misnomers that accompany our image of the circumstances surrounding the production of narrative texts, particularly in ancient Israel, we can still gain a clearer picture of what some thought about education and writing. When addressing the main questions of what education and writing entailed, the text of the Hebrew Bible offers broad and diverse answers to each of the inquiries.[17] Although direct evidence for educational structures is sparse, we can still glean compelling ideas from what the authors of these texts conceived.

---

[16] For the relationship between education and use of Aramaic by Jewish scribes during the Persian period, see, William Schniedewind, "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel and Judah into the Persian World," in *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*, eds. Jason Zurawski and Gabriele Boccaccini (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 19–24 (esp. 22).

[17] Of course, there are issues with using the Hebrew Bible as a source or even evidence, especially for a reconstruction of education during the Pre-Exilic period because of the dating of the texts. Some view the dates of the literature to be sometime between the sixth and fifth centuries BCE, which would make any representation of

Teachers in the Pre-Hellenistic Period

The Teacher

In modern conceptions of teachers, we have preconceived ideas of what they teach, their status in society, who they teach (whether K-12 or post-secondary levels), and where they teach (in an elementary building or university setting). Teachers are also understood as professionals who receive compensation for their abilities, serve as faculty on staff, offer lectures, and have writing responsibilities. The image of who we would call the "Teacher" in ancient Israel is naturally quite different and is identified, as we shall see, by a variety of Hebrew terms.

The teacher in the Hebrew Bible is identified by words, such as *mĕlamēd* and *mōrĕh* (e.g., Prov 5:13).[18] Each of these terms is a cognate of a Hebrew word for learning or instruction. Interestingly, no one in the Hebrew Bible is actually called a *mĕlamēd* or *mōrĕh* but instead, people who provide some type of instruction or training are often labeled, as with most Hebrew descriptors, by their actions. Moses, for instance, is known as a teacher because of his affiliation with imparting the covenant of YHWH to Israel without ever being called one, "Now listen Israel to the statues and the commandments that I am teaching (*mĕlamēd*) you to do." (Deut 4:1).[19] Similarly, the famed *Qŏhĕlĕṯ* is referred to as a teacher (or sometimes preacher) in Jewish tradition even though the word itself is a cognate of *qāẖăl* (to assemble or gather). The designation of *Qŏhĕlĕṯ* as a teacher arises in translation and tradition from his function according

---

education or the role of teachers appear anachronistic. Are the ancient authors recalling how education actually took place or is it more of an idealized image of what they expected to happen? Additionally, some would hold that the image of teaching in the Hebrew Bible is reflective of what occurred in elite communities and was not meant for lower-level commoners.

[18] In Proverbs 5:13, both words are used in juxtaposition to one another.

[19] Here *mĕlamēd* is used as a participle to describe what Moses is doing. In later Jewish tradition *mĕlamēd*, like priest (*ḵōhēn*), became the title for the person performing the activity.

to the writer as one who taught knowledge, "Moreover, Qoheleth was wise, yet he taught (*lĭmmăḏ*) knowledge to the people." (Eccl 12:9). In this way, Moses and Qoheleth are labeled as teachers because of their actions, although not designated as teachers by profession.

The teacher, or maybe better, the one who carries out the function of imparting instruction, appears from all walks of life in ancient Israel. The image of a teacher as a typically older (male) sage or a specialist in religious or cultic practices, while not unfounded, does not represent the enormous amount of nuance that makes up the panoramic picture of teachers current at the time. Teachers appear in the Israelite community as both specialists and laypeople; however, having a particular expertise does not necessarily equate to elite membership. [20] While some specialists were certainly of aristocratic stock depending on their position (e.g., judges and administrators), others were among the common rank of citizens but specialized in more menial tasks (farmers, craftsmen, and butchers). Some experts that are mentioned in the Hebrew Bible include family members, servants, priests, and anyone else that had a specialization in the community. We do not often think of these individuals as authorities or teachers per se but they, in fact, had to be taught how to carry out their specific skill set at some early point under the guidance of a master tradesman or "teacher."

Terms for Instruction

While there is no one specific term designated for "teachers" in the Hebrew Bible, there are multiple terms used to indicate "teaching" or "instruction."[21] The usual terms related to teaching

---

[20] For the different types of teachers, stages of education, and the relationship between instructor and students, see, André Lemaire, "Education (Israel)," *ABD* 2:306–307, 311.
[21] For a summary of the various words associated with teaching and education, see, André Lemaire, "Education (Israel)," *ABD* 2:305.

encompass several Hebrew ideas and some, for example, *mŭsăr*, even carry specific nuances, such as correction or punishment, as a means of learning. One verse in Proverbs, for example, shows the ambiguity that terms for teaching or instruction have, which does not always come through in translation: “Listen, children, to a father's instruction (*mŭsăr*), and be attentive, that you may gain insight; for I give you good precepts: do not forsake my teaching (*ṯŏrăẖ*)” (Prov 4:1–2). One could certainly quibble over the minor difference between the English translations of teaching and instruction. Likewise, one could argue that the passage should be translated instead with “father’s correction” and “not forsaking my law/torah.”[22] Besides *mŭsăr* and *ṯŏrăẖ*, other specific terms, such as *lĕqăḥ* (Isa 29:24) and *līmmud* (Isa 29:24) also carry the connotation of “learning.” The point is that a variety of terms were used to describe teaching or instruction, which reflected the diverse content of education.

Who Were Teachers?

The lack of one specific word to describe a “teacher,” as a single profession, and the assortment of terms used to indicate multiple forms of instruction, suggests that many people in the community functioned as dispensers of various types of knowledge. The question remains, however, who were these individuals and what sorts of tasks or information did they teach? The Hebrew Bible alone offers images of communities and the sorts of tasks and information that would need to be learned by someone at some point in life, whether as a young child or an adult. Although none of these persons were referred to as teachers (they were simply carrying out the duties with which they were tasked), we can still consider them as such with regard to their

[22] The Septuagint translates the Hebrew *mŭsăr* with the Greek *paideia* and *ṯŏrăẖ* with *nomos*, which can be translated as, “listening to a father’s instruction” and “not forsaking my law.”

function in the community as transmitters of information.[23] A few examples of individuals that taught in the community include both men and women. The *māshāl*, "Like mother, like daughter" (Ezek 16:44) may have implied that mothers were responsible for the overall teaching of their daughters in the home. Mothers may have also provided at least some instruction in tandem with Fathers to their sons: "My child, keep your father's commandment, and do not forsake your mother's teaching" (Prov 6:20, cf. Prov 1:8). Fathers are depicted numerous times as providing instruction to their sons, particularly throughout the book of Proverbs: "Listen, children, to a father's instruction, and be attentive, that you may gain insight" (Prov 4:1). Some figures in the community seem to have held a more prestigious teaching position. The clerical order of Priests and Levites are especially mentioned as teachers in a broader sense within the community, particularly with respect to religious matters (2 Kgs 17:28; 2 Chron 17:8-9).[24] Another example of teaching from a royal position to the general community is found in 2 Chronicles 17:8–9, where we encounter Jehoshaphat sending Priests, Levites, and his officials (*śar*) together to teach (*lĕlammēd*) in the cities of Judah. Regardless of the historicity of the account, it provides the reader with a scenario of Priests, Levites, and officials teaching, which is plausible and relatable.[25] In sum, teachers came from diverse social strata of the community and taught subjects ranging from religious, legal, and business, to skilled-trades.

---

[23] For the different types of teachers, including religious and vocational, see, André Lemaire, "Education (Israel)," *ABD* 2:306–307.
[24] For a discussion of the Levitical order as teachers in Israel, see, Karel Van Der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA; London, England: Harvard University Press, 2007), 90–94.
[25] For the role of Priests and Levites as teachers, particularly of ritual and the Torah, see, Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*, (Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 80–82, 95–96.

Who were Students?

Just as there were a variety of teachers in ancient Israel, there was an equally diverse range of students who received educational training.[26] Although they were not known or thought of as "students" in the modern sense of a classroom, the learners of the time experienced instruction from someone who was well trained in their craft. Students, as we might expect, were comprised of an assortment of people: men and women, elite and commoners, as well as children (boys and girls).

In addition to learning in academic settings, adults worked as apprentices in a variety of skilled trades. Occupations, such as carpentry, architecture, and engraving required supervision first by a master tradesman who passed on their skill to a younger upcoming apprentice. The episode in the book of Exodus provides an example of skilled trades workers lending their materials and expertise to constructing the tabernacle and its sacred furniture.[27] Although the spirit of God (רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים) is initially involved with giving knowledge (חָכְמָה) to build the tabernacle, part of the account also describes how the lead tradesmen (Bezalel) was instructed to teach other tribes how to participate in the construction project as well.[28] This retelling of events may be indicative of the type of collaborative exchange of knowledge and techniques between tribes; in this instance, Judah with Dan.[29] A less religious or fanciful example is found in the wisdom book of Sirach. Sirach explains, in juxtaposition to the leisure and privilege of the scribe, the various types of physical labor that people performed. While scribes held more

[26] For a detailed discussion delineating who were students, the various capacities they served in, what they learned, and who taught them, see, Aaron Demsky, "Jewish Education," *Encyclopedia Judaica* 6:162–169.
[27] Exod 35:10–19.
[28] Exod 35:30–35.
[29] Exod 35:30, 34.

prestigious positions within society, daily workers were employed as farmers, artisans, smiths, and potters. These would all require a period of apprenticeship to learn and would likely be taught by fathers to their sons. Women are typically described as having trades as well. Along with being homemakers, they were professional mourners and seamstresses.[30] Additionally, adults (particularly men) were taught and prepared for military service and to function in administrative or legal capacities, both of which necessitated prior training.[31] Certainly young men, in the Priestly or Levitical genealogies, learned to administer the ritual cult from their fathers or other family members.[32] Their position was not always predicated on social status but rather on familial connections; however, this would change in the later Hasmonean era. Children were students in the home first. They learned generally under parental guidance. Fathers, Mothers, and other family members or servants participated in teaching a child. Royal children had other aristocrats to assist them with acclimating to their future duties. Mothers are depicted as teaching sons and daughters.[33] In sum, students (male and female) were from both elite and non-elite statuses; however, the opportunities and quality of education was not always equal.[34]

What do Students Learn?

Although people from different social statuses provided instruction, such as the Priests, Levites, and officials under Jehoshaphat's royal administration, we still need to ask questions, such as, what subjects were taught; what types of things did people learn to do; was educational training

---

[30] Jer 9:19; Exod 35:25–26; Prov 31:13–19.
[31] For an example of military training alluded to in the Hebrew Bible, see, 2 Sam 22:34–36.
[32] For the genealogical appointment of Priests and Levites, see, Exod 28:1 and Num 1:48–50.
[33] Ezek 16:44; Prov 31:1.
[34] The book of Proverbs, for instance, emphasizes that wise and righteous men acquire learning, "Give instruction to the wise, and they will become wiser still; teach the righteous and they will gain in learning (*leqaḥ*)" (Prov 9:9). This passage gives the impression that learning that resulted in wisdom was perhaps relatively accessible for most. Although the passage specifies the wise or righteous (man), it may have been applicable to women and children as well.

open to everyone; and if an educational curriculum existed, what did it entail and where did it take place?[35] What people learned was at times highly specialized and at other times mundane.[36] Personal instruction was, much like today, practical or vocational. Generally, education can be divided into four categories that reflect what was learned by members of the Israelite community. Instruction was given in (1) household training, (2) vocational training, (3) religious training, and (4) practical training. This is not to say that people who lived during this period categorized what they learned in this way, but these divisions serve as a means of breaking down and ordering the types of training offered in the community. Training for common tasks was probably taught by a family member or master tradesman rather than learning from a strict curriculum or technical manual.[37] Household training was aimed at the upbringing of youth (boys and girls) to function correctly in the community. The Hebrew Bible portrays parents (Fathers and Mothers) as teachers of children as they provide general instruction for daily and religious life (Prov 6:20; Ezek 16:44).[38] Although the exact content of the instructions of the parents is not always directly stated, we do have examples of the sorts of subjects that a parent may have taught their son or daughter. According to Drazin, young girls learned a variety of subjects, such as *mikra* (reading scriptures), grammar, and prayers, in addition to household chores from their parents.[39] A young girl's mother was especially active in her education, as well as older women (Titus 2:3–5). Drazin also mentions how women were included in religious

---

[35] For a discussion on the types of subjects and vocations people learned, see, Aaron Demsky, "Jewish Education," *Encyclopedia Judaica* 6:162–169.
[36] The Jewish educational curriculum will be discussed in more detail in Chapter two; however, for a few examples of educational possibilities and curriculums, see, André Lemaire, "Education (Israel)," *ABD* 2:307–308.
[37] Lemaire argues that the biblical texts themselves may have served as textbooks for students to learn from.
[38] Other examples include King Lemuel receiving teaching from his mother (Prov 31:1).
[39] Drazin's educational descriptions of women and girls is mainly taken from Talmudic references, which describe the Second Temple and Tannaitic periods. Nathan Drazin, *History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E. To 220 C.E. During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins press, 1940), 128–133.

settings for learning by using Ezra's assembly where men and women were gathered for the reading of the Torah (Neh 8:2–3).

Vocational instruction included many tasks that could be carried out in the community whether at the industrial, agricultural, or bureaucratic levels. Young girls or adult women are depicted as learning tasks, such as how to be midwives (Exod 1:21), how to weave and cook (1 Sam 8:13), how to be professional mourners (Jer 9:19), and serving as singers in the royal court (2 Sam 19:36; Eccl 2:8). Young men and adult males learned vocational skills, such as maritime strategy, business etiquette, farming, astrological techniques, and of course administrative processes. Other skills, such as serving as musicians, royal court attendees (cupbearers), and guards were all positions or functions that required some type of instruction to perform their duties effectively, although we would not immediately refer to the ones providing such instruction or training as "teachers" in today's sense of the word.

Additionally, instruction had to be given in religious matters. The Hebrew Bible gives implicit accounts of people learning basic religious lessons in the home and together as a community. The famous *Shema*, for example, ideally admonishes the religious education of children in the home concerning the covenantal commands of YHWH (Deut 6:4–9). The Israelites are instructed as a community to listen to the words of the covenant and to participate in commemorative festivals (Lev 23:1ff). Certainly, the religious, yet also vocational, positions of Priests and Levites for the Tabernacle and later Temple infrastructures required extensive educational training to learn the specific butchering and ritual techniques specified in the Torah (Num 28:1–

7).[40] Priests and Levites are not the only ones described as having a prominent religious role in the community. The existence of Prophets is also shown to be more than a merely sporadic and ecstatic phenomenon. Prophets are described as playing instruments (1 Sam 10:5), having apprentices or scribes (Jer 36:4), serving as administrators (1 Sam 7:15–17), as well as being familiar with the activities of other prophets in the tradition (Dan 9:2). The prophetic office, as with other vocations, had to be learned to some extent, albeit certain aspects, such as the ability to foretell events accurately, were thought to be supernaturally endowed. The Hebrew Bible positively depicts prophets being known as a mantic collective (*ḥeḇel nĕḇîʾîm*) that at least occasionally included having an apprentice for training and succession as we saw in the relationship between Elijah and Elisha (1 Sam 10:5, 10; 1 Kgs 19:16).[41] Some of the characteristics that are described include demonstrative acts, such as dancing and praising, having their prophecies accompanied by the playing of instruments (e.g., flutes, lyres, and tambourines), and especially the practice of foretelling events. Each of these religious or traditionally based vocations presupposes some sort of education or training involved to carry out their duty and function.

Lastly, the Book of Proverbs, as an example of practical training, shows an interest in teaching wisdom for carrying out daily life activities, as well as some subjects that may be considered more advanced training. Proverbs 1:1–6 vividly describes some of the practical, ethical, and moral training that students were expected to become familiar with:

[40] The book of Leviticus, for instance, could be considered a manual for training priests in ritual matters because of the complexity of purity laws, which certainly required explanation.

[41] Granted there were others who were not recognized as being a part of the collective group of prophets. Some had the divine ability of prophetic utterance bestowed upon them for brief moments rather than making a career of it. Saul is one prominent example of such an occurrence as well as the messengers of Saul (1 Sam 19:20). Saul is also listed as falling into a prophetic frenzy (1 Sam 19:24). David after talking with Samuel the Prophet/Judge will inherit the gift of prophecy for a short duration as well (1 Sam 10:6).

> To know wisdom and instruction, To discern the sayings of understanding, To receive instruction in wise behavior, Righteousness, justice and equity; To give prudence to the naive, To the youth knowledge and discretion, A wise man will hear and increase in learning, And a man of understanding will acquire wise counsel, To understand a proverb and a figure, The words of the wise and their riddles. (Prov 1:2–6)

The passage covers a wide range of instruction including experiences that one would encounter in daily life, such as behavioral, legal, and business matters (Prov 1:1–5). What is interesting is the additional learning that is ascribed to one who is already considered wise. The passage implies that a wise and understanding person (more than likely an adult and not a child) increases in learning and counsel, as well as other advanced or esoteric subjects. Along with the practical teachings that should be followed for general success in life, the student also learns proverbs, figures, words of the wise, and riddles. These four subjects are interesting because they suggest that either an oral or written collection of common ideas, broken down into categories, existed for the purposes of learning. They are different from the more industrial tasks, such as learning accounting or baking. Learning proverbs meant that there were people, usually referred to as wise ones or sages, whose sayings were used for expanding knowledge.

Where do People Learn?

The image of education, so far, includes multiple terms that indicate instruction, no specific terms or office for a "teacher," students from various statuses, and a curriculum that encompasses both practical industrious tasks, as well as scholarly acumen (e.g., maxims). Finally, the elusive question of where education took place remains; however, the Hebrew Bible does definitively answer this issue. On the surface it seems that there are some relatively clear indications of where education was provided. The home is correctly thought of as a prime location for educating children, especially when reading passages that mention it in connection

with training.[42] The instructions for the recitation of the Shema in the home are a direct example, "Recite them to your children and talk about them when you are at home and when you are away, when you lie down and when you rise" (Deut 6:7). This passage clearly instructs to teach the words of the Mosaic covenant to children (probably both boys and girls) while in the home, although outside the home is also mentioned. Learning the Torah would certainly be a part of the religious and traditional education of a child but what about other types of education? Whether children learned other basic instructions, such as business transactions in the home, is not altogether clear, although it does seem likely from passages that mention a child listening to his father's directions.[43] Proverbs in this case does give the impression that the father and mother, or maybe another family member, was responsible for the bulk of early education.

Industrial vocations tended to be familial, so that a son continued the family business or learned the set of skills that his father had. If his father was a Priest then the child in turn learned the duties of the priesthood, although this was more of a genealogical inheritance (Exod 28:1; Num 18:1–7). Aside from the Temple and monarchic infrastructures, people also learned to work in various other industries, particularly in the market place where they produced and sold what they had. Exactly where they learned these crafts is not altogether clear. Presumably, a Priest taught his apprentice within the Temple precincts. Likewise, a scribe or a farmer probably taught their protégés while on the job. Learning more about advanced or scholarly subjects, such as proverbs, oracles, or riddles, probably took place at the Sage's home or some other unidentified place of meeting. What we can say is that the Hebrew Bible does not afford us an explicit description of any specially designated location for learning.

[42] For education in the home, see, James Crenshaw, "Education in Ancient Israel," *JBL* 104 (1985): 614.
[43] Prov 4:1.

The book of Nehemiah may be indicative of one style of public education.[44] In Nehemiah 8:1–18, the community is assembled before Ezra and other community officials while selections from the Book of the Torah of Moses (whatever shape its early compositional form had) were read and "interpreted" (*měphōraš*) for the Judean community. In this account we are told that the gathering takes place at the Water Gate (8:1) of the Temple where the people learn words of the Torah, however, this is more of a festival setting rather than an informal religious teaching occasion. We still do not know if a gathering of community leaders and laypeople at the Temple for religious reading or instruction constituted an educational norm. The location of learning probably took place wherever it was conducive and convenient. Prior to the Hellenistic period, education is mainly thought to occur in the home with the parents (primarily the Father) serving as teachers. Other family members, however, could also offer instruction, as well non-familial experts who could hold a "son" and "father" relationship with their student.[45]

How People Learned

Closely related to the curriculum (types of things that people learned) and location of learning is the question of *how* people learned. Whether students were educated in homes, at a temple, at a synagogue (later), or some other designated location, multiple methods were available to acquire learning. The communicative method of education is vital for understanding not only the acquisition of knowledge, but it also helps to address why there were so many variations of accounts, sayings, and maxims that existed in the informational mediums (textual, oral,

[44] This passage is certainly during a seven-day festival period as indicated in Neh 8:18 and probably does not represent a common occurrence; however, the approach to learning in a communal setting may be more commonplace.

[45] For further discussion about the location of education, especially in the home, see, David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004), 129–131.

documentary) used in the ancient world and particularly in written literature.[46] In modern times, the advancement of and precision in copying documents and sharing information instantaneously via technology has reduced, to some extent, the amount of errors in received information. In the ancient world, however, information was passed through multiple oral and written streams, across locations, time, and languages without the aid of official publishers or administrative authorities governing the dissemination of information. The question, of course, arises how did these differences in the recounting of biblical events originate? To answer this question, it is important to think of and treat the authors of texts as individuals who incorporated their learning experience into their written compositions. When considering the ancient student's (author's) educational experience we should also consider that it was not received only through literary means but was also comprised of experiential and oral dimensions.[47] All three, oral, experiential, and literary, formed the basis of education and ultimately what comprised the contents of narrative and other literary compositions.

Oral Instruction

Oral instruction is repeatedly alluded to in biblical literature, particularly in sapiential texts. Susan Niditch astutely explains this major aspect of learning for scribes and how oral practices contributed to the creation and transmission of ancient literature in Israel.[48] In the biblical Psalms

---

[46] By "communicative method" I mean, verbal instruction, recitation, and knowledge that was acquired orally and audibly.

[47] When mentioning what students learned, I also intend to imply what authors learned as it relates to textual composition.

[48] Niditch discusses four models that describe the interplay between oral and written literature, and how they affect textual production. She explains how some texts were products of oral or performative settings but also how the reverse occurred with written texts mimicking oral features. The role and significance of orality in the composition of literature demonstrates the complex layers of a text's origins and how it was intended to function. Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 117–130.

and Proverbs, audible instruction is encouraged and appears to be the prescribed norm for acquiring practical knowledge, "I will incline my ear to a proverb; I will solve my riddle to the music of the harp" (Ps 49:4), and "Let the wise also hear and gain in learning" (Prov 1:5). In addition to descriptions of students listening to their teachers to gain instruction, we also find the oral exercise of reading aloud to the public as a means of instruction (Neh 8:1–5). The Hebrew verb *qārā'* (to read or to proclaim aloud) and its nominal cognate *miqrā'* (a reading or proclamation) indicate the audible presentation of reading texts out loud in the presence of listeners. Reading, in this regard, was meant to be done out loud for an audience as we repeatedly find in accounts of leaders gathering an assembly to hear some version of the covenant read to them. Oral instruction is intriguing because it relies upon the reception and memory of the listener (student), which naturally lends itself to variation over time. This, as Niditch covers, raises interesting questions regarding the oral creation and transmission of biblical literature, as well as its original and final forms.[49] Oral instruction could impact the student in different ways; two students could hear the same story or maxim taught differently by their respective teachers, or a student could hear a teacher's instruction and misunderstand its meaning. When evaluating literary texts, we should remember that students had an eclectic selection to draw from and what they learned from their educational curriculum was not always uniform. The student's teacher, much like today, probably had the freedom to adjust their teaching materials to fit how they wanted to communicate to their students. This liberty probably resulted in expanded or contracted versions of proverbs and ritual traditions that a student learned orally, which were eventually reflected in their compositions.

[49] Ibid., 117–120.

Experiential Learning

Experiential instruction was another method for teaching students and was primarily observational or performance based. This does not suggest that there was no audible component to experiential instruction, but rather that the emphasis was on what was seen or experienced by oneself or through another person or group. This goes beyond mere vocational training in a trade, such as farming or wood-working. Experiential learning, as far as the Hebrew Bible is concerned, also includes gaining instruction from the natural occurrences of everyday life. Writers expressed how the consequences of others' experiences could serve as teachable moments, for instance, "When I made sackcloth my clothing, I became a byword (*māšhāl*) to them" (Ps 69:11). Even Israel's national moral lapses and covenantal penalties could be used as an example for other nations to learn from, "You shall become an object of horror, a proverb (*māšhāl*), and a byword among all the peoples where the LORD will lead you" (Deut 28:37).[50] There are other, not so dire, examples of experiential learning that could come from the natural order that taught general ideas, such as the lessons learned from the behavior of ants: "Go to the ant, you lazybones; consider its ways, and be wise" (Prov 6:6). Students had the option to draw from their own experience, natural occurrences, as well as the collective community's experiences as a means of understanding or explaining the world around them. A student's experiential education may have served as a type of systematic theology, although not solely based on a collection of literary texts, but instead, based on the past and present experiences of the wider community. What a community or student believed about how their patron deity interacted with the people and outsiders, or what that deity's range of powers were, was shaped

[50] In both examples, the figure and Israel, became "proverbs" or "parables" for others to learn from, just as students learned proverbial sayings in their training. The Septuagint version translates the Hebrew *māšhāl* in both verses with the Greek *parabolē*.

by experiential, oral, and literary constructs. Since we do not often know the origins of the accounts that we read or how far back they go, it is difficult to know if the oral or written retelling shaped the outlook or if a singular or collective experience was the catalyst for the deity's personal attributes. Despite not knowing which came first, it can be presumed that what a person knew from experience played a crucial role in determining one's perception or worldview. A person's experience could validate—even above literary traditions which may or may not have been shared—whether a deity was actually influential in the real world. No doubt, the student's experience would play a central role in the development and understanding of both religious ritual as well as literary traditions about the God of Israel.

Literary Education

Written media was the third method of education that students experienced.[51] In antiquity, written sources were available not only for educational purposes but existed in a variety of forms including personal, business, and artistic. Personal written materials included letters addressed to family members or friends, while business documents included marriage certificates, land ownership contracts, edicts, and tax receipts. Examples of artistic writings would include poetic and musical collections such as the Psalms. In addition to these, the Hebrew Bible also mentions other genres of written materials that people consulted and learned from. Along with the narrative literature of the Hebrew Bible, there were also other "lost" books or annals mentioned in those same narratives that supposedly recorded deeds of Israelite and Judean rulers (2 Chr

[51] Carr explains how written media of the Hebrew Bible, such as wisdom literature (e.g., Proverbs), poetry, and other biblical texts, were used for Israelite education and enculturation. He mentions, for instance, how Jewish wisdom literature and poetic texts bear similarities to Egyptian and Sumerian gnomic texts for learning. For his full discussion, see, David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004), 126, 132–134.

16:11), prophetic oracles (1 Chr 29:29), genealogical lists (Neh 7:5), and even traditions of foreign rulers (Esth 10:2).[52] Of the various genres mentioned, the ones that lent themselves to having more of an educational value for students were the artistic (poetic, oracles, and proverbial), and business collections of literature (e.g., annals). Artistic literature came in the form of poetry, prophetic oracles, and maxims and its educational value was evident from its use in recitation by students. The connection between written media and education is a functional one. Members of the community operated in various capacities which required some form of instruction. When we consider some the artistic forms of literature, we must ask who was it intended for? Poetic texts, such as the Psalms, were available to groups who had an interest. The Hebrew Bible makes it clear that there were musicians, singers, and directors of melodies that were in some sense connected with the Psalms. From a number of openings in the Psalms, we find ascriptions that insinuate that the written version of the psalm was something intended to be performed, for example, "To the director, with music, a psalm for David" (Ps 4:1).[53] This of course meant that someone had to be able to learn it, that is read it and perform it. The use of many ambiguous musical terms such as *nĕgînāh* (music), *mīzmôr* (melody), and *tĕhillāh* (praise) indicate that music, whether written, sung, or played on an instrument was a part of the educational curriculum for those professionals who had to work with and understand their meanings. Music, like other vocational trades existing in the ancient world, required training which in turn meant that a student had to learn from a teacher at some point. We are told of male and female singers, as well as liturgical musicians who carried out their functions within the

[52] Some examples of other books that served as source material for biblical writers include: the Book of Jashar (Jos 10:13; 2 Sam 1:18), the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah (1 Kgs 14:29), the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel (1 Kgs 16:27), the annals of Jehu the son of Hanani (2 Chr 20:34), and the Book of the Acts of Solomon (1 Kgs 11:41).
[53] My translation.

community and had to learn their specialty, at least in some cases, from written sources (2 Chr 5:12, 35:25; Ezra 2:41).[54]

Similar to poetry or music, prophetic oracles were also seen in the Hebrew Bible as documents that were transmitted and intended, at least in some cases, for educational purposes. The preservation of prophetic literature in the Hebrew Bible implies an interest in knowing and studying the oracles of legendary prophets. Within the Hebrew Bible, we also come across other collections of literature that were attributed to ecstatic figures, such as the Book of Samuel the Seer (1 Chr 29:29), the Book of Nathan the Prophet (1 Chr 29:29), the Book of Gad the Seer (1 Chr 29:29), the Book of Shemaiah the Prophet (2 Chr 12:15), and the Book of Iddo the Prophet (2 Chr 12:15). There was clearly an interest in the words and actions of these figures. As with musicians and singers, prophets, apparently, were a recognized group that functioned in Israelite communities and may have had influence across cultic and political arenas. We learn of prophets from a variety of social classes, such as Ezekiel, having a priestly lineage and background (Ezek 1:3; Jer 1:1), Amos is introduced as a shepherd and gardener, but despite his declamation of not being a prophet, he is grouped with them (Amos 1:1, 7:14), while prophets, such as Isaiah and Jeremiah were afforded an audience with royal leaders possibly because of their aristocratic connections (2 Kgs 20:14; Isa 39:3; Jer 34:2–7).

In addition to the prophet's experience of supernatural ecstatic utterances, sometimes described as being "turned into a different man" (1 Sam 10:6), we also learn of prophetic

[54] A lamentation or dirge (קִינָה) that was composed, as in 2 Chr 35:25, probably needed to be learned by later professional singers or eulogists.

literature being cataloged and read. Daniel (Sixth century BCE) is said to have consulted the written oral prophecy of the prophet Jeremiah (Seventh and Sixth centuries BCE) concerning the meaning of the Babylonian exile lasting seventy years, and its application for his present situation (2 Chr 36:21; Jer 25:11–12, 29:10; Dan 9:2). This would mean that at some point Jeremiah's prophecy had to be recorded (usually attributed to Baruch the scribe), then either memorized or copied by hand separately for dissemination where someone could consult a literary text. The same process of making collections of literature available would hold true for the aforementioned "lost books" that allude to prophetic oracles and activity. The written versions of prophetic traditions appear to be valuable corpora intended for educational use for those within prophetic circles, as well as those who desire to make a more mundane inquisition into the history of the period as the authors of Kings and Chronicles do in recasting their histories.[55] Community members consulted both forms of artistic literature (prophetic and psalms) for educational and training purposes to provide the services that their vocations required.

III. Scribes and Writing

The education of a scribe was a process that had rules and expectations not unlike any other occupational trade in antiquity. When texts needed to be written they adhered to specific rules while including familiar details and accounts that they learned during other stages of their overall educational experience. Their educational curriculum (i.e., the content of what they learned at different stages) was what shaped the details of the narrative texts they composed. The scribe

[55] This may also hold true for the "riddles from former times" (*ḥîḏôṯ minî-qeḏem*) in Ps 78:1–4. On scribes preserving prophetic texts for educational use, see, Richard Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 105.

who wrote narrative literature utilized historical events, sayings, and scenarios that were based in the known world, even when describing supernatural occurrences or non-human beings. When scribes, for instance, wrote about the realm of the gods in narrative, they described it using familial terms (e.g., gods having parents and siblings) or made their meetings resemble courtroom imagery. Divine beings who held authoritative positions sat on thrones and were attended to by lesser beings, which mirrored the royal depictions of Earthly rulers. This type of court room imagery is shown in narratives, such as the book of Job, where the relationship between YHWH and the satan (*haśāṭān*) or accuser, is one of judge/defendant (God) and plaintiff (satan) as they debate the righteous motivations of Job (Job 1:6–12).

The writer must have also had an impetus to pursue the writing trade. To function in the community, the compositional skills of an author must have been in demand, just as the abilities of a carpenter, farmer, or architect were needed. To understand the demand for a skilled writer to produce documentary texts, such as contracts or genealogical records, is easier because of their practical relevance for administration. What was the demand, however, for producing narrative literature? To understand an author's purpose or motivation, we should place ourselves in their seat, before reading the contents of a text, to appreciate the complexities of writing. For example, what was going through the mind of the scribe when preparing to write? Was the scribe, or simply learned person in writing, sitting with their stylus in hand preparing to transcribe their creative thoughts onto some writing material, such as a clay tablet or parchment scroll? Was the scribe trying to remember the rules for writing a narrative first? Was the scribe trying to recall what was seen, experienced, or orally communicated to write it down? From the standpoint of theological continuity, did the scribe need to compare multiple texts or traditions to resolve any

contradictions? Even more intriguing is whether the scribe understood the task of composing a narrative as a form of invention, or if this meant collating separate accounts to form a new story (by adding to or expanding existing accounts), or actually creating new characters and events unrelated to previous traditional accounts? These questions address the mindset of an author at the compositional level of a text. They also help to understand how the writer's education and life experience relates to literary (narrative) production. Since little evidence exists to describe scribal education during the pre-Hellenistic period, we must extrapolate what their curriculum and experience entailed from literary sources and comparative studies.

Scribes produced narrative texts that included reworked accounts and scenes from oral and literary traditions that were probably familiar to them from their educational training. We can see this phenomenon in narrative accounts, such as the enactment of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:1–17 and Deuteronomy 5:1–22, as well as in the Kings and Chronicles collections where accounts use similar wording, albeit with enough distinctions to realize that the writer is not merely making a word for word rendering. Using the ratification of the Decalogue as an example, the reader encounters similarities and differences in the order, details, and grammatical constructions of the two accounts in Exodus and Deuteronomy, not to mention its representation in the Septuagint, Samaritan Pentateuch, and numerous fragmentary manuscripts of Exodus and Deuteronomy found at Qumran.[56] A singular oral or literary tradition could be behind these two divergent texts, yet, each author chose to compose the details of the event with different elements. Even if we accept that authors received variant traditions of the account as a reason for

[56] For variants between the Masoretic text and the Qumran scrolls' versions of the Decalogue, see the translation and notes to Exod 20:1–17 and Deut 5:6–21, which includes references and comparisons to the Qumran fragments, in Martin Abegg, Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English*, (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1999).

the existence of multiple versions, it still leaves open the question of why those who wrote or copied the text would deviate at all from what was received. To use different words, synonyms, or verbs to describe an action is one thing, but when we find entire sections of wording that appear in some texts and not in others—such as Deuteronomy 5:15, where a longer rationale is given for keeping the sabbath in 4QDeut^{n}, as opposed to the shorter versions in the Masoretic text, Samaritan Pentateuch, and Septuagint—it begs the question of why an author would want to deviate from an established spoken or written tradition? When we look diachronically, we consistently find the account of the Decalogue being retold with different wording, but what aspect of an author's educational training would lead to such a prevalent phenomenon?

Although we do not have the scribe's exact curriculum, observations from the literary features of narratives may provide some ideas about what they learned. Several narrative texts within the Hebrew Bible exhibit shared events and sayings both within (intertextual) and outside of Israelite circles. Scholars of the Hebrew Bible have long pointed out the congruencies between accounts, figures, and sayings that the biblical texts have in common with their Ancient Near Eastern literary counterparts. Some clear examples of sharing between literary traditions include accounts of a great deluge (Noah and Atrahasis), wise courtiers in foreign kingdoms (Daniel and Ahiqar), righteous people suffering (Job and the sufferer in the Babylonian Theodicy), and especially archetypal figures such as the biblical Enoch sharing characteristics, such as writing, astrology, and wisdom with the Egyptian Thoth and Greek Hermes.[57] These narratives show

[57] In addition to the pseudepigraphal Ahiqar, see also references to Ahiqar in Tobit 1:21–22. For Enoch's association with writing and teaching, see 1 En. 12:4 and T. Ab. 11:3–10. For the associations of the Greek and Egyptian gods Hermes and Thoth with wisdom and writing, see, L.H. Martin, "Hermes," *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* 405-411; R.L. Vos, "Thoth," *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* 861-864. The "Babylonian Job" is an Akkadian acrostic poem (ca 1,000-750 BCE) and is better known as the *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi* ("I will praise the lord of wisdom"). For the similarities between Job and "Babylonian Job," see, Douglas Mangum, "Ludlul Bel Nemeqi," *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*.

many undeniable similarities between them with their characters, scenes, and worldviews. It would be difficult to dismiss that the traditions have some type of shared background whether written or oral. Despite not having the details to explain how authors learned to write in this way, observing examples from the Hebrew Bible can offer insight into compositional practices, such as expansion, creation, or editing extant written or oral accounts.

Scribes and Scholarship

To understand the literary shifts and developments that transpired during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, we must first understand several key points related to the individuals responsible for creating the texts. Scribes, some type of professional writer, or at least someone with a proficiency in writing, are generally thought to be the authors and disseminators of biblical texts, but who what do we know about them? The scholarly study of scribal identity and activity in pre-Hellenistic Judaism, usually examines three subjects: the scribe's function, status, and education. In each case, scholars are fraught with a lack of direct evidence to reconstruct what the scribal image entailed. Here, we will consider some of the major issues and conclusions scholars have deduced regarding scribes and their activity. Each of the three main subjects (function, status, and education) will be mentioned as a way to situate how scribes were understood during the Iron Age and into the Exilic period. The focus will be on scribal education, especially the curriculum for writing, and how they produced literature. Understanding these features helps to explain the relationship between Israelite literature and writing practices and scribal activity among their ancient Near Eastern neighbors, such as Babylon and Egypt. Scholars have shown that scribal writing conventions for literature in the

Hebrew bible resembles content and structure found in other non-Israelite texts. The issue here is not to argue for which direction writing influence flowed in, but to demonstrate that Hebrew scribal practices reflected the writing techniques that were prevalent during the time. How Israelite scribes were taught to compose literature, as scholars have shown, was similar to scribal training in places, such as Egypt and Babylon. These similarities help to explain what the scribal situation was prior to the onset of Hellenism and accounts for the shift in textual content and compositional techniques. We will begin with how scholars discuss the function and status of scribes, but the main emphasis will be on scribal education and compositional practices.

Scribal Identity, Status, and Function

Discussions about scribes, especially before the pre-Hellenistic period, generally center on identifying who scribes were and how they functioned. Scribal identity is usually bound together with their status in the community. Scholars, however, tend to agree that there is a lack of unambiguous evidence to fully reconstruct the identity and function of scribes. Due to this impediment, scholars rely on literary sources, such as the Hebrew Bible, Sirach, Josephus, Tractate Sopherim, and epigraphical artifacts, to provide a framework for a plausible reconstruction.[58] The evidence from these diverse sources are typically synthesized to create a generalized image of what scribes and their work encompassed. Based on these texts, scholars, such as Schams, Davies, and Toorn, identify scribes as belonging to several groups and participating in a host of functions. Scribes are identified as professional writers, legal experts (particularly in the Torah), teachers, interpreters (typically of Torah), and royal or religious

[58] Not all sources are evenly agreed upon as reliable. Some, for instance, see the use of biblical or rabbinic evidence as too untrustworthy or anachronistic to offer a reliable account of scribal activity.

administrators.[59] Not all of these positions are agreed upon, but scribes as writers (professional or lay) and teachers appears to be accepted by most. Scribes are thought to be associated with different groups, especially Jewish sects, such as the Priests, Levites, and Sadducees. In some cases, scribes are affiliated with sects, such as the Hasidim and Pharisees, and are considered to be precursors to the Rabbinic sages.[60] Their connection to these various groups also reflects the types of status they held. Scribes are sometimes presented as an elite social group, serving as administrators in temple and royal positions.[61] At other times, usually closer to the Hellenistic period, scribes are described as lay persons, instead of aristocrats, who have acquired proficiency in writing but remain at a middle class or peasant status.[62] How scribes function is equally wide-ranging and includes many tasks, such as, Torah interpreter and instructors, composers of literature (e.g., historiography, prophetic, liturgical, wisdom), copyists, and writers of administrative documents.[63]

Scribal Curriculum

Scribes, as their function as teachers and administrators indicates, learned a plethora of subjects in addition to writing. Levitical or Temple scribes, for example, likely learned to compose songs and liturgical texts. Scholars often begin their reconstruction of scribal education and activity with Ezra, regardless of the historicity of the character, because of his designations as priest and

---

[59] Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 31; Philip Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 74.
[60] Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, 17, 21, 27; Karel Van Der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA; London, England: Harvard University Press, 2007), 89–90, 94, 80; Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*, 75.
[61] Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, 17; Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 76, 83, 84.
[62] Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, 17.
[63] Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*, 75, 78; Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, 17, 29-31; Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 76-79, 89.

scribe (Ezra 7:11). From Ezra, a scribe's education and function in Torah, religious matters, writing, as well as elite administrative capacity were established. Ezra, at times, becomes symbolic of what an ideal scribe embodied. Scholars, such as Davies, Carr, Horsley, Toorn, and Rollston, reconstruct various parts of the scribe's educational curriculum and writing practices. In most cases, the scribe's education and description of writing practices are explained from three types of sources; they are either drawn from epigraphical artifacts, comparisons with ancient Near Eastern neighbors (e.g., Babylon or Egypt), or from biblical examples.[64] A scribe's education, like other forms of early instruction, is often described as beginning in the home as an apprentice to their father, or another writing professional outside the home, such as at the Temple or palace.[65] The style of learning for scribes is explained as being dualistic, including oral and written components.[66] Students listened to oral instruction and engaged in recitation of texts (and other subjects) with the goal of memorization. Closely connected to oral learning was the practice of dictation from the teacher to the student.[67] This was training for how scribes, such as Baruch, might have learned to listen and transcribe Jeremiah's oracles to a scroll.[68] Scribes also studied classical literature from biblical and cross-cultural sources as models for literary

---

[64] For instance, Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 75, 98.

[65] For scribes being taught in the home by their father or as an apprentice to one or more master scribes, see, David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005), 130; Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 97; Richard Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 82. For scribal education outside the home, in the palace or Temple, see, Christopher Rollston, "Scribal Curriculum during the First Temple Period: Epigraphic Hebrew and Biblical Evidence," in *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*, ed. Brian Schmidt (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2015), 93; Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 82.

[66] For oral and written elements of scribal education, see, Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*, 131; Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 98; Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea*, 102.

[67] Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea*, 104.

[68] Training in dictation is also used to explain the transmission and preservation of prophetic literature by scribes. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*, 146–148. See also, Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 94.

composition. Students, presumably, read biblical texts, such as Proverbs or Ecclesiastes, in addition to prophetic oracles, as a means of enculturation; however, they may have also studied foreign languages and literature, as attested by scribal education in Mesopotamia and Egypt.[69] Carr offers a succinct summation of how scribal education using these features, particularly learning biblical and foreign literature, resulted in new forms of textual production.

> As in other cultures like Mesopotamia or Egypt, young scribes showed their competence through their ability to accurately recite and copy texts from an authoritative curriculum. Yet fully educated literate specialists in those other cultures also demonstrably add to that curriculum at key points, whether through producing a translation or new edition of major works, or through authoring new works that often echo those works in which the scribal author was trained. So also, Israelite specialists appear to have added to, recombined, and revised elements of the Israelite textual-education tradition.[70]

In addition to the writing curriculum and educational setting, students and professional scribes learned to practice specific writing techniques. Dictation was one form of writing, but other styles, as described by Toorn, included textual expansion, adaptation, and integration.[71] According to Toorn, textual expansion involved a scribe functioning as an editor, and making changes to an existing text. A scribe who practiced adaptation reworked a model text, which

---

[69] For scribes learning "classical" or standard literature, wisdom texts, and foreign language and literature, see, Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005), 150–151, 156–158; Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 100–101; Richard Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 106; Christopher Rollston, "Scribal Curriculum during the First Temple Period: Epigraphic Hebrew and Biblical Evidence," 91–92. Regarding prophetic oracles being used for enculturation, Carr suggests, for instance, that the colophon to Hosea (14:9) is evidence for prophetic literature being used for learning wisdom.
[70] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*, 159.
[71] Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 125–140.

resulted in a variant version. Integration was how a scribe combined multiple sources to create a new singular text out of many. Additionally, Toorn discusses the various ways that views of authorship contributed to the production and reception of texts.[72] Scribes who wrote texts from memory (that were based on model texts) may have also led to new versions of the same text, even if unintentionally.[73]

This brief reconstruction of issues and conclusions regarding scribes and their educational curriculum demonstrates how little we know about scribal practice during the pre-Hellenistic period; however, it also shows how much Jewish texts and techniques resembled literary practices of the ancient Near East. The latter is the central point. Despite not having an overabundance of evidence for Jewish scribal learning or writing exercises, the texts that have been transmitted bear some similarities—as scholars have indicated—to literature from surrounding cultures. Due to similarities between Jewish texts, writing practices, and educational training and archaeological evidence from neighboring cultures, such as Babylon and Egypt, a clear precedent has been made for explaining how and why Jewish literature took on new literary features. The social environment that surrounded Jewish students and professional scribes precipitated mutual writing and educational standards. Scribes (students) located in Palestine were at a nexus between Mesopotamia and Egypt, which made it conducive to share literary techniques and elements, especially proverbial, legal, and religious.[74]

[72] Toorn discusses various types of authorship, such as honorific (ascribed to a patron), pseudonymous (ascribed to a prestigious past figure for authority), attributed authorship, which a later scribe adds to a text for explanatory purposes, and texts that are signed by an author, which he explains as being done by writers who want to be recognized for their writing acumen, Ibid., 27–49.

[73] See especially Carr's discussion of scribes in the exilic and post-exilic periods who may not have had access to copies of traditional scrolls with them, but composed texts relying on their memory, Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*, 169–170.

[74] On the literary and educational interface between Palestine and its surrounding neighbors, see, Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*, 88.

Jews living under Persian and Macedonian (Hellenistic) empires experienced significant cultural shifts in religion, education, and writing. Jewish scribes learned innovative forms of writing that were passed down and incorporated into new literary mediums. The precedent for appropriating new information, whether religious or writing techniques, occurred during the Achaemenid era and would continue into the Hellenistic period. The next chapter will consider the Greek structures that afforded the opportunities for Jewish students to acquire education and compositional skills that would further shape new versions of traditional ideologies.

CHAPTER 2

Jewish Education in the Hellenistic Period

I. Introduction

The onset of the Macedonian regime under Alexander the Great brought about the beginnings of the spread of Hellenization, although the degree to which it affected Jewish life and culture is debatable.[75] This process, even described in Jewish literature as taking on Greek culture, education, and religion (2 Macc 4:13), provided the setting for how and when Jews living in Jerusalem and the diaspora could learn Greek rhetorical techniques.[76] The Greek *polis* (city) with its theater, libraries, and gymnasiums offered ample opportunities for resident Jews to interact and learn Hellenistic culture. Those who desired to ingratiate themselves into Greek culture had the opportunity to be exposed to education (e.g., encyclical paideia), religious beliefs and customs, language, and for some, advanced learning in rhetoric, composition, and philosophy.[77] Jewish authors, such as Philo of Alexandria, frequently demonstrated their familiarity with

---

[75] For a thorough history of the spread and development of Hellenistic culture, see, Peter Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). Feldman presents a convincing argument, mainly against Martin Hengel, for tempering how widespread and entrenched Hellenism was in Palestine before the Maccabean period (and after). He examines the evidence supporting Jewish Hellenization and demonstrates its ambiguity or offers alternative viewpoints. Feldman concludes that Hellenism in Palestine was a matter of degree. While some participated in Greek culture the majority likely did not, and this helps to explain Jewish resistance to assimilation and why they continued to thrive. Louis Feldman, "How Much Hellenism in Jewish Palestine?", *HUCA* 57 (1986): 83–111.

[76] For the various distinctions between Hellenism, Hellenization, and Hellenistic Judaism, see, Shaye Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 27–29.

[77] Many scholarly studies about the interaction between Jewish and Hellenistic cultures are available. For detailed discussions about the intersection between Hellenism and Judaism, see, Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, (London: SCM Press, 1974); Lee Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998); Shaye Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).

Hellenistic features, especially in education and writing. Jews, in Jerusalem and the diaspora, utilized their knowledge of Greek culture and writing to advance in society and to formulate new ideas and literature. Various Jewish writings began to exhibit Greek rhetorical features as a result of literary training whether at the gymnasium or with private instructors. The Hellenistic period is when the rules for writing Greek narrative expanded and began to influence Jewish writers' compositional style. Although some Jews were averse to incorporating Greek culture into their lifestyle, apparently there were many Jews (especially in the diaspora) who invited its social benefits. This openness to participating in Greek educational and religious institutions made it possible to understand how and why some Jews—often referred to as Hellenistic Jews—incorporated what otherwise appears to be pagan attitudes and practices. Assimilating Greek culture was, for them, not a sign of apostate behavior but part of common life that could also be infused with their Hebrew traditions, as the works and status of prominent Jews, such as Philo and Josephus, can attest to.[78] This period created the educational framework for Jewish authors to not only learn Greek rhetorical techniques, but to also adapt and expand on traditional Hebrew literary accounts in innovative ways.

The merger between Jewish and Hellenistic culture resulted in a variety of permutations that could be seen in religious practice, the dissemination of education, and especially in the

[78] Gruen discusses the difficulties in understanding the historical interaction between Judaism and Hellenism. He explains how the process of "Hellenization" is problematic to define due to the challenges of identifying the various forms of Judaism and Greek culture. Essentially, Judaism and Hellenistic culture had multiple forms that could also differ depending on location, which makes them hard to classify. Gruen also describes how Jewish in Palestine and the Diaspora did not have to consciously choose between Hellenism and Judaism because at a certain time (which is difficult to pinpoint) Greek culture became a norm for some Jews, although they retained aspects of their heritage. One of his central ideas is that some Jews actively engaged in using Greek literary forms and techniques to recast Jewish history. For Gruen's further view on the intersection between Hellenistic and Jewish cultures, see, Erich Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998), xiii–xvi.

production of literature. Once Jewish and Hellenistic cultures intersected, there were opportunities for cross-cultural exchange where, for example, elements of religion (terminology and practice) could be appropriated and reinterpreted by the recipient group. From an educational standpoint, and our main interest, Jews living under Greco-Macedonian rule could certainly continue employing their own styles of education but they (or at least some) could also participate in Greek educational institutions. Several interesting questions arise concerning the interaction between Jewish and Greek education during the Hellenistic period that help to explain what education entailed in Jewish and Greek communities. The topic of ancient education (particularly Jewish or Greek education) is complex due to the various time periods, ancient literary sources, and locations required for understanding it. The most important question, from which all others become sub-categories, is what structures and opportunities existed that allowed Jews to learn the Greek literary techniques that were found in their narratives? Comments about Jewish authors incorporating Greek rhetoric into their works and identifying similar literary patterns are one aspect of explaining the formation of a text; however, we should also ask *how they acquired the skills to do so*.

Since there is little extant material (archaeological or inscriptional) or literary evidence for Jewish education (and especially compositional education) the goal is to reconstruct what would have been available to Jews living during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. The reconstruction process will be built from comments from ancient authors, as well as details from instructional/educational handbooks, both of which offer a clearer sense of what took place on the ground in everyday life. The comments about education from ancient authors, such as Philo or Plutarch, will certainly vary but this will be a benefit to appreciating the complexity and

variety of instructional methods that were available at the time. The instructional handbooks and their descriptions of learning exercises offer practical evidence of learning practices and expectations. Together, these two sources of information about education can help to give a broad view of what education for Jews and Greeks entailed during the period.

II. Methodology

The reconstruction of Jewish and Greek education from an authorial perspective will cover several categories: curriculum, teachers, students, and location. Each category will describe the comments made by Greek and Jewish authors, as well as details mentioned in the educational handbooks. The aim is to demonstrate a range of possibilities for how Jews encountered Greek education and were able to incorporate it into their writings. While the approach is not systematized, the examples are from various locations and time periods, the different descriptions allude to the diversity of possibilities that were available to Jewish students. We will begin with Greek education in general and what educational structures were available at the time, and then transition to Jewish education during the Hellenistic and Roman eras. The emphasis will be on what authors were saying about education during each period. Understanding the different ways that Greek education was delivered will be vital to reconstructing how Jews acquired Greek education and when in the curriculum they learned to write Greek narrative literature.

III. Greek General Education: Stages and Curriculum

Perhaps the broadest of each of the categories, the reconstruction of general Greek education offers insight from a host of comments from ancient authors and instructional details.[79] Due to the larger body of evidence for general education (as opposed to the decidedly sparser details for compositional education) we are able to include a wider range of authors and sources. Inclusion of authorial comments about education from writers, such as Plutarch and Quintilian, provides a practical and current view of what types of educational practices were occurring during their day. The reconstruction aims to highlight what authors directly or indirectly allude to regarding educational norms from early to later stages. The obvious weakness is that chronology and locations must be taken into account, which prevents the reconstruction from being absolute. Instead, we gain a more nuanced, and probably more actual, sense of how education was presented. Most likely it was varied from place to place and certainly between each instructor. Here, we will begin with each category (curriculum, stages, teachers, and locations), elaborating on the details, to show what types of educational opportunities were available to Jews during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. After the Greek presentation of general education, a reconstruction of Jewish general education will be given following the same format of presenting authorial comments, as well as sources that offer details that allude to aspects of the educational curriculum. Understandably, the lack of definitive or explicit evidence for Jewish education during this period will at times necessitate resorting to later (perhaps in some cases anachronistic) testimony that describes what Jewish education entailed. This will be done

[79] Marrou's comprehensive and detailed work on education in the antiquity is still one of the finest presentations available. His section on classical education during the Hellenistic age was particularly helpful and informative for understanding the wider scope of Greek learning. Henri Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1956), 102–216.

sparingly and mainly only for illustrative or comparative reasons, not to support any definitive conclusions about the reconstruction of education.

Both Jewish and Greek reconstructions are made to take us one step closer to how Jews learned to write narrative in Greek. The broader framework of education helps to situate at what stage in the curriculum they would have encountered the techniques used for composing narrative texts. It also helps to explain how Jews might have learned other details, such as "maxims" (γνῶμαι), found in their writings that may not have explicitly been part of the compositional curriculum, but rather learned at a different stage in the general education process. Following both reconstructions, we will consider the central questions of how and when Jews would have engaged in Greek education based on both Jewish and Greek availabilities for learning. The reconstructions themselves and the plausibility of Jews taking part in Greek educational, in general at the macro level, will then lead us into the micro level of compositional education.

IV. Greek General Education (Macro Level)

Modern studies of the educational curriculum during the Classical and Hellenistic periods, usually approach the subject by dividing it into various stages of progression. The stages are based on relatively clear distinctions made by ancient authors across time periods and locations, as we shall see. Based on ancient comments and exercises, scholars have come to a general consensus that there were at least two or three (and sometimes four) distinct stages of Greek education that students could participate in.[80] Although the three stages, which will be discussed,

[80] For an excellent and detailed overview of the stages of Greek education see, Henri Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1956), 95–226.

serve as a starting point to discuss education in a coherent manner, it is also agreed that all students did not participate or advance through each of the levels. Additionally, all three stages may not have been available to every location if there were no teachers to offer the specific subject matter. The content of each stage of education will be considered here, giving an overview of what types of education were available at this time. The questions of how and if Jews participated in any of these stages will also be addressed in later in this chapter's section on the "Greek Educational Curriculum for Jewish Students." The selection of certain authors helps to demonstrate the continuity, development, and diversity of Greek education across time periods and locales. The presumption is that during the Hellenistic period, Greek educational institutions and practices were available to those in areas that included *polis* features.

The Greek Educational Curriculum

The Greek educational curriculum is mentioned and described by several ancient authors. Well before the Hellenistic period, authors such as Plato offered descriptions of both current and ideal stages or divisions of education along with their purpose.[81] In Plato's *Republic*, Socrates offers a series of revisions to the current educational curriculum in his dialogues with Glaucon, although they both appear to be pessimistic that it could actually be enacted.[82] The value in Plato's presentation of Socrates's ideal education for philosophers, is that it critiques what was current for their time, thereby giving the modern reader insight into what type of curriculum was available to students. In this sense, we can compare an actual (what Socrates criticizes) and ideal

[81] Of course, Plato offers the ideal stages, content, and purpose of education as coming from his teacher Socrates (and others). In Plato's Republic, philosophers are the ideal leaders and should undergo specific forms of teaching. Each of the stages are preparatory and function to hone the ideal type of leader. Plato's ideal structure for education is merely suggested; in some cases, it is merely a rearrangement of what was currently practiced during the time.
[82] Glaucon's doubtful response to Socrates's suggested educational outline, ""Certainly," he said, "and I think, Socrates, you have given an excellent description of how the state would come into being if it were ever possible!"" Plato, *Republic* 541a1-b1 (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).

(what he promotes) educational curriculum. What is of most value for this study is the curriculum that Socrates suggests needs revising, because it is probable that this is what was taking place during the time and would be more representative of everyday people, rather than his elaborate curriculum designed for producing philosopher leaders.

Curriculum: Learning Myths

The current curriculum that Socrates condemns includes several topics and divisions which will continue to be a part of curriculums into the Hellenistic era. The first stage of the actual educational curriculum of Socrates's and Plato's time began with children learning what he refers to as myths (μύθους). Socrates explains that children first learn myths which contain truth and falsehood and are written by authors who are called "myth makers" (μυθοποιοῖς).[83] These mythical accounts are from a variety of authors that include famous poets such as Homer and Hesiod.[84] The myths are intended to teach young children through the behavior of the characters in the stories, whether they are gods or heroes. Socrates' complaint is not that the myths should no longer be told entirely or even placed in a different position in the educational curriculum, but that some of the stories need to be censored.

> [Socrates] "We shall persuade their nurses and mothers to tell their children the approved stories and form their souls with them much more than their bodies by handling them. The majority of the stories they tell nowadays must be thrown out."[85]

[83] "Then first of all it seems that we must put them into the care of those who create these tales and accept any that they compose which are good, and reject those that are not.", Plato, *Resp.* 2.377c (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).
[84] Plato, *Resp.* 2.377d.
[85] Plato, *Resp.* 2.377c (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).

His suggestion is that children should learn myths from an approved list of texts that do not corrupt the rearing of children with lies about how the gods behaved. Homer and Hesiod are, in his estimation, telling lies in their accounts of the gods.[86]

> [Socrates] "The ones," I said, "which Hesiod and Homer told us as well as the other poets. For they composed and told false tales to people, as I see it, and are still doing so."[87]

The significance of learning myths at an early age and their usefulness for teaching children behavioral values, demonstrates how and when someone would become familiar with the basic storylines of Greek mythology. Regardless of Socrates's convictions about the truthfulness of the accounts, his accusations against the use of Homer and Hesiod confirm that they were utilized at an early stage in educational curriculum. When we move into the Jewish educational curriculum, we will see how the use of myths by revered Greek poets could factor into Jewish narrative composition.

Where is Grammar?

Although Socrates does not mention grammatical education specifically in either the actual or ideal educational curriculums, there is an allusion to what might be considered an early stage of writing for children. In the actual educational curriculum, Socrates describes how children typically learn myths in the first stage of education. This is significant because it not only explains that they are learning the poet's stories through hearing, but it may also imply that their myths were utilized as the foundations for learning grammar as well. Grammatical education was

[86] For example, Socrates explains how he views the behavior of Uranus and Cronos as lies that should not be told to children, ""Firstly," I said, "is the man who told the greatest lie about the greatest matters and made a poor job of it, about how Uranus accomplished what Hesiod says he did, and furthermore how Cronus took revenge on him. And as for Cronus' deeds and sufferings at the hands of his son, even if they were true, I would not think they should be told to fools and youngsters in this lighthearted way, but should be kept strictly quiet." Plato, *Resp.* 2.378a (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).
[87] Plato, *Resp.* 2.377d (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).

recognized as one of the earliest subjects taught to children, which continued into adolescence and adulthood.[88] There are educational exercises that were designed for training youths in writing, pronunciation, and reading, that were referred to as *chreia* (χρεία), which could mean things that are useful or necessary, in this case needed for learning grammar.[89] Many of the extant *chreia* are considerably later than the fourth century BCE (some of the earliest date to the first century CE) but may reflect practices from earlier periods. Whether actual *chreia* were used during the fourth century BCE in or around Athens remains a question, but the idea that children learned grammar using myths is plausible from the structure and contents of exercises that have been preserved.

The *chreiai* are often divided into the aforementioned three stages of education (primary, secondary, and rhetorical). The ones thought to be used for the primary educational curriculum include several features that could help identify at what point grammar was taught to children. The exercises, written on papyrus, contained written examples from a variety of sources intended as samples to be practiced by students. Students learned to write and pronounce words in columns, often using names and terms found in mythological writings. In this sense, their vocabulary was being formed employing the words that they were learning by listening to the

---

[88] Cribiore, for instance, lists and describes the steps for learning writing and grammar using extant physical textual materials. She demonstrates what can be known from copious examples of actual writing exercises by teachers and students during the Greco-Roman and early Byzantine periods in Egypt. These exercises show that students learned specific skills that successively prepared them for different writing activities. They learned exercises and techniques, such as, tracing letters of the alphabet, pronunciations using syllabaries and *chalinoi* (χαλινός), *chreia*, which included lists of words and names, maxims, copying short and long passages, as well as practicing to write scholia and paraphrases (among other things). For her full discussion with excellent notes and examples from papyri, see, Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 38–55.

[89] For a fine collection of *chreia*, their descriptions, translations, and use at various levels of the educational curriculum, see, Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World; V. 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002).

myths of the poets. In addition to learning their letters and words, the *chreiai* also show that they learned to read and compose shorter and then longer passages from the works of the poets such as Aesop, Menander, and Aristippus.[90] The point is that during the primary stage of education, myths were being employed for educating children, and while not mentioned explicitly, the grammatical use of myth and other works by the poets were being used to teach grammar around the same time. When Socrates says that the first part of education begins with the mythical writings of the poets, he is plausibly including their use for teaching grammar as is evident in the later *chreiai*. Socrates, however; does mention the importance of music—which includes learning myth—as the first stage of his ideal educational curriculum. In doing so, he explains to Glaucon that learning grammar or letters (γραμμάτων) required a similar skill and effect on the learner as music did. His description of learning letters implies that it was at an early stage, just as learning the subject of music was for his ideal curriculum.

> "Then just as with reading our letters," I said, "we were competent at that point when the individual letters, few that they are, did not escape our notice in any of the words in which they were scattered around, and we did not overlook them, as if we did not need to see them, whether the context was small or large, but were keen to distinguish them in all circumstances, since we could not be literate until we were able to do so."[91]

In the actual educational curriculum, grammar would also have to be at the earlier stages of education in order to progress to the later stages, which would naturally include longer and more complex readings.

[90] Two examples of *chreiai* are from the University of Michigan's papyri collection, P.Mich. inv. 25 and P.Mich. inv. 41. Both are written on papyrus and are dated to the first century CE. P.Mich. inv. 25 contains fragments of apothegms (short sayings of maxims) from Aristippus (a philosopher from Cyrene) and Aesop, who is called a "prose writer" (λογοποιός). P.Mich. inv. 41 contains apothegms from the Greek philosopher Diogenes Cynicus. In both papyri, they show the incorporation of poets and philosopher's writings or sayings as appropriate subjects for learning. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World; V. 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 13–23.
[91] Plato, *Resp*. 3.402a-b (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).

Physical Education

For the actual and Socratic ideal educational curriculum, what follows learning myths and grammar, is physical education (γυμναστικός).

> "After the arts (μουσικὴν), our young men must have some physical training (γυμναστικῇ)."
> "Yes, of course."
> "Indeed in this discipline too they must be brought up from childhood (παίδων) carefully throughout their lives …[92]

Physical education, from the use of the word children (παίδων) implies that this education doesn't necessarily come after education in music or myth and grammar, but rather, it is learned along with those subjects. The word for children makes this clear because a child (παῖς) can be classified from around one to twelve years of age, and these were the times in life when children were participating in physical exercise. Physical exercise included activities such as wrestling and was thought of as promoting good health for the body and in Socratic thought, cultivating bravery.[93] In Socrates's ideal educational curriculum, music and exercise were complimentary to each other. The musician (or educated person) used exercise to enhance his inner nature.[94]

Mathematics and Arithmetic

In both the ideal and actual educational curriculums, the subject of Arithmetic (ἀριθμητικός) is presented as a sort of advanced level of learning. It typically follows the learning of myth, grammar, music, and physical education, and is inclusive of sub-categories related to numbers. For Socrates's philosopher leader, arithmetic is vital for both practical and philosophical reasons.

---

[92] Plato, *Resp.* 3.403c-d (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).
[93] Plato, *Resp.* 3.410c (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).
[94] ""So won't the man educated in the arts pursue physical training along these same lines, if he wishes, and adhere to it so that he will not need anything from medicine except where necessary?" "I certainly think so." "What is more, he will toil at the gymnastics and physical exercise with a view to arousing the passionate side of his nature (φύσεως) rather than cultivating mere strength, unlike other athletes who plan their diet and exercise with a view to developing muscle."" Plato, *Resp*. 3.410b (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL).

From a practical perspective, arithmetic includes learning to deal with number amounts (ἀριθμός), which directly helps with military situations, such as counting to order troops, and aides in increasing comprehension of other subjects.[95] From a philosophical standpoint, Socrates emphasizes how learning arithmetic can ultimately benefit in understanding "truth" (ἀλήθεια) and the nature of numbers.[96] In some instances, the study of geometry (γεωμετρία) came before or after arithmetic. For Socrates, geometry was suggested to come after arithmetic.[97] Similar to the characteristic value of arithmetic, geometry also had practical and philosophical benefits for the philosopher ruler. Geometry, in tandem with arithmetic, also aided in militaristic strategy; it could be used to better plan for battle formations, encampments, and for positioning occupations.[98] On the philosophical side, geometry was intended to benefit the student in understanding the "good", gaining knowledge (primarily of eternal things), as well as drawing the soul to truth and philosophy of the mind.[99] The descriptive uses that Socrates gives for both arithmetic and geometry are rather esoteric and probably meant for his (and Plato's) audience as those interested in philosophical subjects. The actual curriculum probably did not delve this far into arithmetic and geometry, and certainly not into its philosophical underpinnings, unless it served a practical use for the student.

For Socrates, education beyond arithmetic and geometry is for the most advanced students and included third dimension solids, astronomy, and finally, dialectics (considered the highest of all education).[100] The presentation of the ideal and actual educational curriculums, in Plato's

---

[95] Plato, *Resp*. 7.524d; 525b; 526b.
[96] Plato, *Resp.* 7.525b-c.
[97] Plato, *Resp.* 7.526c.
[98] Plato, *Resp.* 7.526c-d. Socrates admits that while geometry is essential for the successful military leader, it does not require an inordinate amount of study, nor is it necessary to become an expert to become functional with it.
[99] Plato, Resp. 7.526e; 527a-c.
[100] Plato, Resp. 7.528d-e; 527d; 532a-b; 534e. Dialectics is also referred to as discourse (λόγος), 7.539d-e.

Republic, provides a step-by-step look at the learning process, as well as an explanation of the value and content of each subject. However, Plato's Republic is not the only source that mentions common or ideal educational curriculums. We can also gain insight into what the Greek educational curriculum entailed by considering other writings that are later than Plato and provide material evidence to support or problematize the curriculum. A few examples will suffice to gain a semblance of what was commonly encountered in Greek education at a macro level.

In addition to Plato's Republic, a few other sources—dating from the fourth to the second century BCE—offer descriptive insight into the stages and content of educational curricula. The stages or levels of education are described as including two, three, or even four levels.[101] Stages of education can be divided not only based on content but also on the age of the student. When it is based on the age of the student, this is referred to as a natural division of stages; the first stage being from ages seven to puberty (ἥβη), and the second stage from puberty to twenty years of age.[102] The more traditional three stage educational curriculum, alluded to by Socrates, is mentioned more definitively by Teles the Cynic (ca. 235 BCE) in a spurious writing attributed to Plato called *Axiochus*.[103] Combined, these sources describe the educational curriculum as consisting of three levels (also divided by age). The primary level begins at age seven, and includes learning in physical training, reading, writing (or letters), music, and occasionally

[101] Douris's Cup, painted in Athens (ca 485 BCE) by Douris an Athenian vase painter, offers evidence of a standard educational curriculum, as well as concurrent learning. The cup depicts students with their teachers (*paidagogoi*) learning to read the poets on scrolls (e.g., Stesichorus), to write on tablets with styli, and to play instruments such as the lyre and flute. For more details and theories on Douris's Cup see, Mark Joyal, Iain McDougall, and John Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook. Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World* (Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2009), 46-47.
[102] Aristotle, *Pol.* 7.1336b35 (H. Rackham, LCL).
[103] Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*, 128-129.

drawing (γραφικός).[104] The secondary level (after the student advances in years) now incorporates teachers for arithmetic, geometry, and riding. The third stage, often referred to as the *ephebos* (twelve to eighteen or twenty years of age), includes continued physical training.[105] The placement of what will later be called the Ephebeia, will become more synonymous with the second stage of education, coming after the primary stage and followed by more advanced learning with a private Sophist or Rhetor. The major difference in the descriptions of the stages and curriculum, is that in Socrates ideal education there is not a mention or focus on more advanced studies such as astronomy or dialectics, which had more use for philosophers or sophists.

VI. Later Authors on Stages of Education and Curriculum

Later authors do not deviate much from the foundational ideas expressed by earlier writers. The descriptions and contents of the stages of education and its curriculum remain remarkably consistent across time and location. Moving from earlier conceptions of education into the Hellenistic and Roman periods, authors such as Quintilian (35–90's CE), and Plutarch (ca 50 CE–ca 120 CE), provide vivid insight into the details of what education consisted of and what might have been available to Jews living during these times. Their comments about the stages and curriculum of education mirror, in some ways, the earlier conceptions made by Socrates and Plato, but expand on or modify them in other ways that reflect the developments of a new era. Here we will consider the continuation of some aspects of education, while also identifying some of the alterations that were made.

[104] Aristotle mentions four core educational subjects along with their functions and usefulness: letters, physical education, music, and drawing. Aristotle, *Pol.* 8.1337b22–33.
[105] Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*, 129.

Plutarch: Primary Education for the Child (παῖς)

The stages or levels of education remained relatively unchanged. Authors such as Plutarch, continue to use age or stages of human development to describe divisions of educational progression. What is considered the "Primary" stage of education, consists of similar subjects that were mentioned by Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato. For Plutarch, a free born child (τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐλεύθερον) was taught the branches of general education (ἐγκυκλίων παιδευμάτων) but at an introductory level and not in full detail.[106] In addition to learning general education, children were also expected to learn myths and to participate in physical training, both continuations of previous educational programs.[107]

Plutarch: Secondary Education for the Young (νέος)

Plutarch also describes another stage of education for the young (νέος) in his *De liberis educandis* ("Concerning the Education of Children") and *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* ("How an Adolescent Should Listen to Poetry"). This stage of the educational curriculum is complex in how it developed from earlier periods in Athenian society and into the early Roman era of Plutarch's time. Our concern here, is to identify what features the curriculum for this stage entailed. We will examine the locations and teachers that are associated with this stage in the next section. The primary stage of education, for the child (παῖς) from ages one to puberty, dealt mainly with introductory subjects in reading, grammar, physical exercises, and music. Plutarch and others in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, describe the stage of education and the

[106] Plutrach, [*Lib. ed.* 10].
[107] Plutrach, [*Lib. ed.* 11]. Plutarch, while advocating that children learn myths, argues against using random ones which could cause foolishness and corruption in a child's mind, [*Lib. ed.* 5]. This echoes Socrates's complaint that some myths contain too many falsehoods and should not be told to children.

curriculum for students who advance to the secondary level. Even before Plutarch, this secondary stage of education was being developed as early as the fourth century BCE in classical Athens.[108] The secondary stage of education became associated first with the division of age. Plutarch and others usually refer to those learning primary educational subjects as children, from ages one to twelve or puberty. The next age division was from twelve or puberty to eighteen or twenty years of age. The student who had reached puberty was referred to by Plutarch and other writers as now being a "youth" (νέος), as opposed to a child (παῖς). The designation of a youth as *ephebos* (ἔφηβος), a derivative of the word for puberty (ἥβη) or the physical change from a child to an adolescent, became somewhat synonymous with youth (νέος). The curriculum for this age group was mainly a continuation of what was learned at the primary stage but with advancements in levels of difficulty. For example, reading and writing exercises from the poets and myths became longer and more challenging. During the initial phases of the institution and location that would eventually be called the ephebeia (ἐφηβεία) or ephebeion (ἐφηβεῖον)—an eponym for the attendees—the focus was primarily on physical exercise (wrestling), use of weapons, and military strategy.[109] By the time of the Hellenistic period, the emphasis on military preparation began to decrease while instruction in other subjects increased. It is in the new educational setting of the ephebeion that the curriculum would become central for understanding Jewish education during this period. The primary and ephebeion stages are where the connections can be made between the Greek literary details and Jewish narratives. We will focus more on these connections and how they are made in the coming sections. The curriculum at the ephebeion stage included a variety of subjects that were taught by different teachers (who will be

[108] Sparta also has its own version of the ephebeion that emphasizes physical education and militaristic exercises.
[109] The fifth-century BCE historian Thucydides refers to the same group of young men, aiding in military battle, with νεωτάτων (from νεώτατος), Thuc. 1.105.4; 2.13.7. This is an early allusion to the physical and militaristic training that would become associated with the later institution of the ephebeion.

discussed in the next section). In addition to continued training in physical education (e.g., wrestling and other athletic contests), the curriculum also expanded to include more rigorous readings in poetry, training in music, discourse, rhetoric, dialectic, and composition.[110] Plutarch, for example, explains that a young man (νέον) should be taught poetry, particularly as a precursor to the study of philosophy.

> Wherefore poetry should not be avoided by those who are intending to pursue philosophy, but they should use poetry as an introductory exercise in philosophy, by training themselves habitually to seek the profitable in what gives pleasure, and to find satisfaction therein; and if there be nothing profitable, to combat such poetry and be dissatisfied with it. For this is the beginning of education, "If one begin each task in proper way, So is it likely will the ending be" [my added quotations marks for Sophocles's fragment], as Sophocles says. First of all, then, the young man (νέον) should be introduced into poetry with nothing in his mind so well imprinted, or so ready at hand…[111]

Quintilian: Stages of Education

Quintilian, a Roman rhetor, provides insight into the merger of Greek and Roman education early in the first century CE. His observations show a degree of continuity with earlier forms of the educational curriculum as well. The stages of education are three to four, just as some forms of Greek education. He explains the divisions of education based on the order and function of the various teachers that a student encounters.[112] For Quintilian, the first stage of education consists of gaining the ability to read, writing, learning the alphabet, and memorizing maxims or sayings of famous authors (typically poets).[113] The next stage (or secondary level) is, in Quintilian's estimation, the most important. The student is introduced by the teacher to more advanced excerpts of suggested and approved writings for reading, which includes the poets (e.g.,

---

[110] We have already mentioned examples in the spurious writing attributed to Plato, *Axiochus*, and comments from Teles the Cynic, which directly describes the secondary stage of the educational curriculum mentions subjects such as arithmetic, geometry, riding, physical exercise, and military training. Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*, 128–129.
[111] Plutarch, *Adol. poet. aud.* 15–16 (Babbitt, LCL).
[112] Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.4.1–5.
[113] Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.24–37. For examples of writing exercises that demonstrate how students learned maxims and sayings of famous men, see especially, Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 43–47.

Menander and Virgil), as well as other genres (e.g., tragedy and comedy).[114] In addition to advanced reading, the student is also introduced to astronomy, philosophy, music, and some rhetoric. This is somewhat different from earlier approaches to education, where the more difficulty subjects of astronomy and philosophy were typically withheld for the third stage of the curriculum. The third and fourth stages, not discussed directly here by Quintilian, are mentioned—albeit later—by the Latin writer and sophist Apuleius (125–170 CE),

> There is a famous saying of a wise man over dinner: "The first bowl," said he, "is for thirst, the second for cheer, the third for pleasure, the fourth for delirium." Not so the Muses' bowl: the more often drunk and the more strongly mixed, the more it promotes the health of the mind. The first bowl is the writing master's (*litteratoris*), and removes ignorance; the second is the schoolmaster's (*grammatici*) and provides learning; the third is the rhetorician's and arms with eloquence. Most drink no more than that: but I have drunk other bowls too in Athens—the aromatic one of poetry, the clear one of geometry, the sweet one of music, the slightly sharp one of dialectic, and of course the inexhaustible and sweet one of universal philosophy.[115]

VII. Greek Education: Teachers and Locations

The questions of stages of education and their inherent curricula demonstrated a diversity and development of subjects at each level of learning for students. Just as what was learned varied and had shared overlap in content and placement, some things were learned concurrently, while others were learned progressively across different stages. Along with understanding the stages of education, it is also equally important to consider those who were responsible for disseminating knowledge, as well as where learning took place. Both questions have direct connections to the later issue of how Jews learned to compose their narratives. To uncover what they learned to write and what they thought about their texts, the process must address who they might have learned from and where they could have accessed such learning. The specific questions of who taught composition and where and how composition was learned will be addressed in upcoming

[114] For additional examples of the authors and genres that Quintilian mentions, see his *Inst.* 1.8.4–12.
[115] Apulieus, *Flor*. 20.

chapters. Before delving into specific teachers for general Greek education, it must be reiterated that the systems of education and their curricula were rarely in full consensus. This lack of consensus was in most cases due to the level of expertise of one's instructor or their availability in a given location. The practice of hiring a private tutor, instead of going to a public institution was also an option for some, which probably lent itself to students learning certain subjects (based on their teacher's abilities) at different stages in the educational cycle.[116] Private tutors were hired for early and later stages of education to teach a host of subjects. This practice will be assumed but for the purposes of this section, we will concentrate on the types of things taught by specific teachers and the locations that students were taught in. For the most part, this will omit trying to identify all the subjects that private tutors might have covered. For the sake of clarity, we will approach the questions of who the teachers were, their subjects, and locations of education, by organizing them based on the primary and secondary stages that have been covered previously. What may be considered the third stage of education, at the academy, lyceum, or with a private tutor will be mentioned briefly at the end. The main focus will be on the first two stages.

Primary Education

The primary stage of education, aimed at the child, was mainly taught in the home. There were also instances where children are described as rising early and being accompanied by a "child teacher" (παιδαγωγός) to go to the "school" (διδασκαλεῖον) for learning their lessons. The *paidagogos* often accompanied the child to school and assisted with teaching some of the early

[116] Plutarch describes how some fathers hire unworthy teachers for their children, a practice that he says is all too common, "Nowadays there are some fathers who deserve utter contempt, who, before examining those who are going to teach, either because of ignorance, or sometimes because of inexperience, hand over their children to untried and untrustworthy men." [*Lib. ed.* 7].

lessons. The main teachers in the home, however; were fathers, mothers, and nurses. Nurses are specifically mentioned as teaching children myths before handing delegating them to a *paidagogos*.

> And, as it seems to me, Plato, that remarkable man, quite properly advises nurses, even in telling stories (μύθους) to children (παιδίοις), not to choose at random, lest haply their minds be filled at the outset with foolishness and corruption. Phocylides, too, the poet, appears to give admirable advice in saying: Should teach while still a child the tale of noble deeds.[117]

> When now they attain to an age to be put under the charge of attendants (ὑπὸ παιδαγωγοῖς τετάχθαι), then especially great care must be taken in the appointment of these, so as not to entrust one's children inadvertently to slaves taken in war or to barbarians or to those who are unstable.[118]

While the *paidagogos* and nurses taught some lessons of the primary stage of education, there were additional subjects that the student learned that required the expertise of other teachers. The primary stage also included subjects of physical exercise, beginning grammar (e.g., learning to write out the alphabet), and music. While it was possible that the *paidagogos* or the *didaskalos* may have taught some of these subjects, there were specialists in these areas that the students could learn from as well.[119] The teacher for physical exercise is called the *paidotribes* (παιδοτρίβης), or more literally "the one who teaches a child wrestling."

> … exercise of the body, but we should send the children to the trainer's (παιδοτρίβου) and cultivate adequately this side of education with all diligence, not merely for the sake of gracefulness of body but also with an eye to strength; for sturdiness of body in childhood is the foundation of a hale old age.[120]

Secondary Education

Along with the *paidotribes* teaching physical exercise and military strategies, much of the other subjects were taught at the gymnasium or *palaistra*.[121] There are several inscriptions which offer

---

[117] Plutarch, [*Lib. ed*. 5] (Babbitt, LCL).
[118] Plutarch, [*Lib. ed.* 7] (Babbitt, LCL).
[119] Plutarch mentions teachers, without specification, and does not indicate how they might differ from a *paidagogos*, "Teachers (διδασκάλους) must be sought for the children (τέκνοις) who are free from scandal in their lives, who are unimpeachable in their manners, and in experience the very best that may be found. For to receive a proper education (παιδείας) is the source and root of all goodness." [*Lib. ed*. 7] (Babbitt, LCL).
[120] Plutrarch, [*Lib. ed.* 11] (Babbitt, LCL).
[121] The palaistra (παλαίστρα) was typically adjacent or nearby the gymnasium, where wrestling and other contests were held.

names of teachers at the gymnasium, as well as their responsibilities. These lists, along with author comments provide a clearer, on the ground, sense of what types of activities students engaged in. In some cases, the division between a child (παῖς), a young man (νέος), and an *ephebos* are obscured, each being mentioned as attending the gymnasium/palaistra and learning similar subjects. This also reflects the overlap between educational subjects at the primary and secondary levels of the curriculum. One inscription from the third century BCE, lists teacher's names and functions along with their suggested compensation for service at the gymnasium.[122] The inscription lists the *paidotribes* (παιδοτρίβης) "wrestling teacher", *kitharistes* (κιθαριστής) "chithar player", and the *grammatodidaskalos* "letter teacher".[123]

The Sophists

For the primary and secondary subjects, as well as the more advanced subjects of astronomy, geometry, rhetoric, and dialectic, the Sophist served as a catch all instructor for hire.[124] The Sophist could be hired to teach various subjects at various locations, including the home, gymnasium or elsewhere. Learning with a sophist generally constituted the third stage of education. The fourth, and rarer, stage typically consisted of hiring a philosopher to learn higher order subjects in philosophy. The connection between the Academy (Ἀκᾰδήμεια) and Lyceum (Λύκειον) with the study of philosophical subjects is localized. The Academy, founded by Plato,

---

[122] *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* (*SIG*^{3}) 578. *SIG*, 577 also describes the functioning and endowment of schools along with positions of teachers with their pay scales. A third inscription, *SIG*, 959, (first century BCE) lists winners of competitions held by students. The list is valuable because it gives the contests they competed (along with the winner's names) thereby giving a sense of what types of subjects and activities they learned or participated in at their schools.
[123] The *grammatodidaskalos* is a compound of the *grammatistes* (γραμματιστής) and *didaskalos* (διδάσκαλος), "letter or writing teacher".
[124] For sophists teaching poetry, see, Plato, *Prot.* 338e6–339a6. For arithmetic, astronomy, geometry, and music, see, *Prot.* 318a6–319a7. For grammar, music, and physical education, see, *Prot*. 312a–b6. For Sophists receiving payment for hire, see, Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*, 72–74.

was located in Athens and was led by a *scholarch*. The curriculum generally focused on subjects related to mathematics, zoology, logic, rhetoric, argument, philosophy, and later studying Plato's teachings. The students that attended the Academy were typically young men (νέος) and local or visiting scholars. The Lyceum, named after the temple to Apollo Lykeion (Apollo of the Wolf) that was located near the gymnasium, was affiliated with the philosopher Isocrates in the fourth century BCE.[125] The Lyceum was essentially the same as the gymnasium and covered subjects that were included in the gymnasium including grammar and rhetoric, with an aim to prepare students for careers in politics and culture.[126]

VIII. Greek General Education: Conclusions and Next Steps

From various author's comments we gain the sense that there was a general understanding of what types of subjects were to be introduced to students when they reached a certain age. From the fifth and fourth century BCE, particularly in Athenian and Spartan cultures, training of young men who were maturing physically, focused on physical education and building essential skills for military activity. In addition to this learning, however, the subjects that were introduced at the primary stage of education were being expanded to include other advanced topics. It is clear from the example comments about education at the primary and secondary stages that there was considerable diversity and overlap in the subjects students learned. Although, comments about the educational curriculum were from different time periods and locations, there was still a degree of consistency in what students learned at each stage. The primary stage of education appears to be the most consistent, introducing children to the basic exercises for reading, learning

---

[125] Lucian, *Anach*. 7.
[126] For further historical background and development of the Academy and Lyceum see, Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*, 88–90.

the alphabet, memorizing passages from the poets, and learning music. The secondary stage for youths, although not universally referred to as the ephebeion, included many of the same exercises especially physical training and more advanced versions of exercises from the primary stage. The subjects of arithmetic, astronomy, dialectic, philosophy, and rhetoric were also included in some cases during the secondary stage. In some descriptions of education, the stages are not always mentioned explicitly but might be inferred. Cicero, for example, lists many of the subjects for primary and secondary education (even adding a few additional ones) but does not designate at what point they were learned.

> "Nearly all elements, now forming the content of arts, were once without order or correlation: in music, for example, rhythms, sounds and measures; in geometry, lines, figures, dimensions and magnitudes; in astronomy, the revolution of the sky, the rising, setting and movement of heavenly bodies; in literature, the study of poets, the learning of histories, the explanation of words and proper intonation in speaking them; and lastly in this very theory of oratory, invention, style, arrangement, memory and delivery, once seemed to all men things unknown and widely separate one from another. And so a certain art was called in from outside, derived from another definite sphere, which philosophers arrogate wholly to themselves, in order that it might give coherence to things so far disconnected and sundered, and bind them in some sort of scheme."[127]

What is most important for this study is the placement of literary composition and interpretive skills that students learned in the educational curriculum. These will be taken up separately in the Chapter five. Next, we will examine the stages, curriculum, and structures available for Jewish education and how their intersection with Greek education set the conditions for Jews to gain Greek learning and compositional skills.

IX. Literature Review of Jewish Education

The subject of Jewish education in antiquity generally deals with the origin and development of educational structures in Palestine. Questions of origin and development typically entail

[127] Cicero, *De or.* 1.187–188 (Sutton, LCL).

identifying what structures for learning existed, both in the home and outside it. Scholarly studies of Jewish education usually cover the ancient Israelite, Second Temple, Tannaitic, and Amoraic periods. Some studies are comprehensive, addressing educational developments chronologically, while other studies have a narrower scope and present the view of education according to a specific writer (e.g., Philo) or literary work (e.g., Sirach). Just as the time frames and approaches are expansive, the sources for understanding Jewish education are also multifarious. Reconstructions and evidence for Jewish education come from a variety of sources including archaeological, literary, and epigraphic. The main questions that are asked about Jewish education center on the nature of "schools," the location of learning, stages or levels of education, the educational curriculum and its contents, who was responsible for providing instruction (teachers), and who were considered students. An additional question, which is vital to this study, is what was the relationship between Hellenistic and Jewish education? Primarily, how and why did Jews learn Greek cultural, religious, and literary customs, and what was the social consequence? To answer these questions, scholars have sought to reconstruct what the educational system and conditions were based on combinations from ancient records. The arguments for explaining various aspects of education (e.g., location and curriculum) are supported by how scholars interpret specific types of evidence, particularly what the literary record provides. The main impediment to reconstructing what Jewish education entailed during the Second Temple period, is the relative lack of explicit and descriptive evidence from the period. Most of the archaeological support for education, specifically abecedaries and inscriptions (for example, the Theodotus inscription) are ambiguous and debatable.[128] Aside

[128] Hezser discusses the discovery of abecedaries that have Hebrew and Greek letters and are dated to Roman Palestine. They are written on ostraca, ossuaries, and papyrus. Their function as school exercises is debatable. Hezser suggests that they might be a type of apotropaic writing because they are mainly found in funeral contexts. For her full discussion see, Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, Texts and Studies in Ancient

from the dearth of physical evidence for Jewish education during the Second Temple period, the majority of evidence comes from literary extracts. Descriptions of Jewish education during the Hellenistic and Roman eras come from several written sources. Scholars consult texts from the Hebrew Bible, for example, Ezra and Nehemiah, to reconstruct the beginnings of formal education for the masses in Jerusalem. Other modern collections of Second Temple Jewish writings that provide insight into Jewish education include: texts from the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, New Testament, Philo, Josephus, and Rabbinic literature among others. While there are numerous literary sources that mention education and writing, the details they offer regarding the circumstances or setting in which they learned is not equally presented. Often an aspect of education, such as learning to write "letters" (γράμματα) is mentioned but without the context of the learning experience. It may not always be clear who the teacher was, what the writing curriculum consisted of, or where the instruction took place. This is typically the case for texts that are written around the time of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The texts that offer the most descriptive details about the development of Jewish education, including information about its curriculum, teachers, and locations, come from later rabbinic sources such as the Babylonian Talmud. Although the passages in the Babylonian Talmud refer to the earlier Tannaitic period, which does fit within the Hellenistic and Roman eras; however, there is debate concerning the reliability of the details due to the later compilation of the sayings. How much we can know about Jewish education during the Hellenistic and

---

Judaism; 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 85–88. The Theodotus inscription (in *Corpus inscriptionum Judaicarum.*1404), dated to the first century CE, celebrates a Greek-speaking Jew who had a synagogue erected for the reading of the law and the study of the commandments. Some scholars see this inscription as evidence for synagogues being used as places of study (i.e., as schools). While well-preserved, the context of the inscription is uncertain and makes a definitive statement that the synagogue served as a school questionable. For discussions of the inscription see, David McLain Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 243, and Stanley Porter, "Inscriptions and Papyri: Greco-Roman," *DNTB* 534.

Roman periods depends on which sources are considered viable. The debate concerning which sources to use generally involves whether or not to incorporate the later rabbinic sources into the historical reconstruction. Some scholars, such as Catherine Hezser, view the use of rabbinic literature (particularly Talmudic sources) to reconstruct what Jewish education entailed as anachronistic and not representative of the educational structures that existed during the earlier periods. Instead, rabbinic references to education are thought of as representing a later form of education that was closer to and more reflective of the Amoraim.[129] Other scholars, such as Martin Hengel and Nathan Drazin, cite rabbinic sources (e.g., from the Mishnah, Talmud, and Tosefta) to support their arguments for how Jewish education developed during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, although the dates for these texts are considerably late.[130] For some scholars, such as Drazin, the references to Jewish education found in rabbinic writings are treated as being historically reliable or at least containing some historical referent.

X. Jewish Education: Stages of Development

The question of the origin of Jewish education asks, how did education develop into a more systematized institution? Most agree that education started out in the home with parents serving as instructors for their children. The origin of when something new occurred in education is transitionally attributed to Ezra the Priest-Scribe and his interactions with the Jerusalem community after returning from Babylon.

[129] Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism; 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 47.

[130] For Drazin and Hengel's use of rabbinic sources to describe aspects of Jewish education during the Second Temple period, see, for example, Nathan Drazin, *History of Jewish Education from 515 B. C. E. To 220 C. E. (During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim)* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins press, 1940), 37–49; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, (London: SCM Press, 1974), 81–82. Drazin uses rabbinic sources throughout his work, while Hengel only cites a few sources to support the development of the Jewish school during the Hellenistic period.

> Ezra went up from Babylonia. He was a scribe skilled in the law of Moses that the LORD the God of Israel had given; and the king granted him all that he asked, for the hand of the LORD his God was upon him… On the first day of the first month the journey up from Babylon was begun, and on the first day of the fifth month he came to Jerusalem, for the gracious hand of his God was upon him. For Ezra had set his heart to study the law of the LORD, and to do it, and to teach (לִדְרֹוֹשׁ) the statutes and ordinances in Israel.[131]

> They told the scribe Ezra to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the LORD had given to Israel. Accordingly, the priest Ezra brought the law before the assembly, both men and women and all who could hear with understanding. This was on the first day of the seventh month. He read from it facing the square before the Water Gate from early morning until midday, in the presence of the men and the women and those who could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive to the book of the law.[132]

> … the Levites, helped the people to understand the law, while the people remained in their places. So they read from the book, from the law of God, with interpretation (מְפֹרָשׁ). They gave the sense, so that the people understood the reading. And Nehemiah, who was the governor, and Ezra the priest and scribe, and the Levites who taught the people …[133]

Ezra, along with Nehemiah and other leaders (including some Levites) assembled the people to read from the book of the law of Moses. Men and women from the Jerusalem community were gathered together in one place (at the Water Gate) and received teachings about the Torah. The teachings were in the form of reading selections from the scroll of the Torah and were interpreted by recognized instructors from the community. The significance of the setting and activity was that it was a public opportunity to learn about the Torah away from the home environment. Instruction was offered en masse along with designated instructors who served as interpreters to assist the people with understanding the meaning of what they were hearing. For some scholars, this episode serves as a precursor to systematized education because there was a designated place to meet for learning, there were teachers present, and there was a set curriculum (the Torah).[134] It

[131] Ezra 7:1, 9–10.
[132] Neh 8:1–3.
[133] Neh 8:7–9.
[134] Drazin refers to Ezra and Nehemiah as early examples of adult education, *History of Jewish Education from 515 B. C. E. To 220 C. E. (During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim)* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins press, 1940), 74–75. See also Hezser's discussion of how Ezra is connected to the origin of the Jewish public-school system using rabbinic texts, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism; 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 40.

is clear that the reading and instruction under Ezra was a specialized event for ratifying the Torah and not a “school”; however, it sometimes viewed as laying the foundation for the need for public education outside the home. The main literary passage that is used as evidence for the origin and development of schools, comes from the Babylonian Talmud. In tractate Baba Batra 21b, schools and teachers are said to have been appointed at different times.

> [E] For said R. Judah said Rab, “Now may that man’s memory be a blessing, and Joshua b. Gamela is his name, for were it not for him, the Torah would have been forgotten in Israel.
> [F] “‘For to begin with, whoever had a father—his father would teach him Torah. Then whoever had no father would not study Torah.
> [G] “*What exposition of Scripture sustains that thesis?* ‘And you shall teach them to your children’, ‘them you shall teach.’
> [H] “They made an ordinance that they should appoint school teachers in Jerusalem.
> [I] “*What exposition of Scripture sustains that thesis?* ‘For from Zion shall Torah go forth’.
> [J] “Still, if someone had a father, he would bring him up and teach him. If someone had no father, he would not go up and study.
> [K] “They made an ordinance that they should appoint in every district teachers for young people, and they would admit them from the age of sixteen or seventeen. But if the teacher rebuked him, the student would rebel and leave.
> [L] “Then Joshua b. Gamela came and made the ordinance that they should appoint school teachers in every town and village and admit the students at the age of six or seven.” (b. B. Bat. 21b [Neusner])

The passage is structured around the figure of Joshua ben Gamela (d. 69/70 CE) who was a high priest around the time of the second Temple and credited with appointing school teachers in around Jerusalem.[135] According to the passage, before Joshua ben Gamela, there were appointments of school teachers to teach the Torah. The need for teachers arose when some fathers were unable to teach Torah to their sons. The ordinance to appoint teachers in every district and to allow them to enter at sixteen or seventeen years of age is sometimes understood as the starting point for secondary education. The innovation under Joshua ben Gamela, to appoint teachers and allow students in at six or seven years of age, is viewed as the beginning of primary education.[136] The connection to Joshua ben Gamela would place the Jewish elementary

[135] Josephus, *Ant.* 20.213.
[136] Drazin understands the teacher appointments in Baba Batra 21b as describing three stages of school development: (1) the founding of academies, (2) high schools for adolescents, and (3) universal elementary schools. These would

school in first century CE.[137] Even with the start of primary and secondary education in the Torah outside the home, learning in the home from parents and other figures probably continued. The difficulty with the passage, aside from it being a later rabbinic production, is that it does not clarify when the initial institutions were implemented before Joshua ben Gamela and it does not explain what type of school the first or second appointments were meant to be. The exact origin of Jewish public schools for education remains shrouded in mystery. It is unclear when they began or were founded. The Talmudic reference to the development of schools in Jerusalem is the only specific description that offers any insight, but although it references the first-century priest Joshua ben Gamela, the text itself is relatively late. It is possible that schools existed during the Hellenistic period, but unfortunately, there are no explicit records that are contemporary to the time. The descriptions that survive are mainly home training in the Torah. If there were schools, they probably existed as an option alongside home education.

Jewish Education: Primary Stage

Jewish education during the Hellenistic period is generally understood as comprising two or three stages. Information that describes the stages and curriculums is gleaned mainly from later rabbinic literature. Stages of education and the content of their curriculums are not static. They vary based on time period, location, and the skill level of the instructors. Which sources are used for understanding the stages and curriculum of Jewish education depends on how the evidence is viewed. Rabbinic sources give the most detail but may reflect the educational situation of the

---

all be during the Tannaitic period, *History of Jewish Education from 515 B. C. E. To 220 C. E. (During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim)* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins press, 1940), 37–38.

[137] See Hezser's discussion of the scholarly arguments concerning Joshua ben Gamela as the central figure in Baba Batra 21b, as well as the issues of dating when these events occurred, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism; 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

Amoraim more than the Hellenistic and Tannaitic era. Literary descriptions of education from earlier writings, such as those in the New Testament, typically do not offer enough specifics to make a clear reconstruction. Philo and Josephus offer some additional details about location and curriculum but are not entirely explicit. The first stage of education appears to be the clearest of the three. The first stage is often referred to by scholars as primary education. Primary education is mainly teaching that occurred in the home and involved learning rudimentary skills such as the Hebrew alphabet, reading and memorizing the Torah, and grammar.[138] The central subject of learning the Torah is connected to biblical passages that mention fathers teaching it by repeating the commandments of YHWH to their sons. One example of teaching the Torah in the home is from the *Shema*, "Recite them [commandments] to your children and talk about them when you are at home and when you are away, when you lie down and when you rise."[139] Rabbinic sources also refer to the first level of education with the designation of *miqrā'* (מִקְרָא) which means "reading" and in this context reading the Torah. Later rabbinic texts also discuss which books children ought to begin reading. In some cases, it was suggested that children should begin reading Leviticus before Genesis.[140] The ages for entering and learning primary education is referred to in rabbinic sources as five, six, or seven years of age.[141] The first stage of education essentially sets the foundation for what students are taught during their secondary educational experience. The actual curriculum of learning the Torah, alphabet, and basic grammar are generally inferred from biblical, extra-biblical, and rabbinic literary sources. Primary education

[138] Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism; 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 68.
[139] Deut 6:7.
[140] Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, 77.
[141] m. 'Abot 5.21; b. B. Bat. 21b.

more than likely remained unchanged and a viable option for students and parents throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods, even when elementary schools were eventually implemented.

Jewish Education: Secondary Stage

The secondary stage of education is primarily described in rabbinic literature as well, although aspects of it are sometimes mentioned in other writings. Rabbinic sources sometimes refer to this stage of education as *mishnah* (מִשְׁנָה) "repetition". Mishnah in this sense refers to the curriculum of continuing education in the Torah but with additional advanced study and interpretation. In rabbinic sources, Mishnah is sometimes listed in second place, after mikra, as the order of what students learned at different ages in life or as learning that precedes the third level of study (Talmud or Gemara).[142] The study of the Mishnah presumably focused on the teachings and interpretations of Torah scholars and would continue into a more detailed study of passages.[143] More specifics about the details of what secondary education entailed is difficult to assess because the exact lines between primary, secondary, and higher education are not entirely clear, due to a lack of evidence. Some scholars think that other subjects were studied at the secondary level through their connection to what is discussed in the Torah, such as astronomy or calendrical studies.[144] One rabbinic passage mentions the progressive study of Yohanan ben Zakkai (first century CE),

> They said concerning Yohanan ben Zakkai that he never in his life left off studying Mishnah, Gemara, laws and lore, details of the Torah, details of the scribes, arguments a minori ad majus, arguments based on analogy, calendrical computations, gematrias, the speech of the ministering angels, the speech of spirits, the speech of palm-trees, fullers' parables and fox fables, great matters and small matters.[145]

---

[142] m. 'Abot 5.21; b. Sukkah 28a.
[143] Nathan Drazin, *History of Jewish Education from 515 B. C. E. To 220 C. E. (During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim)* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins press, 1940), 89.
[144] Drazin, *History of Jewish Education,* 92.
[145] b. Sukkah 28a.

Yohanan ben Zakkai's education consists of a variety of subjects, but when and where he learned them is unclear. Some of the subjects might have been at a secondary level of education while others may have been during a higher learning experience. The distinctions are not clearly delineated.

Jewish Education: Higher Learning

The third stage, often referred to as "higher learning", is the most challenging to distinguish between the three stages. While it is generically described by scholars as higher education or as colleges, later rabbinic sources sometimes refer to it with the designation of Talmud, Midrash, or Gemara.[146] These designations for this third stage of education reflect the activities of learning and interpreting texts under the tutelage of rabbinic sages. Talmud is understood as the body of learning that the Jewish student engages in, while Midrash describes the interpretive techniques they apply to the Mishnaic teaching. The use of Gemara, from the verb "to complete" (גמר), was also used to refer to higher learning as a synonym for Talmudic teaching. The sources for understanding higher education are divided between pre-rabbinic and rabbinic literature. Pre-rabbinic literature does not differentiate between secondary or higher learning explicitly. Reading selective passages from pre-rabbinic texts such as Sirach (second century BCE), where the scribe is described as studying an assortment of subjects (e.g., sayings of the famous, prophecies, and parables), it is clear that education beyond the primary stage included other topics in addition to learning the Torah.[147] The difficulty is knowing the extent of what was

---

[146] See Drazin's discussion of the terms for higher education and the definitions of Mishnah, Midrash, Talmud, and Gemara during the Tannaitic and Amoraic periods, Nathan Drazin, *History of Jewish Education*, 87–89.
[147] Sir 38:34–39:1–3.

taught and the conditions of the educational setting. Rabbinic sources also offer additional details about what was studied beyond primary education. According to one source, the study of Gemara is suggested to begin at fifteen years of age after the study of mikra and mishnah.[148] Similar to the passage in Sirach, students and rabbis are described as studying a variety of topics—such as astronomy and gematria—in addition to advanced Torah learning and interpretation.[149] The idea of a distinction between a secondary stage of education and a third level, rests primarily on references to stages of learning Torah. The first stage of mikra (reading of scripture) and the second of Mishnah (explanations of Torah readings) progressively built on the student's understanding of Torah and led to the third stage of Talmud or Midrash, which was comprised of more intensive interpretive study of halakhic and haggadic texts.[150]

Jewish Education: Locations for Learning

The location of education is another subject that is not entirely clear. Both pre-rabbinic and rabbinic literature offers names for places where learning occurs. In most cases, the locations for education are multi-functional. The Jerusalem temple could serve as a place for academic discussions, as well as for religious ritual celebrations. Pre-rabbinic literature typically mentions places of learning, not as "schools" but in generic terms. The most common places of learning mentioned during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods are the home and synagogue. The home is mentioned directly as a place for teaching young children about the Torah commandments and other introductory subjects. The synagogue, also referred to as the "place of

[148] m. 'Abot 5.21.
[149] b. Sukka 28a.
[150] See Drazin, *History of Jewish Education*, 95–96.

prayer" (προσευχή), is mentioned several times as a place where the reading and explanation of Torah is given.[151]

What can be known about Jewish education during the Hellenistic and Roman eras depends on which sources of evidence are considered valid. Rabbinic literary sources have the most descriptive information about schools and education but there remains some doubt to their veracity. Aside from rabbinic sources, there is very little direct description of Jewish education from earlier writings. With the caveat of different approaches and interpretations of physical and literary evidence in mind, there are some general—albeit debatable—conclusions about what Jewish education entailed, regarding its origin, stages, curriculum, and location. The next step is to consider how, when, and where Jews could have learned Greek education in tandem with Jewish educational structures.

XI. Jewish Education in Greek

Two questions remain when attempting to understand Jewish education during the Hellenistic and Roman periods that are not typically addressed in comprehensive treatments of Jewish education. The first is when in the educational curriculum would a Jewish student begin to learn subjects related to Greek literature and writing, and the second is where this type of learning would be made available to them. The existence of Greek writings by Jewish authors makes it indisputable that they learned Greek writing practices. The circumstances surrounding how they learned these techniques remains challenging to uncover. Jewish literary sources during the Second Temple period and afterwards offer scant information describing how and when students would have learned Greek education. Although the available information is not explicit, there are

---

[151] For synagogues called places of prayer, see, Philo, *Flacc.* 49

enough comments from writers who are active during the Hellenistic and Roman eras to make a plausible reconstruction of the possibilities of how and when students could have gained access to Greek education. Comments made by Jewish authors can also help with understanding what was learned at different stages of a student's academic journey.

The Problem of Evidence

The aim of this reconstruction, similar to the one for Greek education, is to consider how authors from the Hellenistic and Roman eras describe Jewish education. They are not always intentionally trying to give full descriptions of what education entailed, but combined, their allusions to educational practices offers a fuller image of what was available. While the problem of explicit evidence that describes educational circumstances for learning Greek education remains; attempting to reconstruct how Jews learned Greek based on author's comments about available education offers another avenue for resolving the dilemma.[152] The goal is to answer which structures were open to Jews at the time and at what point they would have learned to write narrative. The next chapter will investigate the specific details of what they would have learned during their training in writing narratives.

Possibilities for Jews to Learn Greek Education

There were at least three avenues available for learning Greek education for Jewish students. A student could have learned through a private tutor, at the synagogue, or at one of the Greek

---

[152] Scholars, such as Catherine Hezser, acknowledge that the inquiry into how Jews learned Greek education in Roman Palestine has not been adequately addressed. The main challenge is the lack of evidence or sources that gives explicit descriptions of how Jewish students would have learned to read and write Greek. This study will attempt to make some plausible reconstructions from the author's comments and perspective. For additional discussion of the availability of Greek education to Jews and the limitations of the sources, see, Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, 90–92.

institutions such as the gymnasium. Private education is certainly a viable option but will not be emphasized in this study, although it will be mentioned at times. Most of the discussion will deal with what education may have looked like in the home, synagogue, and gymnasium. One of the central points is that Jewish and Greek education were happening simultaneously. Jewish students would presumably have had access to both an education that indoctrinated them into their national traditions surrounding the Torah religion, as well as an opportunity to learn certain aspects of Greek education. More than likely, they would have learned more of the Torah and then some combination of primary and secondary learning in Greek education. In theory, Greek education would have been available to all Jews (especially those who held citizen rights), whether in Jerusalem or the diaspora, but it probably would have been pursued by students who came from socially elite backgrounds. The pursuit of further education in Greek studies and writing would have taken up considerable time and would be a suitable choice for those who were positioned for careers in politics, civic or religious administration, teaching, or writing.

Jews and Greek Primary Education

For an image of what primary/elementary education entailed—from an author's perspective—during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the writings of Philo and Josephus are most informative. Based on their comments, Jewish elementary education began in the home with parents mainly serving as instructors for children. Josephus explains how the Torah was to be taught and read in the home from an early age. The instruction focuses on both legal and moral subjects as the child learns about the actions of famous Hebrew figures for purposes of enculturation.[153]

---

[153] There is an example of learning the sacred writings from childhood mentioned by Paul to Timothy as well, "You, however, continue in the things you have learned and become convinced of, knowing from whom you have learned

> Again the Law does not allow the birth of our children (παίδων) to be made occasions for festivity and an excuse for drinking to excess. It enjoins sobriety in their upbringing from the very first. It orders that they shall be taught to read, and shall learn both the laws and the deeds of their forefathers, in order that they may imitate the latter, and, being grounded in the former, may neither transgress nor have any excuse for being ignorant of them.[154]

Philo also alludes to home education when he expounds on the meaning of the fifth commandment to honor one's parents.[155] He explains that parents are worthy of honor because of their similarity to God in their creative powers, which regards bringing new life into the world, but most importantly because of their position over their children.[156]

> Now parents are assigned a place in the higher of these two orders, for they are seniors and instructors (ὑφηγηταὶ) and benefactors and rulers and masters: sons and daughters are placed in the lower order, for they are juniors and learners and recipients of benefits and subjects and servants… I say, then, that the maker is always senior to the thing made and the cause to its effect, and the begetters are in a sense the causes and the creators of what they beget. They are also in the position of instructors (ὑφηγητῶν) because they impart to their children (παῖδας) from their earliest years everything that they themselves may happen to know, and give them instruction not only in the various branches of knowledge (ἐπιστήμας) which they impress upon their young minds, but also on the most essential questions of what to choose and avoid, namely, to choose virtues and avoid vices and the activities to which they lead.[157]

The parents' position over children includes serving as their teacher (or as their guide) in moral and ethical development, as well as in the "sciences". The use of the word for children (παῖδας) suggests that this would be introductory lessons in the sciences instead of advanced training. The question, of course, is which educational curriculum is Philo referring to, Greek or Hebrew? He is giving an interpretive explanation of what the command to honor one's parents means, and it seems plausible that his example is describing what took place in at least some homes. He does not mention the Torah directly but considering that it is an explanation related to the traditional decalogue implies that the Torah is part of the learning curriculum, especially regarding what to

---

them; and that from childhood (βρέφους) you have known the sacred writings which are able to give you the wisdom that leads to salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." (2 Tim 3:14–15).

[154] Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2:204 (Thackeray, LCL).

[155] Philo, *Spec.* 2.224.

[156] *Spec*. 2.224–227.

[157] *Spec.* 2.227–228.

choose and avoid. Both Philo and Josephus share that education for children could be carried out in the home, with their parents serving as their teachers. The Torah appears to be the main subject of the curriculum although teachings in other topics were probably also included at an introductory level. It is important to remember that Philo and Josephus are representative of aristocratic families and that their experiences and descriptions of education may not be representative of every household.[158] In addition to their social standing, they also represent two different locations: Josephus presumably trained in Palestine, while Philo appears to have received his education Alexandria. The types of Judaism they engaged were also different. Philo was a product of Hellenistic Judaism and seems to have received a more thorough education in Greek studies, while Josephus eventually settled on furthering his education with the sect of the Pharisees, which resulted in a minor acquaintance with the Greek language.

The opportunity to learn Greek subjects at the primary level is alluded to in Jewish literature but not described explicitly. Education in the Torah and religious subjects were offered in the home but if a parent wanted their child to receive an education that included learning to read and write the Greek language, then it would have to be learned through private or public education. The process of a Jewish child being introduced to Greek language and literature, through private education, would begin with selecting a qualified tutor or instructor. At the elementary stage of education, unless the parents were already familiar with Greek, parents could hire a nurse, foster-mother, or teacher to begin teaching the child. One example is how Plutarch explains the importance of choosing an exemplary teacher for children to insure their proper training.

[158] Philo almost certainly came from a wealthy family. He was well-educated in Jewish law, as well as Greek philosophy. He continued a life of study and contemplation in addition to serving in politics. His brother Alexander also held a position as Alabarch ("tax gatherer") for the Roman administration. Philo and his brother had to have some advanced level of education to function in administrative and political positions. For Philo's connection to his brother Alexander, his political activity, and his learning in philosophy, see Josephus's comment in *Ant.* 18.259.

> Teachers (διδασκάλους) must be sought for the children (τέκνοις) who are free from scandal in their lives, who are unimpeachable in their manners, and in experience the very best that may be found. For to receive a proper education (παιδείας) is the source and root of all goodness.[159]

There apparently were some problems associated with choosing teachers for students. Plutarch also comments on the detrimental trend of Fathers selecting teachers for their children that were unqualified but came at a cheaper cost.

> Nowadays there are some fathers who deserve utter contempt, who, before examining those who are going to teach, either because of ignorance, or sometimes because of inexperience, hand over their children to untried and untrustworthy men… Why, sometimes even with knowledge and with information from others, who tell them of the inexperience and even of the depravity of certain teachers, they nevertheless entrust their children to them; some yield to the flatteries of those who would please them, and there are those who do it as a favour to insistent friends.[160]

Jewish parents who hired a private teacher for their children, would help to explain how authors, such as Philo and Aristobulus, as well as others, would have been introduced to Greek writing and literature. The Jewish and Greek curriculums at the primary stage of education appear to be somewhat similar. The curriculum in the Jewish home centered on learning the Torah but also would have included introductory grammar and reading/recitation. A Jewish student who had a private Greek instructor would have also learned basic grammar, reading, selected stories (especially myths) from Greek literature, as well as other subjects related to the encyclical paideia (depending on the expertise of the teacher).

> And, as it seems to me, Plato, that remarkable man, quite properly advises nurses, even in telling stories (μύθους) to children (παιδίοις), not to choose at random, lest haply their minds be filled at the outset with foolishness and corruption. Phocylides, too, the poet, appears to give admirable advice in saying: Should teach while still a child the tale of noble deeds.[161]

> Now the free-born child (τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐλεύθερον) should not be allowed to go without some knowledge, both through hearing and observation, of every branch also of what is called general education (ἐγκυκλίων παιδευμάτων); yet these he should learn only incidentally, just to get a taste of them, as it were (for perfection in everything is impossible), but philosophy he should honour above all else.[162]

---

[159] Plutarch, [*Lib. ed*. 7] (Babbitt, LCL).
[160] Plutarch, [*Lib. ed*. 7] (Babbitt, LCL).
[161] Plutarch, [*Lib. ed*. 5] (Babbitt, LCL).
[162] Plutarch, [*Lib. ed*. 10] (Babbitt, LCL).

This expanded curriculum would help to account for when and where Jewish students would have initially become familiar with Greek language and literary accounts. Philo, for example, not only writes in Greek but is also capable of citing Greek authors and mythical accounts. Plutarch's assertion that children should be introduced to encyclical paideia would also explain how authors such as Aristobulus and Philo could have been familiar enough with those subjects to incorporate them into their writings if they were trained by private instructors.

Rabbinic sources attest more directly to Jewish students learning Greek at the primary stage. Teaching Greek to children (boys and girls) is alluded to in positive and negative ways. One positive example is from a saying attributed to Rabbi Yohanan (first century CE), by Rabbi Abahu, who taught that it was permitted to teach Greek to one's daughter because it would be an "ornament" for her.[163] There are also passages that question the appropriateness of teaching Greek to one's children. The Mishnah contains a prohibition on teaching Greek to one's son.[164] The prohibition is set during the war of the Roman Emperor Titus (79-81 CE) but without further elaboration.[165] The Tosefta offers an additional comment to the same prohibition, stating that an exception was made for the house of Rabban Gamaliel to teach Greek to their sons because their connection with Roman administration.[166] The prohibition itself, implies that Jewish education in Greek was a common occurrence. The practice of teaching Greek remains a debatable issue. The Talmud, in connection to the prohibition on teaching Greek under Titus, records the question of

---

[163] y. Šabb. 7d. The saying is criticized in the next saying by Simeon bar Ba who alleges that R. Abbahu attributed the saying to R. Yohanan because he wanted to teach his daughter Greek.
[164] m. Soṭah 9:14. A more detailed explanation is given in the Talmud surrounding the events leading up to the prohibition (b. Soṭah 49b) and mentions an elder who was familiar with Greek learning.
[165] Danby mentions that the Cambridge edition has Quietus (governor of Judea in 117 CE) instead of Titus, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: The Clarendon press, 1933), 305.
[166] t. Soṭah 15:8.

whether Greek learning should be prohibited at all.[167] Rabbinic sources may indeed preserve some eclectic outlooks on Greek education that were circulating during the Tannaitic period, but even without their testimony, it is clear that at least some Jewish families had an interest in providing their children with Greek education. Aside from rabbinic sources, there is also the example of Jewish education at the primary level in connection to Herod the Great. Josephus records two episodes that mentions educating male children. Josephus tells of Manahem, an Essene, who once observed a young Herod on his way to school. Herod is a child (παῖδα) and is on his way to the place of learning. Unfortunately, it is unclear if he is going to learn Greek subjects or not.[168]

Primary education at the Greek Gymnasium

Another option for learning Greek education at the elementary stage, would have been at a local gymnasium if one was available. We have already seen in detail that several Greek subjects were offered to children at the "school" (δῐδασκᾰλεῖον) which was typically connected to the gymnasium and palaistra.[169] Descriptions of primary education by Teles and others mention curriculum subjects that included: grammar, physical education, music, and art.[170] While there is

---

[167] "[But we have to make a distinction, teaching] the Greek language as one thing, and Greek learning as something else. But is Greek learning, for its part, forbidden at all?" b. Soṭah 49b (Neusner).

[168] See Hengel's detailed discussion and note on the possibility of Herod receiving a Greek education at a Greek elementary school in Jerusalem, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, Judentum Und Hellenismus.English (London: SCM Press, 1974), 77.

[169] There is also literary evidence from authors such as Aeschines (397–322 BCE) and Xenophon (429-357 BCE) who describe children attending "schools", what their curriculums entailed, and who their teachers were. Xenophon, for example, compares how Persian boys go to school to learn justice just as Athenian boys go to learn "letters", "The boys (παῖδες) go to school (διδασκαλεῖα) and spend their time in learning justice; and they say that they go there for this purpose, just as in our country they say that they go to learn to read and write (γράμματα)." Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.2.6, (Miller, LCL). Their descriptions of primary education mainly support what was available for Athenians, but it might also imply what some Greek schools did at later periods as well. For further discussions of Aeschines, Xenophon, and others' descriptions of children and school attendance see, Mark Joyal, Iain McDougall, and John Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*, Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World (Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2009), 36, 51, 128.

[170] Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education*, 128–129.

evidence that Jews were associated with Greek gymnasiums during the Hellenistic period, it is not entirely clear if they attended schools that offered learning at the primary stage of education. Most of the evidence supports primary education taught by parents in the home or by hiring private instructors. Philo mentions the gymnasium, as well as the theater, in connection with its associated activities, such as wrestling and other athletic contests.[171] Although Philo is familiar with the events held in the gymnasium and is aware of the various branches of encyclical education, he does not connect the two. While the edict of Claudius to the Alexandrians may imply Jewish attendance at the gymnasium, it does not specify which activities they participated in or which level of education was offered in Alexandria, Egypt.[172] Josephus mentions the gymnasium but only in connection with its inception under Antiochus Epiphanes. Elementary education and its curriculum, however, are not described.

Jews and Greek Secondary Education

One of the central questions for this study is how Jews learned to write Greek narrative literature. So far, we have seen possibilities for Jewish and Greek education at the primary stage of education. If rabbinic sources have any historical referent, Jewish students began their elementary studies around the age of six or seven and began studying mikra (the reading of the Torah) in the home. If a Jewish parent wanted their child to have a Greek elementary education, they more than likely hired a private instructor who could teach them basic Greek grammar, as

[171] Philo, *Gig.* 37; *Somn.* 1.129; *Abr.* 48.

[172] The "Letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians" addresses a conflict between the Jews and Alexandrians in 41 CE. Claudius warns the Alexandrians to cease agitating the Jews and to behave in a kinder fashion towards them. He also warns the Jews not to want more than what they previously had and not to intrude on the contests being held by the leaders of the gymnasium (*gymnasiarchoi* and *kosmetai*), see No. 153 in Victor Tcherikover, Alexander Fuks, and Menahem Stern, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Published for the Magnes Press, Hebrew University [by] Harvard University Press, 1957), 43.

well as other subjects at an introductory level. Jewish students would have begun their Greek studies at age seven (the same time for Jewish primary studies) and completed them by puberty (age twelve). In some cases, it may have also been possible that a Jewish student attended a Greek "school" near the campus of a local gymnasium, where instruction in the encyclical branches of education would be presented at a rudimentary level. Torah instruction in the home would account for familiarity with traditional Jewish religious concepts and characters. Elementary Greek education would have provided not only grammatical skills for the Greek language but also an understanding of Greek mythological concepts if they were taught writings such as Homer and Hesiod as some Greek students were.

Whereas primary education may have laid foundational understanding of Greek language and concepts, the secondary stage of Greek education, along with its Jewish counterpart, is where advanced techniques for writing narrative would take place. Many of the narrative structures and elements are presented during this phase of education, along with additional details, such as the study of Greek poets or maxims, that are not generally thought to be associated with the Jewish curriculum. The combination of Jewish and Greek secondary education allows authors such as Aristobulus and Philo to integrate traditional Jewish literary topics, such as the creation account, with interpretations that include Greek philosophical ideas. The question here is when and where would Jewish students encounter Greek secondary education and how would it merge with Jewish secondary studies? Consideration will be given to authors from the Hellenistic and Roman periods to reconstruct how the encounter between Jewish students and their Greek instructors may have taken place. The location of secondary education, who the instructors were,

and a few broad subjects of this stage will be discussed. The specific details of what they learned to compose a narrative will be covered in more detail in the next chapter.

Locations for Secondary Education

Jewish and Greek secondary education both begin around the time of puberty. For Jewish secondary education, if the rabbinic sources are viable, students began between the ages of ten and seventeen. According to one Mishnaic saying, a student began studying "mishnah" (introductory interpretation of the Torah) at the age of ten and more advanced study and interpretation of the Torah, called Gemara, at the age of fifteen.[173] The distinction between Mishnah and Gemara (as higher education) was apparently a matter of degree. Whether Mishnaic study of the Torah was considered a part of primary or secondary education is not entirely clear.[174] Regardless, it was a precursor to advanced interpretive study (Gemara, Talmud, Midrash) of the Torah that was certainly a part of Jewish secondary education or a third level of higher education.[175] Around the same time (age twelve), a Jewish parent could arrange for their child to continue their studies at the secondary stage of Greek education, resulting in dual learning. If a parent arranged for private education, instruction could continue in the home or at another place of convenience, such as an instructor's home. Otherwise, students could attend school at the gymnasium where they would be introduced to a host of Greek related subjects. Philo is informed about the gymnasium and its constituent events but does not offer any indication of Jewish students attending there for educational purposes. The "school"

[173] m. 'Abot 5.21.
[174] Drazin understands the stages to be Mikra, Mishnah, and Talmud/Midrash based on rabbinic sources, History of Jewish Education from 515 B. C. E. To 220 C. E., 87–89.
[175] Gemara is a later replacement for talmud or midrash as a designation for higher education. All three were descriptive of advanced study and interpretation of the Torah, see Drazin, History of Jewish Education from 515 B. C. E. To 220 C. E., 88.

(δῐδασκᾰλεῖον), which was near the gymnasium/palaistra, is likely where Jewish students met to learn Greek education. Although not entirely explicit, the edict of Claudius alludes to Jewish interest in attending the gymnasium, even if only for athletic contests. The main source for Jewish attendance and participation at the gymnasium for the purpose of Greek education comes from Josephus and the Maccabean accounts. The accounts present the same story of how a delegation of Jews, led by Jason the High Priest, made a request to the Ptolemaic king, Antiochus Epiphanes, to have a gymnasium built.[176] Their goal, according to the narrative, was to have a gymnasium built so that they could fulfill their desire to live according to Hellenistic social customs, while abandoning traditional Jewish culture.

> When Seleucus died and Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes, succeeded to the kingdom, Jason the brother of Onias obtained the high priesthood by corruption, promising the king at an interview three hundred sixty talents of silver, and from another source of revenue eighty talents. In addition to this he promised to pay one hundred fifty more if permission were given *to establish by his authority a gymnasium and a body of youth for it*, *and to enroll the people of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch.* When the king assented and Jason came to office, he at once shifted his compatriots over to the Greek way of life… he destroyed the lawful ways of living and introduced new customs contrary to the law. *He took delight in establishing a gymnasium right under the citadel, and he induced the noblest of the young men to wear the Greek hat*. *There was such an extreme of Hellenization and increase in the adoption of foreign ways* because of the surpassing wickedness of Jason, who was ungodly and no true high priest, that the priests were no longer intent upon their service at the altar. Despising the sanctuary and neglecting the sacrifices, *they hurried to take part in the unlawful proceedings in the wrestling arena after the signal for the discus-throwing*, disdaining the honors prized by their ancestors and putting the highest value upon Greek forms of prestige.[177]

2 Maccabees emphasizes that there was a strong "hellenization" and that the Jews who supported Jason and the transition over to a Greek way of life, participated in the athletic contests associated with the gymnasium. The most important detail, for the purpose of this study, is that part of the request to have a gymnasium in Jerusalem was to establish a school for the young men (ἐφήβων), known as the Ephebon, which was the traditionally the secondary stage of education. This account for Jews in Jerusalem as having access to Greek education in the

---

[176] The three versions of the accounts are found in 1 Macc 1:11–15; 2 Macc 4:7–15; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.239–241.
[177] My italics added for emphasis, 2 Macc 4:7–15.

gymnasium and it does not seem far-fetched that Jews living in the diaspora, particularly in Alexandria, Egypt, would have participated in education at a gymnasium depending on availability.[178]

Secondary Greek Curriculum

The most crucial aspect of Greek education to answer before delving into the issue of what Jewish authors learned to compose their narratives, is what stage in education did they learn to write and what subjects (broadly) made up the curriculum? It is one thing to assume that Jewish writers learned Greek rhetorical techniques because of the appearance and content of their literary works, but to explain *when* and *how* they might have acquired this knowledge is the object goal of this inquiry. It is tangibly clear that authors such as Josephus and Philo learned Greek at some point, because their surviving works are not only written in the Greek language, but they also reflect structures and contents that are associated with Greek education. We have seen that Jewish education, at both the elementary and secondary levels, primarily focused on Torah study and interpretation. Other Jewish groups, such as the Qumran community and Therapeutae, were representative of alternative forms of education. Their communities may have had what could be considered as primary and secondary stages of education. The Rule of the Community, a fragmentary sectarian document that describes community requirements and eschatological events, describes two stages of education for its young initiates. The child first receives education in the Book of Meditation (or "Book of Hagu") and as he matures, he continues his training in the covenant and commands.

[178] This becomes more plausible when we consider Josephus report that Jews living in various locations were afforded citizenship rights and privileges in some Greco-Macedonian cities, *Ant.* 12.119ff; *C. Ap.* 2.39; *B. J.* 7.43–44.

The following is the policy for all the troops of the congregation, and it applies to every native-born Israelite. From [early ch]ildhood each boy ([נע]וריו) is to be instructed in the Book of Meditation (בספר ההגי). As he grows older, they shall teach him the statutes of the Covenant (הברית), and [he will receive] [in]struction in their laws (במשפטיהמה). For ten years he is to be considered a youth (בטב). Then, at a[ge] twenty, [he shall be enrolled] [in] the ranks and take his place among the men of his clan, thereby joining the holy congrega[tion.][179]

The Book of Hagu could be considered the primary stage of education, while continuing education in the covenant and commandments could be understood as secondary education, akin to how rabbinic sources delineate Mikra, Mishnah, and Talmud/Midrash as progressive stages of learning in the Torah.

Philo mentions another first-century BCE Jewish sect called the Therapeutae ("healers").[180] He describes them as a desert dwelling, somewhat monastic and esoteric sect. The Therapeutae that Philo observed were located in and around Alexandria, Egypt. He describes their solitary study practices and communal assemblies, which appear to be similar to expectations of the Jewish secondary (or higher learning) stage of education. Philo lists some of the subjects that the Therapeutae study, including sacred writings (presumably the Torah), music, the writings of ancient men, and allegorical interpretations.

And the interval between morning and evening is by them devoted wholly to meditation on and to practice of virtue, for they take up the sacred scriptures and philosophise (φιλοσοφοῦσι) concerning them, investigating the allegories of their national philosophy, since they look upon their literal expressions as symbols of some secret meaning of nature, intended to be conveyed in those figurative expressions. They have also writings of ancient men (συγγράμματα παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν), who having been the founders of one sect or another have left behind them many memorials of the allegorical system of writing and explanation, whom they take as a kind of model, and imitate the general fashion of their sect; so that they do not occupy themselves solely in contemplation, but they likewise compose (ποιοῦσιν) psalms and hymns to God in every kind of metre and melody imaginable, which they of necessity arrange in more dignified rhythm.[181]

[179] 1QSa I, 6–11 (Wise).
[180] Philo connects their name with the Greek word θεραπευτρίδες, which means to cure or heal, *Contempl.* 2.
[181] Philo, *Contempl.* 28–29 (Yonge).

These subjects are studied in a solitary setting in their homes called the “monastery” (μοναστήριον).[182] Another important observation is that they compose psalms and hymns to God, implying that they possessed the skills of composition. The study of these subjects aligns with Jewish secondary education that centered on the study and advanced interpretation of the Torah (Talmud/Midrash stage). Even the sacred assembly held on the Sabbath was similar to a school of higher learning, which focused on more advanced details and interpretations of the Torah. Philo explains that the elder explained man complex details of the Law to the assembled community (male and female).[183]

The Therapeutae and Qumran communities each represent the diversity that existed between Jewish denominations, but also commonalities in their educational structures. The Therapeutae appear to be me more expansive than the sect represented by the Rule of the Community document, aside from them studying the Book of Hagu. The Therapeutae engaged in more than just the study of the Torah. Their expanded curriculum included other writings (perhaps ancient men referred to Hesiod and Homer), philosophical and allegorical ideas, and musical composition. Musical composition would certainly imply the study of music in addition to grammatical training.

Greek Educational Curriculum for Jewish Students

Literary sources from the Classical (500–336 BCE) and Hellenistic ages often describe what was typically included in the curriculum for Greek secondary education. Authors from various time periods and location, such as Plato, Aristotle, and Plutarch, attest to what the curriculum for

[182] Philo, *Contempl.* 25.
[183] Philo, *Contempl.* 30–33.

Greek secondary education entailed. There are, expectedly, some differences between them, such as which subjects are taught and what order they are presented. However, there are several similarities between them that allows for some continuity in what could be considered a recognizable curriculum for Greek education. Here, we will consider which subjects can be identified as comprising Greek secondary education and whether comments made by Philo and Josephus align with the results. Both authors will serve as case studies for how Jews living in the Hellenistic and Roman eras might have acquired Greek education at the secondary stage. The central question of, how did the Jews learn to write Greek narrative, will be addressed from the vantage point of *when* it took place in the curriculum.

The question of what Greek secondary education looked like during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, from an author's perspective has already been covered. Authors from the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods attest to a Greek secondary stage curriculum that was comprised mainly of studying literary works, physical training, and other arts/sciences. Several authors offer descriptions of what was involved in secondary education. The age that students began and completed this level of study was from puberty to eighteen or twenty years of age. Authors as far back as Plato and Aristotle suggest curriculums that included students learning letters, reading, physical education, and music, both at the primary and secondary levels. These subjects would be repeated for centuries in Greek academies. Aristotle, for example, divides Greek education into stages based on age. The first stage from seven to puberty and the second from puberty to twenty-one.[184] Although he does not list the subjects that go along with the divisions of education he does explain that the four core subjects that students learn are letters, physical

[184] Aristotle, *Pol.* 7.1336b35.

training, music, and sometimes drawing.[185] The age of the student becomes significant as the educational curriculum continues to advance. When authors refer to education for children, one of the main words used to describe the student is "child" (παῖς) which is typically from seven to puberty. This is the education that is referred to as being taught in the home or by private tutors. Many of the primary stage educational subject teachers carry the word for child in their titles. For example, the child guide is called the *paidagogos* and the wrestling instructor is called the *paidotribes*. The secondary stage of Greek education usually refers to the student (typically a male) as a "youth" (νέος). Knowing the student's age in life (παῖς or νέος) allows for us to make a connection with the stage in the educational curriculum (primary or secondary). Sometimes an author will refer to certain educational topics or instructions for learning without the informative benefit of which stage or division of learning is being referred to. When this happens, we can still determine which stage of education is intended if the author indicates that the target student is a child or a youth. For example, Plutarch's work, "How the Young Man Should Study Poetry" uses "youth" (νέον) in the title, which indicates that the learning involved was meant for the secondary stage of education and not necessarily intended for a child or the primary stage of education. Other subjects, in addition to letters, reading, music, and physical education, that students learned at the secondary level include: Arithmetic, Geometry, and riding as mentioned by Teles the Cynic and Plato. These could all be learned either at the gymnasium or through a private teacher, such as a Sophist.[186] Plato records Protagoras' critique of the Sophists for mistreating the youth they teach. His criticism also indicates which subjects they teach, and the

[185] Aristotle, *Pol.* 8.1337b22-33.
[186] The Sophist could teach (for a fee) in the field of liberal education which included grammar, physical education, cithara/music, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and the proper reading and composition of poetry.

use of “young” (νέους) shows that this was for students who had entered the secondary phase of education.

> When Protagoras heard my words,—You do right, he said, to ask that, while I am only too glad to answer those who ask the right question. For Hippocrates, if he comes to me, will not be treated as he would have been if he had joined the classes of an ordinary sophist. The generality of them maltreat the young (νέους); for when they have escaped from the arts they bring them back against their will and force them into arts, *teaching them arithmetic and astronomy and geometry and music* (and here he glanced at Hippias); whereas, if he applies to me, he will learn precisely and solely that for which he has come.[187]

Another subject is offered by Plutarch, who suggest that that a young (νέος) man should be introduced to poetry as a precursor to learning philosophy.[188] In addition to the expansive secondary curriculum, students were also introduced to the study of rhetoric, discourse, dialectic, and literary composition. Theon, the first-century CE rhetor, explains how Greek secondary education should also include training in the preliminary exercises (from προγύμνασμα). Teachers are expected to provide writing exercises for their young students to practice their composition skills.

> First of all, the teacher (διδάσκαλον) should collect good examples of each exercise (γυμνάσματος) from ancient prose works and assign them to the young (νέοις) to be learned by heart; for example, the kind of chreia found in the first book of Plato’s Republic…[189]

Theon refers to the young (νέοις) as he advises teachers on which method would be effective to teach them composition, indicating that learning this subject would occur during the secondary stage of education. The significance of Theon mentioning the preliminary exercises being taught at the secondary level to the young, is that he also explains how this training serves are preparation not only for a career in rhetoric but also for those who wish to become professional writers.

> Now I have included these remarks, not thinking that all are useful to all beginners, but in order that we may know that training in exercises (γυμνασμάτων) is absolutely useful not only to those who are

[187] Plato, *Prot.* 318d (Lamb, LCL). My italics added for emphasis.
[188] Plutarch, *Adol. poet. aud.* 15–16.
[189] Theon 66 (Kennedy).

going to practice rhetoric but also if one wishes to undertake the function of poets or historians or any other writers.[190]

The teacher who assigned the preliminary exercises was the Grammarian. Training in the progymnasmata, which included writing styles and literary features for various genres, could be learned at the gymnasium, where Grammarians were employed or through private education. Sophists may have also been qualified to teach aspects of composition. The resolution to the question of when training in writing or composing narratives would have occurred, is during the secondary stage of education when a student was between the ages of twelve and twenty. The next question is how Jewish students would have taken part in this learning as well.

Philo and Greek Education

While there are other Jewish works written in Greek that display strong influence from or connections to Greek education and composition, rarely do we get an inner view of the author's life experience. It is especially rare to gain any clear information or insight into what their educational training entailed. Identifying precise details about an author's education or what they thought about the process of composing texts, is still very difficult. With Philo, we possess a unique, albeit partial, view into his education and what he thought about the instructional practices and curriculums that were prevalent around him in Alexandria, Egypt.

Philo offers a somewhat detailed description of the subjects he learned at different stages of his education. He mentions learning subjects, such as grammar, writing, reading, geometry, music, as well as studying the works of poets and historians.[191] From his own descriptions, we

[190] Theon 70 (Kennedy).
[191] Philo, *Congr.* 74–76.

can postulate that he received a respectable dual education in both Jewish sacred writings and law, as well as in Greek language and literature. Despite debates about how much of the Hebrew language Philo knew, he was clearly well-versed in Jewish literature, expanded traditions, and complex interpretations. Considering Philo's family had connections to Roman administration, it is probable that he received a well-rounded education—which enabled him to function as a political figure—much as his brother Alexander did. In agreement with his educational testimony, he is remarkably familiar with the Greek encyclical paideia, and the concordant athletic contests associated with the local gymnasium.

> For who can be more completely the benefactors of their children (παίδων) than parents, who have not only caused them to exist, but have afterwards thought them worthy of food, and after that again of education both in body and soul, and have enabled them not only to live, but also to live well; training their body by gymnastic and athletic rules so as to bring it into a vigorous and healthy state, and giving it an easy way of standing and moving not without elegance and becoming grace, and educating the soul by letters, and numbers, and geometry, and music, and every kind of philosophy which may elevate the mind which is lodged in the mortal body and conduct it up to heaven, and can display to advantage the blessed and happy qualities that are in it, producing an admiration of and a desire for an unchangeable and harmonious system, which they will afterwards never leave if they preserve their obedience to their captain.[192]

Philo demonstrates his familiarity with the divisions of the Greek education through his allegory of encyclical paideia with Hagar and Sarah. There Philo lists Hagar are representing the educational subjects of grammar (including history and poets), music, geometry, astronomy, rhetoric, and dialectic (which he considers as similar to rhetoric).[193] The association of the encyclical paideia with the secondary stage of education is also slightly alluded to when Philo says that one cannot enter through the older doors philosophy without first entering through the "younger" (νεωτέραις) parts which includes grammar, geometry and the rest of the encyclical subjects.[194] The use of "younger" parts of philosophy could be a connection to training in the

---

[192] Philo, *Spec.* 2.229–230 (Yonge).
[193] Philo, *Congr.* 11, 18.
[194] Philo, *Ebr.* 1.49.

encyclical paideia during the secondary stage of education, which would be followed by continual training in the further advanced study of philosophy.[195] Philo also describes how parents instruct children early on but does not include which subjects they teach.[196] Philo is most explicit in describing the types of subjects that are associated with Greek secondary education and encyclical paideia. He describes how parents make it possible for their children to learn (presumably at a later stage) numbers, geometry, music, and philosophy.[197] In addition to these, Philo is also familiar with other secondary subjects such as astronomy and rhetoric, as well as the study of the works of historians and poets (most likely Hesiod and Homer).[198] Each of the educational subjects he mentions are listed by Greek authors as constituting part of secondary education. Unfortunately, Philo does not directly communicate *how* he underwent educational training in each of the branches of encyclical education, but he does offer a brief description of what his studies included. He is silent about his primary educational experience but does share details about how he came to be interested in philosophical studies and the contemplative life.

> At all events I, when I was first excited by the stimulus of philosophy to feel a desire for it, when I was very young (νέος) connected myself with one of her handmaidens, namely, grammar; and all the offspring of which I became the father by her, such as writing, reading, and the acquaintance with the works of the poets and historians, I attributed to the mistress.[199]

Philo begins by explaining when he was "young" (νέος), indicating that his study of grammar, writing, reading, and the poets and historians was at the secondary stage of Greek education (between the ages of twelve and twenty). His study of these Greek subjects would align with the subjects mentioned by Greek authors discussing the divisions of age and educational stages. Whether Philo was taught at a gymnasium or by a private instructor (Grammarian or Sophist)

[195] The young (νέος) usually study at the secondary stage of education.
[196] Philo, *Spec.* 2.228.
[197] Philo, *Spec.* 2.229–230.
[198] Philo, *Congr.* 11, 15–18.
[199] Philo, *Congr.* 74 (Yonge).

remains unclear. Regarding when Philo learned to write narrative in the educational curriculum, his acknowledgement of studying grammar, writing, and historical and poetical literature as a young man, agrees with what Theon describes about young men preparing for professional careers in writing. It is then probable that during the secondary stage of education, Philo would have practiced the progymnasmata (copying and practicing with historical and poetic works, as Theon prescribed) and the necessary techniques to compose his writings. With Philo being a resident of Alexandria, a location where the availability of Greek education flourished and coincidentally where Theon was active as well, it is likely that he could have had a private Greek and Jewish instructor during his primary education or a Jew who knew Greek. He could have then continued to the gymnasium where he would have certainly learned the requisite subjects and literary skills to compose his philosophical collection of writings.

Josephus and Greek Education

Josephus, similar to Philo, does not offer explicit details of how he acquired his Greek education. However, he does mention some specific subjects the he learned. Josephus, without referring to himself, mentions that it was relatively common for Jewish children to grow up being educated in the Torah particularly for enculturation. He also indirectly alludes to his own primary education as including the study of the Jewish laws (Torah). He says that when he was no longer a child (ἀντίπαις) he was already being consulted by other leaders of his community concerning the interpretation of the Torah at the age of fourteen.

> Moreover, when I was a child (ἀντίπαις), and about fourteen years of age, I was commended by all for the love I had to learning; on which account the high priests and principal men of the city came then frequently to me together, in order to know my opinion about the accurate understanding of points of the law…[200]

[200] Josephus, *Life* 9 (Whiston).

Josephus' description of his early education, even if somewhat embellished, aligns with Jewish learning that focused on Torah reading and study (*mikra*) from ages seven to ten and then more intricate interpretation (mishnah) before progressing to Talmud/Midrash at age fifteen. Josephus at age fourteen, describes himself as already being quite skilled in interpretive knowledge of the Torah, and by age sixteen embarks on a more advanced study (higher education) with the various sects of his time. Josephus at the age of sixteen and proposing to study the other sects of Judaism before submitting to study with Banus in the desert for three years, agrees with the description of the secondary stage of Jewish education (or perhaps higher learning as a third stage) associated with Talmud/Midrash/Gemara, which began at the age of fifteen.[201] Josephus joining the Pharisees at age nineteen, could be understood as part of his continued advanced education in interpreting the Torah at the stage of Talmud/Midrash.

What Josephus describes about his educational pursuit at the primary and secondary stages fits within Jewish educational curriculums, but what about his Greek education? Josephus is certainly familiar with Jewish literature (including expanded narratives), religious ritual, and historical traditions, but his education was not limited to the curriculum of the Jewish Torah. Josephus' works, although written originally in Hebrew, were translated into Greek by his own hand.[202] Josephus' ability to read and write Greek is what prompts the question of how he was trained in Greek literature and language. At what point did he acquire a Greek education? Josephus, after acknowledging his expertise in Jewish learning, mentions that he also obtained a Greek education.

---

[201] m. 'Abot 5.21. A Talmudic tradition has secondary or higher education begin at age sixteen or seventeen (b. B. Bat. 21b).
[202] Josephus, *B. J.* 1.3.

> For those of my own nation freely acknowledge that I far exceed them in the learning belonging to Jews: I have also taken a great deal of pains to obtain the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language, although I have so long accustomed myself to speak our own tongue, that I cannot pronounce Greek with sufficient exactness…[203]

Two questions arise about his Greek education: First, did he learn it during the primary or secondary stages or both? Second, how far did he advance in his studies? For the first question, it is clear that Greek composition skills were learned at the secondary stage of education during this time period. Training to compose literature would have certainly required some introductory instruction in grammar (which was normally at the primary stage), such as learning the Greek alphabet and syntax. Josephus came from a wealthy and socially elite family, so it is possible that his parents could have afforded to hire a private tutor (Grammarian) at the primary stage to assist him with introductory grammar lessons.[204] This arrangement would have required dual learning, as he would have also been studying Hebrew and Torah readings. Alternatively, Josephus could have attended the gymnasium in Jerusalem that was built under Antiochus Epiphanes (which he references in his *Antiquitates judaicae* 12.241). He could have been a student at the secondary or ephebos stage, but this seems unlikely because it would be odd that he does not mention it in his brief account of how he came to join the Pharisaic sect. His time comparing Jewish sects and study in the desert with Banus, which he says was between the ages of fourteen and nineteen, would coincide with the usual period of Greek secondary education at the gymnasium from the ages of twelve to eighteen or twenty. With the gymnasium and ephebate being less plausible options, it becomes more likely that Josephus acquired a primary level of Greek instruction through a private teacher. It is much more certain that he would have learned Greek composition at the secondary level, also through private instruction. His familiarity with Greek authors and

[203] Josephus, *Ant.* 20.263 (Whiston).
[204] Josephus, *Life* 1–2.

the form and style of his historical works reflect the literary conventions of other Greek historians, as well as Theon's instructions for composing narratives.

The result of the reconstruction demonstrates how Jewish students had access to Hellenistic educational institutions and participated in the various stages of the learning process. They could do this while concurrently learning Jewish traditional instruction without having to select one curriculum over the other. Possible locations for learning included the home (of a parent or some other teacher), synagogue, and gymnasium. Jewish students, for instance, could learn their traditional heritage first in the home and synagogue, but for those who desired to or were wealthy enough, they could also hire teachers (e.g., a *paidagogos*) to privately tutor a child in Greek grammar. The Greek and Jewish curriculums that they learned helps to explain how Jewish authors were able to learn both Jewish traditions and Greek literary, mythological, and philosophical details and merge them into new theological conceptions. What Jewish authors learned specifically to construct Greek narratives will be covered in Chapter four.

CHAPTER 3

What Did They Mean By Narrative?

This chapter discusses the importance of understanding the uncommon definition of "narrative" as it is used in its ancient and modern conventions, as well as its significance for the wider project. When studying or referring to ancient narrative as a literary genre or which elements constitute its form, there is often considerable confusion about how to define its limits. Misnomers about ancient narrative occur because modern descriptions and approaches are typically used to study a text's form and content without first understanding how the text was composed from the author's perspective. To examine Jewish narratives written in Greek, it is critical to delineate what was meant by narrative in its ancient context, instead of it being miscast due to changing terms or applying modern approaches and designations. Here, we will examine proper terminology for narrative, its genre (and sub-genres), characteristics, and methodological approaches for study. We will review how scholarship has approached ancient and modern narrative and argue that a revision should be made to study Jewish narratives more precisely. Modern uses and studies of narrative as a genre category obscure in some ways what ancient writers meant by the term. This does not mean that modern approaches and categories for studying narrative are unhelpful. Modern approaches to narrative, on the contrary, are extremely valuable for dissecting ancient and modern meanings of literature. In the case of this study, however, part of the goal is to restrict the examination to ancient designations to get as close as possible to what Jewish and Greek authors from antiquity learned and thought about narrative;

because of this, many of the modern definitions for narrative and its related genres would not apply since they introduce concepts and parameters that would be foreign to them. Essentially, this study seeks to identify and define ancient categories and writing techniques more than apply methodologies for interpretation. By returning to how ancient writers viewed narrative it will help to set the parameters and provide a construct for identifying the rhetorical elements in Jewish literature written in Greek. An accurate knowledge of what narrative entailed allows for the next steps in this study to identify Jewish narrative texts and how their content and structure aligns with ancient genre categories, exercises, and comments.

I. Rationale and Critical Methodologies

Although reviewing some of the main aspects of Jewish education and their relationship to Greek educational practices is necessary, the nuance in this study calls for further elaboration in the direction of the scribe's or author's *experience* alongside their educational training. When scholars of ancient literature evaluate or interpret ancient texts (e.g., prose, poetry, or documentary) it is almost universally accepted to first consider the historical milieu. The rationale for this approach, of course, is to attempt to uncover the intentions and mechanisms that underlie the *sitz im leben* of the text. The methods involved in reconstructing the historical milieu of the text, and thereby its meaning, include several methodological criticisms: Historical Criticism, Literary Criticism, Form Criticism, Source Criticism, and Rhetorical Criticism. Each of these critical methods helps to situate the literary text within its own historical context and provides a means of imagining the situation and circumstances surrounding the creation and the purpose of a text. When reading a narrative such as Virgil's *Aeneid*, for example, the modern scholar evaluates its contents for internal markers of dating, locations, and historical figures, and

then collates them with the relevant historical realities of the era (e.g., religion and political structure) that the text was produced in. These combinations usually lead to plausibly informed decisions regarding the *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem* dates for when the text was thought to be composed, as well as authorial intentions and intended audience. The benefit of uncovering the background of a text is that it guards against anachronistic tendencies and helps to reveal its meaning to the modern reader. For some ancient literature, the initial reading or listening audience were probably "insiders" who properly understood the cultural innuendo, idioms, euphemisms, and rhetorical designs that were latent in a text. Texts such as Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, however, were later subjected to interpretive conjectures which the initial audience may not have considered.[205] The original audience probably read or listened to Homer's works without looking for virtuous lifestyle models or moral ethics to emulate.

Although reconstructing a text's historical setting through geographical, political, and social studies is advantageous, this approach is often limited because it attributes a broad social or theological purview to a text or selected passages. Entire texts (or passages) are interpreted with generalized concepts which were foreign to the author and audience. These interpretive readings do not account for the complex diversity of the writer or reader's knowledge and experience. Any methodological approach has strengths and weaknesses; the combination of applying historical critical and literary analysis to ancient literature has limitations as well. The strengths, as mentioned above, are situating the text in its actual historical setting and providing a

[205] Finkelberg, for example, discusses the various ways that later readers of Homer applied allegorical and other interpretive techniques to find new meanings for how the texts portrayed the gods and heroes. In addition to allegorizing Homer (and Hesiod) to accommodate contemporary morals, they also interpreted them as possessing advanced knowledge that was ahead of their own time (e.g., astronomy), Margalit Finkelberg, "Homer as a Foundational Text," in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*, ed. Margalit Finkelberg and Guy Stroumsa (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 92–95.

framework for understanding the world in which the text was produced. The limitation to these approaches is that they do not get close enough to the compositional level of the text; they remain at a generalized level. The generalized level of the text looks at common occurrences found in the historical background of the text (e.g., what is commonly known about the first-century CE political, religious, or social structures) and how that information intersects with the literary content. From a generalized historical perspective, for example, citizens of Rome in the first century CE were supporters of Caesar Augustus (Octavian) and adherents to the *mos maiorum* (traditions of great men/elders) which included the religious cults and myths. This is generalized because we are sure that everyone was not a supporter of Octavian, such as his rival Antony and his supporters, just as everyone was not a believer in the religious cult or the *fabulae* that accompanied them.[206] From the generalized literary content, comments that characters make, as well as philosophical or theological assertions, are at times taken as the social norms of society or of a communal sect. In the case of Judeo-Christian literature, comments made about YHWH, the end times, or supernatural occurrences are thought to be indicators of what the supposed groups behind the text believed. This would be more of a "Communal-Theological/Ideological" approach because it assumes a shared theological belief system, which serves as the foundation and source of the written material. One instance is the often repeated oral/literary tradition of heavenly beings (angels) descending to the Earth and interacting with women, which raises several questions regarding religious belief and interpretation. Does the account and its variant forms in Genesis 6:4, Jubilees 5:1, and Enoch 6:1–7:4 (not to mention the

[206] Fables (μῦθος), for example, are not well-received by all. In Plato's *Respublica*, some myths, such as those created by Homer and Hesiod, are rejected. Plato, through Socrates, explains how these myths should not be taught to children because they are false (ψεῦδος) and will corrupt them. These myths corrupt because they are teaching false things about the gods, making it appear that they do evil things. (Plato, *Resp*. 2.377e–377d, 378b, 391e).

traditions found in Rabbinic and Qur'anic literature) reflect the actual beliefs of a community? One question that could be raised is whether or not the account of the angel's descent and rebellion in 1 Enoch should be understood as a *historical* event. When the account was read or heard, was it received by the people as fiction or reality? Additionally, if it was understood as a historical reality, how does it affect the rest of their belief system? If the account was not taken as a historical reality, was the moral supposed to be taken as something that should be emulated or learned from? Questions about how a text was meant to be understood (e.g., whether it should be received as literal history or fiction that was emblematic of real life) demonstrates some of the challenges a writer or reader faced when interpreting a text.

How the writer and audience conceived of the text and which elements (e.g., historical and supernatural) were reflective of their theological worldview are also significant questions. The Communal-Theological viewpoint understands comments or opinions made by characters in a text to represent generalized norms of a sect. The speech of a single character or dialogue between figures in a text are interpreted (at times, rightfully so) as representing the wider concerns and opinions of the people of the time. The Gospel of Matthew is an example of how dialogic instances in a text may be juxtaposed to social realities. Interpretation of the Gospel of Matthew usually proceeds from one or all of the critical methods already mentioned (e.g., historical or literary criticisms). Literary Criticism, for instance, is often deployed as a means of understanding the message of Mathew, as well as its generalized Judeo-Christian outlook towards the political, religious, and social constructs of first-century Jerusalem. One example that highlights the generalization of ideologies from a literary source is Matthew's image of the Judean sect of the Pharisees. In Matthew 23:1-33, Jesus is depicted as delivering a scathing

pronouncement against the Pharisees (and Scribes) for their hypocritical behavior in leading the Jewish people. The passage highlights the Pharisees, a sect among many other Jewish groups during the first century CE, as occupying the authoritative seat of Moses (23:2), possessing the correct teaching of the Torah (23:3), being hypocrites (ὑποκριταί) (23:13), and for being unduly harsh toward those who attempt to live by the Torah (23:4), amongst other things. These critiques from Jesus of Nazareth, as the central character, could be interpreted as the opinions of his disciples, as well as how other sects felt about members of the Pharisees. From a generalized literary standpoint, the Pharisees could be characterized as an antagonistic group that challenged the followers of the Jesus movement. This indeed, may be how the author intended to portray the Pharisees; however, it does not mean that these sentiments were widely held by others or was an accurate assessment of their behavior or outlook. Other evidence and descriptions from antiquity helps to broaden our understanding of the Pharisees' beliefs, practices, and reception from writers, such as Flavius Josephus.[207] Josephus, for instance, explains that the Sadducees were supported by the rich, while the Pharisees had the multitude (πλῆθος) on their side.[208] These comparative sources for understanding the Pharisees—in contrast to Matthew—reveal a sect of Judaism that appears to be revered by some for their strict adherence to the Torah. Of course, this presentation of the Pharisees could also be a concoction of Josephus, since he claimed to be a member of the sect.[209] Even within Matthew, there are comments about the Pharisees that may hint at how much they were admired by others. One example, despite including a subtle criticism by Jesus against them, says, "For I say to you, that if your righteousness does not more than surpass that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt

[207] Josephus describes beliefs and customs of the Pharisees (as he understands them) and how they were received by his contemporaries, e.g., *Ant.* 13.171–173, 297–298.
[208] Josephus, *Ant.* 13.298.
[209] Josephus, *Life* 9.

5:20). The strength of literary criticism is that it utilizes the text as its primary source for interpretation; however, other sources outside the text may offer a clearer reality, which presents a limitation. The main text and outside witnesses should be jointly considered to guard against simplified generalizations being taken as fact or the *status quo*.

Rhetorical Criticism

Another methodological criticism, more closely related to this study than the previous two, is Rhetorical Criticism. Rhetorical Criticism in its classic sense, attempts to evaluate the literary text in a different manner than Literary Criticism, Historical Criticism, Form Criticism, and Source Criticism. Literary Criticism, as already mentioned, considers the entire work of the text and interprets it based on its own internal content. Historical Criticism considers the realia and veracity of the text's content. Form Criticism (*Formgeschichte*) is concerned with the genre and form (e.g., liturgical or lament) of a text and how it functioned in the community. This study will deal with genre to an extent, but the goal is to understand ancient writers' genre designations more than modern categories. Source Criticism studies the interconnectedness of texts with other literary sources and how they formed their content. Sources for textual content will be discussed but this is not the most essential part of the study. Genre Criticism is another methodology that could be considered. Genre Criticism focuses on how to classify texts based on their literary style, content, and structure. Genre will be discussed in this study but mainly from the ancient writer's perspective. We will examine the terminology and rules ancient writers used to designate the genre of their writings and to see if Jewish narratives are parallel to them. Although genre helps to label texts and understand their function, it primarily serves as one of the elements of our study of narrative, but not the central one. The main goal is to understand the rules and

expectations for composing narrative (which genre plays a significant role in) and to discern its function and status. While some aspects from each of the various criticisms overlap with our study of narrative compositional training, Rhetorical Criticism is the methodology that best embodies the concerns of this study.

Rhetorical Criticism analyzes the structure of the text in relationship to the various styles, rules, and elements that were known from antiquity. Scholars have worked, for a long time, through the Gospels to compare their structure and rhetorical elements to what is known from ancient rhetoric.[210] The obvious strength of this methodology is that it gets the interpreter one step closer to the design and intention of the writing. When the reader notices similar speech structures (whether a *sûḡyāh*, midrash, or formal address), plot patterns, and character tropes, it alerts the interpreter to consider the expected use of such rhetorical devices. These literary devices can serve as internal indicators for authorial intention and thereby, a means or aid for interpreting a passage. When the author of the Gospel of John deviates from the narrative and makes a comment about the narrative itself, for example, "But these things have been written so that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ the son of God" (20:31), it allows the reader to

[210] Rhetorical Criticism is a bourgeoning approach in the study of the Gospels and New Testament literature. Rhetorical Criticism, as an umbrella approach, also has other sub-approaches related to it, such as Socio-Rhetorical Criticism and Reader-Response Criticism. The Greco-Roman approach is the one most suited for what is done in this study. It examines the connections between the Gospels and the rules taught in Greek and Roman school books belonging to the *progymnasmata* of writers, such as Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Scholars who apply this methodological technique tend to conclude that the Gospels exhibit rhetorical features (especially Luke) of Hellenistic literature, such as biographies. Whereas the approach attempts to identify parallel rhetorical elements that make up the textual content, this present study goes further in reconstructing what they learned to write a narrative overall and not just what fits a Gospel or New Testament literature, as well as what they thought about it. Closely related to this approach is the study of the *chreiai* which are the useful sayings and actions of Jesus that they claim were modified into written form. For discussion of Rhetorical Criticism and related approaches, see, D. F. Watson, "Rhetorical Criticism," *DJG* 698–701.

have clarity on the writer's purpose for producing the text, as well as why certain aspects of Jesus' life were selected (e.g., to induce belief), but it does not help with the selection process.

While Rhetorical Criticism is valuable for evaluating the literary text for ancient writing techniques, it has its own deficiencies in not going beyond making the observation to the further step of why authors would employ such techniques and how they felt (or what they thought) about such measures. Identifying the use of allegory is helpful, but the deeper question of how they learned to employ it allows for a more substantial response to issues regarding function, authority, and textual diversity. Those more complex questions ask about why and in what instances writers chose to use allegory and what they thought about its use, whether it was just a pedantic exercise or if they considered the various symbolisms and comparisons to be valid. The deficiency in previous approaches is that they stop short of getting at the most fundamental questions of composing a text, that is, how the author learned their writing techniques and how they felt about what they were writing. These two questions (how they learned to write and what they thought about their products) are often approached, rightfully so, with due caution because of the highly speculative nature of trying to navigate the complexity of writing in the ancient world, not to mention the high occurrence of pseudonymous and anonymous literature. The latter two features of literature make it nearly impossible to know, with any degree of certainty, who an author was, the full extent of their education, or their disposition towards the literary product. Even when the author is known, such as Philo or Josephus, there is not a complete description of their educational background, only partial mentions and extracts from their writings or references from later writers about their educational acumen.[211] The issue of what authors thought about

[211] For example, Philo lists what is popularly known from Greek paideia (grammar, mathematics, dialectic, etc.) but gives no clear indication as to how or where he learned them or the Jewish traditions—some of which are

their compositions is an even more speculative endeavor than ascertaining their education. Attempting to comment on what a writer thought or believed about their own text, is often met, understandably so, with negative responses, such as the implausibility of getting into the mind of an ancient writer. The objection to accessing the mind of an ancient writer in terms of what they thought or felt about what they wrote is certainly credible; however, it remains a tantalizing question because of the diverse and incredible accounts in many narrative texts. The question remains, what did the author of 1 Enoch think or feel about composing a text in the name of an antediluvian figure, such as Enoch, or writing about cosmic and angelic figures, which would seem fantastic to modern readers? The answers to these questions are relevant because they would get us closer to the literary problems of function, status, and diversity, as well as additional issues, such as pseudonymity.[212]

The main persistent difficulty is how to go about answering these questions without operating in complete speculation. Although a total reconstruction of educational training and authorial thought processes is nearly impossible, attempting to answer these questions is still advantageous. The combination of data concerning literary education and writing expectations during the nearly four-hundred years that Hellenism intertwined with Judean literary and

---

expansions of known biblical accounts—that he interprets in his various works (cf. Philo, *Congr.* 11–19). At best Philo describes his high interest in learning since his youth as well as his desire to return to his studies in lieu of his political career (Philo, *Spec*. 3.1-6). Josephus is less forthcoming about the details of his educational curriculum. He only mentions that he was commended at a young age (fourteen) for his interest in learning and proficiency in the Hebrew Torah and how he wanted to learn about the various Jewish sects of the time, which eventually led to his desert training with Banus for three years (Josephus, *Vita* 8–12). How he learned his compositional skills or where he learned them is not mentioned, however he does state that he joined the sect of the Pharisees which is similar to the Stoics (who are known for their interest in rhetoric and grammar), which may indicate how he came to know more literary conventions.

[212] Perry, when discussing the ancient Greek novel, suggests the practice of anonymous or pseudonymous authorship may have been the author's attempt at avoiding ridicule by other scholars. They might have risked criticism because of the absurdities in their works. B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Sather Classical Lectures, V.37 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 176.

religious traditions, helps to form a workable composite image.[213] To alleviate the problems of having only a few explicit examples of how Judean education and writing originated, using only definitive descriptions about education during the Second Temple period, will prove beneficial. A logical way to fill these gaps of knowledge should come from the ancient sources. Instead of asserting what writers did based on primarily modern categories, priority should be given to the descriptions that ancient authors employed. Too often there is a loss or neglect of what the ancient writers or audience experienced or imagined when encountering a text because it is not always expressed explicitly. Emphasizing ancient compositional education and expectation further opens how they processed issues of textual authority, functionality, and diversity.

Literary Education and Expectation

The author's *education* and *expectations* are two data sources that should be combined to produce a composite of the ancient writing process. These two categories, although separate, have some overlap between them. The first category (the author's education) consists of what was learned in the educational curriculum to enable the individual to not only read and write but to also compose narratives using specific styles and elements. The second category (the author's literary expectations) consists of what was known and understood about narrative literature during the relevant time span between 332 BCE and 100 CE. This is crucial because adds another layer of complexity to how narratives were conceived and perceived by those who

[213] While Hellenistic (or better Macedonian) rule by Alexander the Great begins around 332 BCE and lasts until the onset of the Roman Empire around 63 BCE, it is also recognized that Jews were in contact with Greek culture well before this time. Schwartz explains how Greek cultural artifacts and influence are found in in Judea as early as the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, particularly Jewish coinage (as well as Samaritan coins which bear Greek inscriptions!) that is modeled on Greek designs. Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. To 640 C.E. Jews, Christians, and Muslims from the Ancient to the Modern World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 24–25. Additionally, as noted in previous chapters, Judean writing practices and education were mingled with Babylonian and Persian practices before the Hellenistic era.

composed, read, or performed them. What an author learned through their educational curriculum may or may not align with the expectations (opinions, critiques, and usage) of narrative outside of the "classroom." In the educational curriculum, for instance, the young author learns to create persuasive arguments in their narrative by utilizing mythological accounts, although in reality, some readers may criticize the use of fables or expansions to a narrative.[214]

The composite image of how narratives were composed and perceived provides a broader vantage point into the questions regarding their function and status among Judean groups of the era. The composite image from an educational and experiential standpoint is conducive for approaching the many difficulties presented through terminology, contrasting rules, and opinions that existed in the ancient world. Some of the difficulties, which will be addressed in the proceeding chapters, include ways to identify and assess the many terms that are used to refer to the modern category called "Narrative." When ancient writers explain how to create a narrative, they use a specific Greek designation called *diegesis*, while other authors may refer to an account—that appears to fit the description of a narrative—as a myth (μῦθος). The challenge in the ancient world was that standardization for what constituted narrative and its subgenres was still flexible. While different genres of narrative had perceived functions, how a text was conceived (as history, myth, or comedy) was at times dependent on the recipient. These complexities, and the mixture of elements between texts, makes it difficult for the modern reader to immediately identify the genre and function of a text, which sometimes results in scholars having to create categories. A narrative could be categorized at the whim of whoever its

[214] For example, Josephus criticizes the use of Greek myths by explaining how Moses did not employ them in his writings (*Ant.* 1.15), while Theon mentions that the composition and use of myths is a subject that the student should learn (Theon 72–78).

antagonist or supporter was. While modern readers, for example, designate certain texts of the Pentateuch as fitting the narrative genre due to its literary style and structure, Philo gives a more specific classification of narrative by calling "the first part" of Moses' writings history. [215] The difference is that Philo uses history as a narrative subgenre that has its own set of parameters. The contrasting opinions of different parties about the same narrative is also interesting. Josephus, for instance, chides the Greeks (like the Romans) for accepting certain details about the afterlife as historical certainties, which he refers to as "myths." He explains that the Greeks "tell myths" (μυθολογοῦσιν) about where the souls of the godly and ungodly depart to in the afterlife. The heroes and demi-gods depart to the Islands of the Blessed (also referred to as the Elysian Fields), while the wicked are dispatched to Hades. [216] Myth, as a narrative subgenre, was expected to relate things that there unhistorical. The critic or supporter is the one who determines the designation of the text as history, myth, or some other category. For the purposes of this study, the difference between modern designations, such as folklore or story, and maintaining the use of terms that ancient writers applied to their selected texts, is critical to remember. Preserving these distinctions adds precision to the distinctive categories and clarifies how ancient writers or readers viewed their texts, as well as cautioning against modern anachronistic classifications such as "wisdom literature", "pseudepigrapha", or "apocalyptic."

The complicated problem of terminology related to the designation "narrative" is further emphasized when evaluating the variety of expectations and perceptions toward the umbrella category of narrative literature. The difficulty comes, for example, when one commentator

[215] Philo, *Praem.* 1.
[216] Josephus, *B.J.* 2.155–157.

understands the narrative to be a malicious fictitious "myth" while another understands it to be an accurate historical reality. Herein is the value of considering a composite collection of writing expectations from commentators and authors. By collecting varying and competing outlooks, it allows for a realistic measurement to hold the educational elements against. The approach is similar to what is done when comparing archaeological evidence to literary depictions. Some of the biblical accounts appear to emphasize a monotheistic viewpoint that was shared rather strictly by the Judean people, even to the point of not acknowledging or constructing images of their own and certainly not of competing deities (e.g., Exodus 20:4). However, when comparing the assertive claims or prohibitions of some biblical texts to archaeological remains, such as the fourth-century CE synagogue found in Hammath near Tiberias, it demonstrates that not every group felt the same way or enforced what was found in the literary accounts.[217] The synagogues are physical evidence that apparently contradict the literary witnesses. The synagogue ruins show that some groups were comfortable with using divine images (even pagan ones) in their meeting places. In a similar manner, just as archaeological evidence and literary witnesses can be combined for a clearer interpretation of the ancient behavior and viewpoints, scribal education and literary expectations can also be paired to gain a more accurate and broader perspective of the function and status of narrative literature.

[217] The well-known synagogue in Hammath displays a mosaic paved floor including a zodiac with the four seasons and the Greek god Helios riding the quadriga. The inclusion of these images clearly shows that not every Jewish group took prohibitions such as Exodus 20:4 with the same degree of seriousness. There were obviously different interpretations regarding how to deal with pagan images. For example, the Jerusalem Talmud (y. Abod. Zar. 3:4, 42d) even discusses a conversation between Rabban Gamaliel and Pericles the Philosopher about washing in a bath house dedicated to Aphrodite. The question posed to Gamaliel is how he could wash in a bathhouse where there is a pagan deity, to which he responds that as long the image is not feared as a god it is allowed.

Methodology

To properly assess an author's compositional education and expectations of narrative, some inherent issues of terminology and literary trends also require brief discussion. Four areas of inquiry: (1) terminology, (2) literary trends, (3) education, and (4) expectations, will help to reconstruct the ancient milieu surrounding narrative literature and thereby build an appreciation for the complexity of compositional writing, as well as for the competing attitudes towards it. Each of the four areas of inquiry will be addressed in turn with an introductory explanation of their significance, assessment, and concluding remarks. The issues of terminology and literary trends are grouped together under the question "What did they mean by Narrative?" and serve to define what is meant by "narrative" in the modern and ancient world. The subjects of education and expectation (which will be covered in Chapters five and six) emphasize the diversity of ideas about how narrative was learned, as well as its status and function. Examining these four topics improves our understanding of how Judean communities learned Hellenistic writing techniques and their use of narrative literature.

II. Narrative: Terminology and Genre

One of the persistent problems of reading and interpreting ancient texts is how to first classify them in terms of genre. How one reads and understands an epistle, poetry, or a tragedy is based first on the understanding of what type of text it is and presupposes which literary rules should govern its meaning or interpretation.[218] When evaluating ancient texts, the problem is further

[218] Aristotle's *Poetica*, for instance, provides insight into rules and expectations for poetry. Poetry is understood as a genre, which epic, tragedy, and comedy (as well as others) are derived from. Each were related but had their own distinct features. Although his discussion of comedy has been lost, he offers details into the components of tragedy, particularly the similarities and differences it has with epic poetry (Aristotle, *Poet.* 1447a1–20, 1449b21–25).

compounded because the author—often anonymous or pseudonymous—does not always specify the text's genre. Of course, this is not an oddity, considering that modern writers tend to have the same practice. When someone pens a fantasy novel it does not often begin with or explicitly state that it is a fantasy or that one should read it as such; it is already assumed and recognized by the reader, typically based on how it is catalogued. Sometimes, however, an ancient author does refer to the text's genre with specific literary terms such as "narrative" or history (ἱστορία) in passing and at other times with elaboration; for example, when Josephus (justifying his own work) describes a good representation and reason for composing a history versus a poor one (*Ant.* 1.1–4, 16–17). The instances when a writer does not mention the genre are the most difficult because the modern reader must make assumptions about what type of text it was meant to be, what the author's intentions were for writing it, and how to interpret instances of (what we might consider) miraculous events.

Another equally confusing problem (for modern readers) is the fact that there were a variety of alternative terms for narrative as well as sub-categories. This poses a problem because our modern designations do not always align with the terms they used or the expectations they had. Modern terms, such as narrative, folklore, story, fiction, and prose, may not be the best designators for what ancient authors meant when they referred to narrative. The word English "narrative" is problematic because it is from the Latin word *narratio* (generally translated as narrative or story), which is a derivative of *narro* ("to tell") and does not convey the kind of

---

Additionally, just as narrative has six elements based on Theon's instructions, tragedy also has six parts according to Aristotle, "Tragedy as a whole, therefore, must have six components, which give it its qualities—namely, plot, character, diction, thought, spectacle, and lyric poetry" (Aristotle, *Poet.* 1450a7–10 [Stephen Halliwell, LCL]).

nuance that Greek authors intended when describing their texts with various labels.[219] Using other non-Greek terms, especially modern ones, to describe or categorize ancient texts also presents similar problems. The Latin *narratio* is close to the Greek understanding of narrative (διήγησις), which meant an explanation or description and is derived from the verb διηγέομαι "to describe." Another translation of διηγέομαι is "to narrate" showing its close approximation to the Latin meaning of *narro*. One example of this is found in the comparison of the Greek version of the Gospel of Luke with its later fourth-century Latin translation. In the Greek version of Luke, the author observes that many have undertaken to compile a narrative (διήγησιν) of the things that have happened among them (Luke 1:1), while the Latin Vulgate translates the Greek διήγησιν with the Latin accusative singular *narrationem*. At least in this instance, the Latin *narratio* is a fair approximation of what the Greek entailed.

Other English words, however, are not quite as concise when trying to approximate what was meant by a wider variety of Greek terms. Story is a later contraction of the Greek word for history (ἱστορία) which was, at least in some compositional manuals, a sub-category of narrative (διήγησις).[220] Fiction and Prose are also two words that have an etymological meaning that does not quite align with what is meant by their Greek counterparts. Fiction comes from the Latin word *fictio* ("something formed" or "invented") and has come to mean something invented in an untrue or unhistorical sense for modern readers of the genre, despite this not necessarily being its original meaning. Likewise, prose as a modern genre has its origins in the Latin word *prosus* ("direct"), which was understood as direct or plain language. Categories, such as novel or myth,

[219] The Latin *narratio* (feminine) and *narratus* (masculine) both mean "narrative" and are derived from the verb *narro*, which means "to make known", "to tell", or "to narrate."
[220] From an etymological standpoint, the word "story" is from the Greek word ἱστορία ("an inquiry or account") which comes into English as history and is shortened to story. Essentially, they are the same word, one longer and the other shorter but now their meanings are distinct.

are also difficult because of their initial meanings. The modern term novel—from the Latin *novus* ("new")—does not help with ancient genre classification; as an adjective, it offers no literary insight into the content or structure of a text. The modern genre of myth is truer to its ancient meaning mainly because it is a transliteration of the Greek word μῦθος and retained much of its original sense. Myth as a subgenre of narrative, in its modern and ancient use, generally expects the contents of a literary work to be unhistorical.

The point is that *modern* designations (such as story or novel) for describing ancient literary works, especially ones referred to as narrative, are often imprecise descriptions of what the ancient authors intended when composing their texts. A better understanding of their terminology and expectations would prevent unintentionally imposing our modern categories and thereby our presumptions—which are often anachronistic—onto their compositions. Instead, when reading ancient literature (narrative or otherwise), we should consider their contents from a compositional viewpoint, which would help to determine its genre, what sorts of expectations they had, and its intended function.

Modern Concerns of Narratology and Novelistic Literature

Before addressing what is meant by narrative, the status of ancient narrative studies and its relationship to Jewish narrative should be briefly mentioned. The wealth of scholarly literature devoted to analyzing ancient narrative is not lacking, and it would be far beyond the scope of this summary to address all of the nuances of narrative and its inherent interests and problems. The scholarly study of ancient narrative naturally covers a broad range of issues; however, for the purposes of this examination the focus will be on some of the most common points of interest as

they relate to answering and understanding the question of what narrative is. Five questions are typically raised regarding what ancient Greek narrative entails: (1) Terminology and genre. (2) The origins of narrative. (3) The approaches used to identify narrative. (4) The "canon" of texts. (5) The intended purpose and function of narrative (which includes origins). The question of terminology and genre is paramount in the study of narrative because it allows for a more precise definition and identification of which texts are being referred to both from a modern and ancient perspective. The origins of narrative examines the theoretical precursors that may have led to the production of narratives, which are often referred to using modern terms, such as novel or romance. Approaches to narrative study explains the common methods used to evaluate its structure, content, and relationship to other literary genres. The "canon" of narrative texts considers the ancient Greek works that are commonly classified in the genre and studied as a comparative collection. Lastly, the purpose and function of narrative analyses its intended use by its authors and readers.

Narratology

The study of narrative can be divided into two fields, the wider and more encompassing Narratology and the study of the ancient novel or romance. Narratology attempts to provide an empirical and systematic approach to examining narrative but is often encumbered by a lack of clarity and consensus concerning its definition, literary scope (modern and ancient), and objective.[221] Narratology (the study of narrative) is a diverse field that is still in flux. The

[221] For a detailed discussion of the origin, development, and diverse subjects included in Narratology as a field of study, see, Gerald Prince, "Narratology," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, ed. Raman Selden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 8:110–130. Prince, in addition to offering how Narratology developed from structuralism and branched off into other approaches outside of literary sources for narratives, also includes the many criticisms of Narratology as a scientific field of study, which includes problems with terminology, scope, and methodology.

definitions and parameters of what Narratology covers are still being determined and can be adjusted to fit the subject and interests of its inquiry. Classical Narratology has a more traditional focus on elements of literary narrative, such as authorship, narrator, focalization, and point of view. This approach to studying narrative has evolved and is referred to by some as Post Classical Narratology. Whereas Classical Narratology has been used as a heuristic model to study classical literature (epic, drama, lyric, biography, and history), the new form of Narratology includes studies that focus on literature and non-literary mediums, such as media, cognitive studies, and music. Approaches are also interdisciplinary, combining Narratological approaches with other methodologies, such as Reader-Response and Speech-Act approaches. Although Narratology shares some of my interests in narrative, the present study is more focused on identifying what ancient authors learned when they flourished and how that knowledge can inform our understanding of the function and status of Jewish narrative. Classical Narratology's focus on structuralist methodology certainly overlaps with my examination of a narrative's elements but this is not the main goal of the study. My approach is not to dissect an entire text, using a narratological system, but to demonstrate how parts of a narrative reflect Greek compositional education and how they inform our understanding from an author's perspective.[222]

The scope of Narratology presents a major challenge to the study of ancient narratives mainly because any contrived system of thought would be difficult to apply across such wide-ranging

[222] For additinal discussions of the development and diversity of Narratology (Classical and Post), its terminology, and interdisciplinary aspects, see, Monika Fludernik and Greta Olson, "Introduction: Assessing Current Trends in Narratology," in *Current Trends in Narratology*, ed. Greta Olson, vol. 27 of *Narratologia: Contributions to Narrative Theory*, eds. Fotis Jannidis, Matías Martínez, John Pier, and Wolf Schmid (Berlin; New York City: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 1–4. For a work focused more on ancient Greek and Latin literature, see, Jonas Grethlein, Antonios Rengakos, eds., *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Vol. 4 of *Trends in Classics, Supplementary Volumes*, eds. Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos (Berlin; New York City: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 1–3.

cultures and times. Regardless of any similarities, the category labels, expectations, and literary techniques used to collectively analyze narratives would be faced with numerous anachronisms. Systematized theories imply that there are common ways of not only producing texts but also classifying them and determining their authorial function and community use. How would one group a narrative from the modern era and one from the first century CE? The authors would have a gap of nearly two millennia between them. The genre categories used today do not exactly correspond to those of the ancient world and the intended uses of narratives are not directly parallel either. Modern categories that are generally taken as including untrue material include: myth, fiction, fairytale, and legend; each can be classified as a type of narrative yet have their distinct characteristics. At different points of time in antiquity, however, a narrative—such as Josephus' reference to Moses' historical writings—that might meet the *modern* parameters of folklore, myth, or legend could be understood and categorized as history by ancient writers and readers.[223] Similarly, texts that may be construed as the modern genre of fairytale could be written following the rhetorical form of a history and meant to be received as such based on the author's prerogative. While the diverse field of Narratology offers many interesting nuances and approaches for studying Greek narrative from a literary perspective, this discussion will restrict itself to examining narrative using categories and designations that were current during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

III. Novel as Genre

The study of the ancient novel (the second division of narrative study) is narrower in its scope than Narratology. While scholarly studies on Narratology look at the structure and content of a

[223] Josephus quotes Alexander Polyhistor's comment about the history of Cleodemus the Prophet (also called Malchus) agreeing with Moses' historical report (*Ant.* 1.240).

variety of narrative genres, studies on the novel are restricted to ancient or modern works that are typically fictive in nature. Similar to the difficulties in defining the field of Narratology, the genre of novel is equally, if not more, problematic to delineate. Whereas the word "Narratology" sounds more descriptive of a field that covers narrative issues, the terms novel and romance as field titles, are noticeably out of sync with ancient literary categories that were employed by authors, such as history, myth, or poetry. Scholars recognize that novel and romance, as genre terms, are products of a much later period (around the twelfth and fifteenth centuries CE) and are distinct from ancient descriptions of unhistorical accounts. Despite the anachronistic application of novel and romance to describe ancient texts, both terms are retained in scholarly studies mainly due to modern convenience. Their use is similar to how the field of biblical studies refers to collections of writings as Pseudepigrapha or Gnostic, although no one in antiquity would have done so.[224] The modern terms, novel and romance, have no ancient equivalents (as scholars have pointed out) in terms of being used as literary categories for texts that were composed containing fiction akin to comedy or myth. The use of novel or romance can be confusing not only because they do not correspond to any ancient literary compositional genre but also because their etymologies are so vastly different, as well as our modern expectations of them. The novel is typically thought of as a prose writing of fiction of varying length (although it could include

---

[224] The terms novel and romance as genre classifications to describe literary texts in antiquity are recognized by scholarship as being anachronistic. There appears to be no consensus of which term is preferable as they are both used to describe the same sets of ancient literature. The justification for the continued use of the terms—despite objection and refusal by some scholars to employ them—is because, in their estimation, there are no ancient names to adequately describe them. For example, Perry, in his excellent monograph, explains that there is essentially no difference between novel and romance as modern literary genres. He also justifies the use of the terms due to the lack of an ancient literary category to describe the texts under consideration. Perry uses both terms interchangeably in his work, although he prefers romance because it is well-established, but advises that English readers should use novel because the former is old-fashioned, B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Sather Classical Lectures, V.37 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 3-4. For further discussion on the matter of using novel or romance as genre labels for ancient texts that contain fiction see, Niklas Holzberg, "The Novel: Genres Proper and the Fringe," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 11.

poetic stanzas too), yet “novel” is derived from both Greek (νεαρός) and Latin (*novellus*, *novella*) adjectives that mean approximately “new” or “young.” The Greek word νεαρός—an adjectival form of the noun νέος denoting a youth up to thirty years of age—was used to describe youthful or new things including literary texts such as hymns.[225]

The modern genre classification of novel is derived, from an etymological standpoint, from both a Greek and Latin adjective that mean “new” or “youthful” and have nothing to do with literary content. The word “novel” makes its entrance into English via Italian. The Latin *novella* is incorporated into Italian—one of the Romance languages—during the fourteenth century of the Middle Ages and becomes associated with fictional literature, such as adventure and romance. Since Italian is one of the languages associated with Latin, *novella* comes into the language unchanged in its form, but its meaning expands from something “new” to describing a certain type of fictional tale now called the short story. The Italian genre label, novella, was used for fictional tales that included adventurous and romantic accounts. Ironically, the shorter form “novel” comes into the English language as a genre category for the same types of fictional literature but are considered longer, while the lengthier Italian word, novella, designates a shorter tale. Those who assign “novel,” as a genre category, to ancient writings do so because they identify similar elements, such as plot, character, and adventure, that match modern observations of content and structure and not because it conforms to an ancient genre. The assignment of the

[225] The Greek adjective νεαρός (from νέος = a youth up to the age of 30 years of age) is used for “youthful” or “new” as opposed to the other terms used to describe stages of development such as βρέφος (embryo or in the womb), τέκνον (a child in general), παῖς (in Sparta, a boy 11 years old starting public education), ἔφηβος (an adolescent 18 years of age). For the use of νεαρός as a “new hymn” (ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις) see Hesiod Fragment 357 line 2 (in the West and Merkelbach version). For further discussion on the historical and etymological development of novel and novella see, Baldick Chris, "Novel," ('Oxford University Press') and Panizza Letizia and Hainsworth Peter, "Novella and Racconto," ('Oxford University Press').

modern term “novel” to ancient fictional literature is also based on the hybrid nature of the text’s content. Both ancient and modern texts incorporate elements from a variety of genres, for example history and myth, into a single narrative and its eclectic nature distinguishes it from other genres. The prevailing notion is that these hybrid texts of fiction lacked an actual ancient classification—as opposed to history, poetry, and comedy—and were therefore assigned the modern label of novel because it shared similar eclectic features. This development demonstrates that “novel” as a classification for ancient literary fiction is founded on later Medieval characteristics and does not represent a genre that authors in antiquity would recognize. Additionally, the presumptions that accompany the genre of the modern novel (e.g., motivation or intention for writing)—despite their similarities in content—should not be anachronistically transferred to ancient works of narrative.

Romance as Genre

Romance, as a genre label, is derived from the Old French term romanz which means “Neo-Latin” or “New Latin.” French—along with Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian—is one of the Romance languages that descended from Latin.[226] Romanz is the French version of the Latin *romanus*, an adjective meaning “of or concerning Rome” (Latin *Roma*). The Latin *Roma* or *romanus* could refer to Rome as the capital city of Latium, the citizens living there (the Romans), or also the language and script of the Roman citizens living in Latium which was called Latin. In Old French, romanz (signifying the new Latin language) meant the vernacular of French speakers. When translating the old Latin epics or narratives from Latin (*Roma* or *romanus*), a common French expression was “metre en romanz,” which meant to put or translate into the

[226] Roberta Krueger, “Romance,” in *The New Oxford Companion to Literature in French*, ed. Peter France (Oxford University Press, 2005), doi:10.1093/acref/9780198661252.001.0001.

vernacular (i.e., Neo-Latin which was French).[227] Essentially, to translate the old Latin narratives into the current common language of French. During the Middle Ages, the narratives they translated were epics, court, and love stories. Because these narratives needed to be translated from Latin (*Roma* or *romanus*) into the vernacular of French (romanz = Neo-Latin) they were called and classified as Romanz. The word Romance as a modern literary genre is connected etymologically to the word for Rome or the Roman language (Latin) and enters French (a descendant of Latin) as romanz indicating the new Latin language. In this respect, narratives are called Romance not because of their content or structure, but because of the Latin (*Roma*) language they are composed in and the New Latin (Romanz) that they are later translated into.

Both Novel and Romance then, are later categorical labels from the Medieval era which evolved from descriptive terms (*novella* and romanz) that are indirectly related to the types of narratives they come to convey. The literary labels Novel and Romance are not categories that ancient authors employed but are reflective of what authors and readers of the Middle Ages and modern times thought about and recognized as fictive narratives. Novel and Romance are useful for classifying writings that have similarities, such as structure, theme, or narrator position, but these external qualities should not be absolutely applied to ancient narratives simply because they have comparable elements. To use Novel or Romance as labels for ancient literature confuses which types of categories were available to writers. To label a text Novel or Romance further complicates which ancient compositional categories the writing should be evaluated against. It also obscures the function and meaning of ancient categories and what authors were attempting to accomplish when composing their narratives. Instead of designating ancient

[227] Ibid.

literature as Novel or Romance, we should first indicate a text's rhetorical elements and compare them to compositional practices and genres familiar to ancient writers. This process would lead to greater precision in identifying an ancient genre rather than resorting to a modern one. Ultimately, Novel and Romance do not offer the modern reader any information about what an ancient writer thought about their composition or how they expected it to function; mainly because they are disconnected from ancient categories and carry Medieval and modern meanings.[228] Although Novel and Romance are attempts to retrofit labels onto an otherwise ancient label-less genre of narrative, this study will purposely attempt to avoid using either term; instead, preferring to use ancient terminology (myth, history, poetry) to describe the texts under review to maintain continuity, as well as direct connections to compositional education and comments.[229] Now that narrative terminology has been covered, we will consider the next three issues related to modern narrative studies: Novel canon (which texts are usually studied), Novel origins, and the Novel's function.

Canon of Novel Literature

Closely related to the issue of narrative, or in this case "novel," terminology, are the questions of which texts should be classified as "novel" and what characteristics identify them as such. Scholarly studies on the ancient Greek novel differ on the proper designation for the genre (some opting to call it Novel, Proto-Novel, or Romance), just as they differ on which texts should be

---

[228] Holzberg makes this point clear in his opening of the chapter on Novel as a genre, "If the terms "romance" and "novel" are applied in discussions of Greek and Latin prose fiction to any of the texts in hand, this is only done so in full awareness of the fact that these generic labels were coined for medieval and modem narrative prose, but not for that of antiquity. We know of no ancient *termini* even remotely similar in meaning to "romance" or "novel"." Niklas Holzberg, "The Novel: Genres Proper and the Fringe," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 11.

[229] In the immediately following section, "novel" will be used because it is the standard term for referring to Greek novelistic literary studies. When describing ancient Greek narratives to reconstruct education and expectations, I will seek to refrain from novel or romance and use only ancient genre designations.

included under the genre.[230] The dispute as to which texts belong under the genre of novel is mainly due to the nature of the ancient texts under consideration and the lack of concrete or unified boundaries for what defines novel as a genre.[231] Despite the apparent disparity regarding what constitutes a novel, the scholarly field has unofficially created a so-called canon of novelistic literature that is commonly studied and comprises most of the field work.[232] Eight "canonical" texts typify the genre of the ancient novel and are divided linguistically (but not chronologically) into Greek and Latin ranging from the second to the fourth century CE. The five Greek texts are: *Chaereas and Callirhoë* by Chariton, *The Ephesian Tale* by Xenophon of Ephesus, *Daphnis and Chloe* by Longus, *Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius, and the *Ethiopian Story of Theagenes and Charicleia* by Heliodoros. The remaining three Latin texts are: The *Satyrica* by Petronius, *Metamorphoses* (also called *The Golden Ass*) by Apuleius, and the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (author unknown). These eight Greek and Latin texts are commonly grouped because of their similarities in structure, theme, and content. In addition to these eight main novels, there are also other texts that are sometimes referred to as being "novel-like" which include well-known stories such as the *Cyropaedia* by Xenophon of Athens (fifth or fourth century BCE), *Apollonius of Tyana* by Philostratus (second or third century CE), and the *Life of Aesop* (second or third century CE).[233]

---

[230] For discussions of the varied terminology for the Greek novel, see, Gareth Schmeling, *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 1–3.
[231] Niklas Holzberg, "The Novel: Genres Proper and the Fringe," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 12.
[232] Gareth Schmeling, *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 6.
[233] The eight canonical texts are also described as major. For further discussion on the delineation of canonical, novel-like, and fringe-novel texts see, Schmeling, *The Novel in the Ancient World*, 6–8.

How Novels are Grouped and Defined

The eight canonical novels are typically treated together because of the similarities between their contents and structure. Scholars, however, readily recognize that even with their similarities, many significant differences also exist between the texts both from a stylistic (e.g., prose instead of verse) and presentation standpoint (e.g., first-person versus third-person narration). The similarities between them are usually based on broad structural or content observations, such as whether they contain an erotic or adventurous theme or if the narrative is based around an imaginative character or set of circumstances. One of the main difficulties in defining what a novel is or which writings should be included under the genre, is that none of the extant texts precisely fit the parameters. Novels, or the texts being labeled as such, characteristically do not conform to a strict or specified pattern. Despite their dissimilarities, the texts are similar because they feature hybrid content. The distinction between novel and other genres is the generous inclusion of rhetorical elements and rules from other genres such as history and myth. Novel is a hybrid text because it can appear as a history in its form and narration but also incorporate mythical elements (e.g., creation of fictional characters), which makes it neither myth nor history. The combined features make it a new text, not based solely on its content and structure but on the author's intention for the composition.[234] Did the author intend to compose a history, myth, or something new? How to interpret the author's intentions when assembling the genre

[234] Perry explains that the author's intention for a text is the primary clue for understanding the genre of text, whether it is supposed to be a novel (he mainly uses the term romance) or not. A composition may have the appearance of historiography, but the inclusion of false information could mean that the author was including lies but if the writing was intended to be a "romance" then the inclusion of false events or words is a function of entertainment and not a lie. The distinction between the two rests on the author's intention for composing the text. The historian writes for to inform while the "romancer" or "novelist" writes to entertain. B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Sather Classical Lectures, V.37 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 31, 35, 37–39.

parts becomes the challenge. Definitions of novel are understandably varied in their length and precision. Some common descriptions used to define novel include: containing prose narrative, being a fictitious account, including elements from other genres (especially appearing as historiography), being built around romantic or adventurous subjects, having a plot, and intended for entertainment.[235] These broad similarities are shared, in some capacity, to unite the eight canonical novels and to provide a helpful, albeit artificial, distinction between other modern and ancient genres of literature.

How Novel Functions

The study of "novel" as a literary genre is generally two questions: what were the origins of the ancient novel and how was it supposed to function? The question of how novelistic literature *originated* is divided into two arguments. The first argument maintains that ancient Greek narratives that are labeled as "novel" developed out of the use of previous genres such as epic, history, or drama. This view claims that ancient Greek novels use rhetorical techniques and elements from other genres based on their content and structure. For example, *historia* (as an ancient literary category) had specific rules and expectations for its composition. Famous historiographers, such as Herodotus, Thucydides, and Josephus, claim to report historical "truth" with accuracy as one of the requirements of composing a good history, but it was also typically written in a prose narrative format that described events, places, and real characters. The

[235] There is quite a bit of nuance and complexity to defining novel. For summary sake, I have just listed some of the central points of agreement. There are several short and long definitions as well as main and sub-categories for describing novel that are too involved for this brief mentioning. For various definitions and the difficulty in drawing lines of demarcation for what novel entails and the compositions that should or should not be included, see, B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances*; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins, Sather Classical Lectures, V.37 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 44–45., Gareth L. Schmeling, *The Novel in the Ancient World*, (Leiden, Netherlands ; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 2–3., and Chris Baldick, "Novel," *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms.*

argument that novel developed from historiography claims that the narrative prose style and structural appearance of history was mimicked, but often incorporated fictional characters, and this was how the novel as a "pseudo-history" came into existence.[236] Instead of being history, which reports factual accounts, novel used the rhetorical framework of history to tell its fictional stories. In this sense, novel was a subsequent outgrowth from historiography.[237]

The other side of the argument is that ancient novels were *not* a progressive development from other known and established genres, but instead were the result of shifts in social conditions and demands. Perry, rejecting the notion of a precursor to the novel, argues that novelistic texts came into existence because of the intentions of the author and not a next-step evolution from history or epic. Perry acknowledges that novel has some of features that make up history, drama, and epic, but he argues that these were merely an author's tools to create a new text. For Perry, the novel may look like historiography in its form and content, but the author's intention for it to entertain is what distinguishes it from "true" history.[238] According to Perry, the shift in social conditions led to an increased desire for social entertainment to accompany the theater. The

[236] Ruiz-Montero provides a very detailed and insightful discussion on the comparative similarities between the Novel and the Historiographical Tradition. He connects the shared points, between both history and biography, with novel as two genres that have their rhetorical elements appear in novelistic works. Ruiz-Montero also lists a number of specific historiographical texts as well as "historical novels" (as they are sometimes called) that theoretically demonstrate the imitation of and transition from history to novel as a new genre. Consuelo Ruiz-Montero, "The Rise if the Greek Novel," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 42–48.
[237] Ruiz-Montero also discusses additional similarities between novel and other categories that include not only historiography but also, biography, drama, epic, tragedy, comedy, and what he calls local legends and Utopian traditions. Ibid., 38–65.
[238] For Perry's argument against the viewpoint that Greek Romance developed as a progressive outgrowth of the literary genre of history and its distinction from it as, what he calls, and "artistic composition" and for entertainment, see, B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Sather Classical Lectures, V.37 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 37–39, 66.

novel, at least initially, was a response to a higher demand for new modes of entertainment that were intended for the common person as opposed to the intellectual elite.[239]

Although asserting that all Greek novelistic literature was composed for the same purpose would be preposterous (e.g., to say it was because of the diversity of cultural concerns, different levels of education, or lack of a centralized publishing authority), it would be appropriate to mention generalized characterizations concerning their function for the reading populace. Two scholarly explanations for the function of the ancient Greek novel are: its fulfillment of the desire for entertainment and usefulness for education. How a novel operates is related to its origin because of the possibility that it developed from acknowledged genre categories such as history, epic, tragedy, and myth. These other genres all had well-defined parameters and elements (and maybe even audiences) which ensured the respective goals of their authors—thus, their *raison d'être*.[240] Since novels utilized elements from these other genres, their authors must have also had specific functions in mind. The two notions behind why novelistic literature arose—whether one agrees with the development from other genres theory or due to shifts and demands—do not need to be exclusive.

---

[239] Perry suggests that the appearance of novels was due to the demand for a new form of entertainment intended for an increasing literate population of common-folk. He describes this an initial stage where authors wrote anonymously because the novels were not generally accepted by the intellectual elite. However, this rejection of the novel by intellectuals reverses itself during the Sophistic Period when novel-type literature was beginning to be incorporated into educational curriculums and improved upon by sophistic authors. B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Sather Classical Lectures, V.37 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 118, 174–175.

[240] Tragedy, for example, was defined by Aristotle as having more intense action (πράξεως σπουδαίας) that was meant to elicit pity and fear in the audience. "We shall later discuss the art of mimesis in hexameters, as well as comedy. But let us now discuss tragedy, taking up the definition of its essence which emerges from what has already been said. Tragedy, then, is mimesis of an action which is elevated, complete, and of magnitude; in language embellished by distinct forms in its sections; employing the mode of enactment, not narrative; and through pity and fear accomplishing the catharsis of such emotion" (Aristotle, *Poet.* 1449b21–25 [Stephen Halliwell, LCL]).

Novel as Entertainment

The discussion of how Greek novels came into prominence suggested that increased levels of literacy led to a market for entertainment that transitioned from a theatrical venue to a written medium. The same rhetorical features that were utilized, for instance, in actual dramas, were also incorporated into their literary counterparts. Entertainment, as a function of Greek novel, is predicated on the inclusion of shared rhetorical elements found in the other genres (e.g., having a plot and a moral to the story) that were known for their entertainment and leisurely qualities, such as tragedy and comedy. These shared genre elements are taken as evidence for a common purpose or function versus a more serious and informative tone found in the prose narrative of history.

Novel as Instruction

The didactic function of Jewish and Greek narrative will be discussed in Chapter six. For now, a few cursory points will be made without delving into the many of the main literary sources. Education is another function of novelistic literature. Both young children and those studying more advanced rhetorical training made use of novelistic literature in their curriculums.[241] Emphasis on the educational function of novel becomes more pronounced during the so-called Sophistic Period when an increasing number of authors were being trained in the rhetorical arts and were now the composers of the primary literature.[242] The connection between education as a

---

[241] For examples of novelistic (mythical) texts in the *chreia*, see, Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World; V. 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 13–23. Socrates (Plato, *Resp.* 377c) and Plutarch (Plutarch, [*Lib. ed.* 11]) also advocate that children should begin their education learning myths. Quintilian describes how young students continue practicing with "novelistic" texts like Aesop's *Fables* (Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.9.2–3).

[242] The divisions of novelistic literature and their authors—as it relates to their acceptance or rejection by educated elite—are often expressed as being between the periods of the Pre-Sophistic (before the fifth century BCE), Sophistic (fifth century BCE to 59 CE), and the Second Sophistic (60 CE to 230 CE). During the Sophistic Period, novelistic literature increased and became more acceptable to not only the laity but also to the aristocrats.

function of novel is inferred, rather than directly supported by citations. Novels are, to some degree, thought to be used for educational purposes as they become more associated with Sophistic interests that are evident in novel content and in the educational subject curriculum that is traditionally identified with the Sophists and later Rhetors. The Sophists were, of course, associated with educational training—often financially compensated—in both oral and written arts, including public speaking (rhetoric, which would undoubtedly include grammar), making arguments, and mathematics.[243] Novels, as previously mentioned, had rhetorical attributes that were commonly found in the other genres. These same elements are also the traditional educational subjects taught by the Sophists. An example of this connection of novel with education is through two (one earlier and one later) authors from the "canonical" classical novel collection: Xenophon of Athens (ca. 430 to ca. 354 BCE), *Cyropaedia*, and Philostratus (second century CE), the *Life of Apollonius*. Both authors produce "biographical-novels" that are about famous figures, Xenophon writes about Cyrus (the Elder) while Philostratus composes his about the life of Apollonius of Tyana. The inferred thought is that these sophistic authors used their novels as educational models to teach their students or young readers how they should live in imitation of the idealized lives of their literary main characters.[244]

---

[243] For the affiliation of the Sophists with subjects such as rhetoric and mathematics, as well as their professional services for hire, see, Plato, *Min.* 85b, *Euthyd.* 271, *Lach.* 186c; Isocrates, *Antid.* 15.148; Aristotle, *Soph. elench.* 165ᵃ 22.

[244] See Holzberg's discussion about the use of novel as an educational model for ancient readers, especially on Xenophon's the *Education of Cyrus*, where he posits that the training was initially aimed at Athenian nobles, in, "The Novel: Genres Proper and the Fringe," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 20. Holzberg goes on to describe how the target audience shifts from nobles to the common people by the time of Chariton's novel, *Chaereas and Callirhoë*, in the second century CE. On Philostratus being a sophist from Lemnos (Λημνίου σοφιστοῦ) and a writer during the so-called Second Sophistic, see the reference in the *Suda*, phi, 421 Adler.

IV. The Status of Novelistic Literature

The Novel's status is related to its reception among different social strata and its presumed target readership. Its reception was predicated on how it was viewed (positively or negatively) by social groups that were typically divided between the educated elite and the under-educated laity. Somewhat connected to reception, is the question of readership. Readership considers what type of person was interested in novels and asks whether they were produced for public consumption or for select groups? The reception of novelistic literature (mainly the canonical texts) is often delineated between the Pre-Sophistic, Sophistic, and Second Sophistic eras.[245] Pre-Sophistic novels are described as more simplistic in their narration structure and content than the considerably more complex rhetorical elements of novels written during the Sophistic Period. This early stage of novel narration and its rudimentary presentation of its characters and plots—even more so its lack of advanced rhetorical elements—are taken as evidence that these texts were intended for a specific readership with a certain level of literacy. The notion is that the style, form, and content of these early novels did not meet the more advanced grammatical standards of the educated elite and were thereby repudiated by them for being unsophisticated. The rejection of these texts partially rests on their titles being omitted from lists of genre descriptions (such as lists of historical works) by the educated elite. The thought being, that if they are not classified within a specific category, then they must not have been taken as seriously as other texts, where an author had to necessarily follow specific criteria (particularly rhetorical

[245] Perry discusses the rise of the ancient Greek novel and the different phases of its acceptance using the Pre-Sophistic and Sophistic periods, B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 109, 117–122.

rules taught by the Sophists and later Rhetors) for producing their works.[246] Pre-Sophistic Greek novels were also cosigned to the under-educated because they were not written with advanced rhetorical or grammatical elements, which meant they were designed for those who were not privy to advanced studies.[247] The presumption is that an author wrote for their audience, and that one would avoid adding unrecognizable or confusing elements which required more learning than an audience of the laity possessed. Therefore, the Pre-Sophistic novels were accepted or intended for the under-educated but rejected by the educated-elite because of their unsophisticated appearance.

Sophists were now engaged in creating novels and crafted them with advanced rhetorical and grammatical elements, which were part of their students' educational curriculum. The rhetorical complexity of their works garnered more appeal from the educated elite because they merged advanced literary constructs (which were familiar to the Sophists and their clientele) with the entertainment value of fictional accounts.[248] One of the difficulties with the rejection theory of Pre-Sophistic novels is that the later Sophists would have had to encounter them to craft their intellectually improved versions. Their rejection then was probably not absolute; instead, the lack of mentioning or categorizing novels could have been due to them simply not being a part of the topic list they were writing about. Although the proposed division between Pre-Sophistic and later Sophistic and Second Sophistic novels may be too artificial, it could still reflect some

---

[246] For Perry's discussion on the lack of a genre category or proper name being assigned to novel-like literature and its relationship to being eschewed by the intellectual elite, see, B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Sather Classical Lectures, V.37 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 4.
[247] Ibid., 5.
[248] Ibid., 118–119.

historicity; however, it more than likely was not this clear, as the question of novel readership will show.

Novel Readership

Similar to the approach for determining the novel's reception, the question of who comprised its readership also relies on examining the content and structure of the texts to make a generalization about its intended readers. Bowie wisely divides the question of readership into two groups: the author's intended audience and the actual readers.[249] This division of readership allows for a more nuanced evaluation of novelistic texts to determine whether there are elements that align with certain reader types or levels. The same societal separations between the educated-elite and the non-elite are also applicable for evaluating reader reception. The educated and the under-educated are the binary groups for which the novels are potentially written. To answer the question of readership, novels are assessed for their use of grammatical and rhetorical attributes, such as recapitulation and foreshadowing, among others.[250] Literary devices may have served as sign-posts to assist elite or under-educated readers with navigating or interpreting the text.[251] One weakness with viewing the author's use of literary devices to aid a targeted group of readers, is that some novelistic literature contained both elite and common rhetorical elements, which could signify an expectation for a dual readership instead of one group or another. In addition to the rhetorical and grammatical elements, the characters and storylines are also used as evidence for non-elite readership. One example is the emphasis placed on female lead characters

---

[249] For Bowie's explanation of the division of the two groups and how they impact understanding readership of the ancient novel, see, Ewen Bowie, "The Ancient Readers if the Greek Novels," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 89.
[250] Ibid., 97–99.
[251] For Bowie's examples of rhetorical devices used and their connection to readership of early novels, see especially, Ibid., 95–100.

who are more developed than male figures (typically their love interest). This is understood as the author appealing to female readership just as mundane life events in fictional characters' lives were aimed at common readers who might have identified with similar struggles.[252] The question of who the intended or actual readers of novels were remains problematized due to the dearth of evidence to directly clarify the issue.[253] Some scholars, however, continue to hold that most readers were indeed elite, based on the rhetorical and grammatical complexity of some novels, although the resolution remains uncertain.

The combination of the two questions—reception and readership—demonstrate that the problem of the status of novel remains ambiguous at best. Some novels may have been intentionally written for educated-elite, non-elite/under-educated, or both. They may have been accepted or rejected by some Sophists but were certainly more prevalent (maybe more acceptable too?) by the time of the Sophistic era. Perhaps the novel's increase in popularity should be attributed to the increase in literacy and demand for a new form of entertainment in a written medium. Either way, it appears that the novel was known and used by the laity and educated-elite despite earlier restrictions or hesitancies towards it.

The study of Narrative and the ancient Novel yields several conclusions related to understanding the Jewish narratives. The timeframes under consideration mean that narratives and novelistic literature were already flourishing and that Jews who had Greek education and compositional training could certainly encounter these writings. Along with structural, rhetorical, and thematic similarities between Greek and Jewish narratives and novels, they also share similar

[252] Ibid., 95–96.
[253] Ibid., 87–88.

functions and status (as we shall see). Readers of Greek novels are just as diverse and difficult to identify as they are for Jewish novelistic texts. Many of the genre categorization problems are also experienced with Jewish texts, and more so because no direct genre listing exists in Jewish sources for the time; aside from when authors make mention of specific elements, such as allegory, narrative, or history, but there is no definitive listing of genres with guidelines as we find in the works of Greek and Latin rhetors. The next section covers the Jewish novel, as all that has been said so far is an assessment of Greek narrative and novels. Both Jewish and Greek narrative and novels overlap in some ways, whether in problems, approach, or literary content; however, there are also distinctions between them. The study of the Jewish novel helps to situate and distinguish which texts should be classified as narratives. "Novel" will be used for the sake of clarity, to reconstruct what Jewish authors learned and thought about their texts, which also helps to illuminate its status and function.

V. The Jewish Novel

Jewish narratives, like their Greek literary counterparts, are also often difficult to categorize. Jewish literature already possessed a long history of narrative styles before intermingling with Greek rhetorical techniques, so the merger between them unsurprisingly created new forms of literature. Some narratives, written in Hebrew or Aramaic, are analogous to the Greek historical style, reporting past events and actions of famous characters. Even when a text, such as Jonah, Esther, or Ruth emphasizes a central character more than successive historical events, the product is still packaged in historical trimmings. The challenge is how to assign a genre label to diverse types of Jewish literature. To claim an association between Jewish literature written in Greek and Hellenistic rhetorical practices, proper designations for the texts are necessary.

Scholarship on genre designations for Jewish narrative, particularly those written during the Second Temple Period, has understandably led to debate, instead of consensus. Many of the narratives have multiple characteristics which makes them difficult to identify with a single genre category. Compounding the difficulty is the use of modern genre classifications, such as Novel or Romance, which ancient writers and readers would not have known. To properly connect a Jewish narrative written in Greek with Hellenistic rhetorical rules, the ancient genre of the text must first be established. This approach does not infer that modern designations are useless or impractical; on the contrary, they are beneficial in many ways for assisting modern readers to catalog and analyze texts based on shared characteristics.

Scholarly Approaches to Jewish Narrative

Scholars have sought to group and identify Jewish narratives in various ways based on common elements; content, writing style, and structure are usually three of the most observable features. For scholars, "Narrative," is typically the umbrella term used to initially group Hebrew and Jewish Hellenistic texts, such as Jubilees, Daniel, and Aristeas. Scholars, however, also subdivide narrative into types based on observable shared characteristics to form new genre categories that further enable delineations and pairings. The issue of genre classification is generally restricted to narratives that are not overtly historical in their presentation. Literature from the Hebrew Bible, such as Chronicles and Kings are styled as histories, even when they include episodes that focus on the exploits of specific individuals, such as Solomon. Jewish narrative during the Hellenistic and Roman periods also included texts that fit the historical genre and are not seriously debated. Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, *Jewish War*, and *Against Apion*, for

example, are written as historical texts and feature many elements of Hellenistic histories, including formulaic introductions and the use of "description" (ἔκφρασις). Other narrative texts, however, are more ambiguous and difficult to categorize. Aside from historical texts, scholars also consider other groups of Jewish literature that tend to tell a more personal story and less of a strict history. Texts, such as Esther, Ruth, Daniel, Judith, Tobit, Susanna, and Joseph and Aseneth, are referred to as narrative but they are something distinct from general history. Scholars use various genre designations for these texts, such as Novel, Romance, Short Story, Rewritten Bible, and Expansion. The difficulty in applying a genre label to any of these texts is that they do not neatly fit a specific genre category. These texts have some form of history, myth, and biography in them, as they retell the deeds of fictional and historical characters, usually with at least one protagonist. One of the main difficulties is that ancient writers, particularly for Hebrew and Aramaic texts, did not offer specific genre guidelines or categories. Later writers, such as Josephus, do refer back to the twenty-two books of Jewish sacred literary tradition (presumably the collection of the Hebrew Bible) as containing history, hymns, and precepts for living, but without qualification.[254] Sirach and the New Testament Gospels (sometimes designated as biography, history, Gospel, or as its own unique genre) do not offer much help with genre designations either, as they refer more to divisions between writings, such as the Law, Prophets, and Psalms, than to genres.[255] The collection of Jewish sacred literature is often generically referred to as "scripture" (γραφή) even when coupled with a divine or inspired adjective.[256] Because these ambiguous narratives do not inform the reader of their genre—which may not have been as issue or interest to them—scholars must look systematically within the text

[254] Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.38–40.
[255] Sirach Prologue and Luke 24:44.
[256] For example, "All scripture (γραφὴ) is inspired (θεόπνευστος) by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness …" (2 Tim 3:16).

for clues and traits to try to assign a genre label. In the case of texts that focus more on personages than general history, scholars have opted to use modern genre categories to identify and group these works. These categories, which include Rewritten Bible, Expansion, Novel, and Romance, all refer to the same narrative texts due to their shared elements. Rewritten Bible and Expansion include Hebrew and Greek texts which build on existing characters in the Hebrew Bible; Jubilees, for example, is a reworking and expansion of events in Genesis. Other narratives, such as Judith and Tobit, are often categorized as Jewish Novel or Romance due to their presumed similarities to Greek novelistic literature.[257] These narratives usually receive the genre label "Jewish Novel" because of their mixed content—which at times appear as history—and their thematic similarities with Hellenistic novels. The similarities with Greek novels (e.g., Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoë*) consist of focusing on female characters, adventure, having a love interest, and a happy ending.[258] The drawback to designating these texts as novels is that the label does not fit any of the ancient descriptions. Novel is a modern creation that looks for similarities between texts which does not allow for an organic connection to ancient rules for writing narratives because no such genre category exists.[259] Although scholars accept that "Novel," as a genre category, can be grouped under narrative literature, it still does not correspond to any of the ancient labels of Greek composition. This, however, is a problem of

---

[257] The same could be said of Daniel, Susanna, Esther, Ruth, and Job to a lesser extent because of its emphasis on philosophy and theodicy.

[258] Wills, for the Jewish novel literature he examines, thinks that, although they have some similarities with Greek novels, they did not derive from them. He believes that Jewish novels have more in common with literary precursors to the Jewish and Greek novels from nations such as the Syrians, Babylonians, and Egyptians, which later led to the newer form of literature. For his discussion on the similarities and distinctions between the Jewish, Greek, and Latin novels and their relation to Ancient Near Eastern literature, see, Lawrence Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*, Myth and Poetics (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 7, 16–28, 212.

[259] As Wills puts it, "The exact contours and formal characteristics of the novel thus remain ambiguous. The lack of a term in the ancient world for the Jewish novel—or for the Greek and Roman novel—forces use to utilize, in place of any known ancient genre category, a hermeneutical model of our own naming that can explain the data before us." Ibid., 7.

literary content and language (script). Jewish narratives, such as Esther, Ruth, and Judith, were composed in Hebrew and Aramaic, which, although possessing similarities with Greek novels, were probably not influenced by them, nor was a Hellenistic rhetorical education necessary to compose them. When Jewish narratives, however, are composed in Greek and begin to exhibit signs of Hellenistic rhetorical elements in their stories, it becomes appropriate to seek genre designations that reflect Greek composition. These genre categories can then help to determine compositional processes, expectations, function, and status for narratives.

The Jewish narrative literature that are often referred to as Jewish Novels, Romance, or fiction, include, Esther, Daniel, Tobit, Judith, Susanna, and Joseph and Aseneth.[260] Wills also includes a subgenre of Novel called "Historical Novel" (or "Historical Fiction"), which includes Second and Third Maccabees.[261] He refers to these narratives as historical novels because—even if the they are not considered by the author or reader as fictitious—they look like history but have, what he calls, "novelistic" tendencies.[262] Wills expresses the challenges of classifying these works with a single genre and explains the limitations of labels such as Short Story and Novella.[263] For Wills, these labels are imprecise because they do not fully capture what the works entail. Using Novel, for instance, does not fit all the texts because the term has a modern tint.

> To be sure, *novel* as a genre title could be criticized as conveying more to the modern reader than is actually intended here. The Jewish novels, for example, are shorter than modern novels or even Greek and Roman novels.[264]

[260] Ibid., 2.
[261] Ibid., 2, 28–30.
[262] Wills also includes the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocryphal Acts under Historical Novel. He distinguishes Jewish Novel as fiction, while Jewish Historical Novel is history that uses characters and events from the past in combination with fictitious material. Ibid., 30, 185–186.
[263] Ibid., 7.
[264] See also Willis's discussion of how Novel, Novella, and Short Story are distinguished from Jewish narrative. Ibid., 7.

The challenges of using modern terminology to categorize Jewish narrative can be alleviated, at least for those written using Greek rhetoric, by considering Hellenistic genre designations. The Jewish narratives under review for this study are: The Letter of Aristeas, Second, Third, and Fourth Maccabees, Joseph and Aseneth, Luke-Acts, and selected writings from Philo and Josephus. Instead of referring to the person-focused narratives as Novels or fiction, an attempt should be made to classify them with *known* ancient genre categories. In the case of Jewish Hellenistic narratives (written in Greek) that focus on specific characters, Joseph and Aseneth is the main example. The available Greek genres to select from included myth, comedy, history, and poetry; however, elements and style (as we shall see) could be combined into a single text.[265]

The difficulty in selecting one of the four genres is that Joseph and Aseneth has characteristics of myth, history, and comedy. To resolve this issue, we must ask how ancient Greek writers and readers conceived of narrative (διήγησις) as a written genre. According to Quintilian, narrative consisted of three to four genres: myth, comedy, history, and poetry, which he says was the domain of grammarians.[266]

> We are told that there are three species of Narrative, apart from the one used in actual Causes. One is Fable (*fabulam*), found in tragedies and poems (*carminibus*), and remote not only from truth but from the appearance of truth. The second is Plot (*argumentum*), which is the false but probable fiction of comedy (*comoediae*). The third is History (*historiam*), which contains the narration of actual events. We have given poetical (*poeticas*) Narratives to the grammatici; the rhetor should begin with historical ones, which are more grown-up because they are more real. (Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.4.1 [Russell, LCL]).

[265] The rhetorical aspects of Joseph and Aseneth and how they align with the historical genre (and rules for narrative in general) are discussed in Chapter five.
[266] See also, Macrobius' comments of how myth as a genre is divided into two types, for entertainment and for instruction. Instructional myth is then divided into two subcategories of myth build on a fictitious or true setting (*In Somn.* 2.6–12), in Ambrosius Aurelius Theodosius Macrobius, *Commentary On the Dream of Scipio,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990) 83–85.

Theon also offers his understanding of how to distinguish between narratives, although not as explicitly as Quintilian does. Theon in his *progymnasmata*, describes myth as a type of narrative and explains its distinctive function as "a fictitious story giving an image of truth."[267] For his discussion on "Narrative," he says that it covers the past, which implies history.[268] Theon's implication of history as a narrative genre is then confirmed when he offers examples from and cites specific historiographers, such as Thucydides and Herodotus.[269] Although these categories were probably easier to identify in ancient literature for the original readers—if they cared at all—modern readers must devote more time and effort to evaluate whether a text aligns with ancient genre guidelines and boundaries. For Joseph and Aseneth, instead of labeling it as a Jewish Novel, after closer examination of its constituent parts, it has components of history, myth, and comedy.

When a text has multifaceted genre characteristics how should it be classified? I propose that the dominant traits of the text should take precedent over the other visible elements. The dominant traits (e.g., references to historical characters or using a historical structure) may indicate how the author intended the writing to be received, regardless of whether it included mythical elements. Although Joseph and Aseneth has mythical (unhistorical) elements and perhaps some that were meant to be comedic too, the overall content of the text harkens back to a historical period, and the author narrates the account using a historical style. A narrative like

[267] Theon 66, 72. Theon's definition of Myth, as fiction that appears true, is actually closer to Quintilian's description of the *Argumentum* in Comedy. Quintilian's definition of Myth asserts that it is entirely untrue and does not give the appearance of truth at all. This contradiction in definitions demonstrates the fluidity and lack of consensus between rhetorical teachers even in relatively close time periods.
[268] Theon 78.
[269] Theon 83–84. Aristotle, as a precursor to Theon and Quintilian, also discusses narrative's subject matter as characters and events that belong to the past, "In deliberative oratory narrative is very rare, because no one can narrate things to come; but if there is narrative, it will be of things past, in order that, being reminded of them, the hearers may take better counsel about the future" (*Rhet.* 3.16.11 [Freese, LCL]).

Joseph and Aseneth could be written with a historical framework and have mythical and comedic elements interspersed. Quintilian, for example, explains how a history should be written using material that embellishes the account and prevents it from becoming too plain.[270] Additionally, Theon, when discussing historical narrative, advises that it should incorporate the miraculous for credibility.[271] Keeping in mind that an author could mix elements from myth, comedy, poetry, or history, the narrative could still have a general genre specification. By examining a narrative's content and structure, its genre can be determined. If the narrative is myth, it does not need a historical referent and its contents are expected to be unhistorical. The narrative, its characters, and events are largely fictional, even if some historical realia are present. A narrative that is considered comedy could have historical characters and events, and is intended to have some verisimilitude; however, the details of the story are actually untrue. Comedy, from the Greek κῶμος (song), has its roots in the theater, where actors and the chorus depicted real figures (e.g., Philosophers and Politicians) and created fictional stories around them that were intended for entertainment and satire.[272] Using real life characters provided some reality but their dialogue and actions in the plays were invented. Poetic narrative, which included the old epics of Homer, was distinguished by its metrical composition as opposed to the prose style of the other three genres. History, as mentioned, was prose narrative that incorporated elements from other genres and was generally concerned with presenting facts accurately. The best way to identify Joseph and Aseneth's genre based on these descriptive options, is to consider its source material. Poetry is eliminated as an option because the text is certainly not written with any type of meter. While

[270] Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.4.3–4. The subjects of adding embellishment and the incredible to narrative will be discussed in more detail in the section on narrative invention.
[271] Theon 83–84.
[272] Aristotle, in his *Poetica*, briefly describes comedy, "Comedy, as we said, is mimesis of baser but not wholly vicious characters: rather, the laughable is one category of the shameful" (Aristotle, *Poet.* 1449a31–36 [Halliwell, LCL]). He also distinguishes it from tragedy, "This very distinction separates tragedy from comedy: the latter tends to represent people inferior, the former superior, to existing humans" (*Poet.* 1448a16–18 [Halliwell, LCL]).

myth and comedy are essentially unhistorical stories, the biblical account of Joseph and Aseneth in the book of Genesis—which is clearly the source of Joseph and Aseneth—was likely regarded as historical by the author of the revised version. The account in Joseph and Aseneth retells parts of the Genesis version which were considered historical (true). This feature in Joseph and Aseneth distinguishes it from comedy, which also can use real figures, because comedy is a fictitious story that appears true, while some characters and events in Joseph and Aseneth are built on what is considered a true foundation. Due to Joseph and Aseneth's connection to a "true" (historical) story in Genesis, its genre can be classified as "history," albeit mixed with mythical or comedic elements.[273]

Returning to our initial question, "What did they mean by Narrative," we can now assert that when it was defined by Greek writers during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, it probably entailed four genres: myth, comedy, history, and poetry. Although a narrative could have a mixture of elements, an examination of the entire work's contents and structure could help to identify which genre was predominant. Jewish Hellenistic narratives that focus on specific characters are still best associated with historiography. The narratives of Second and Third Maccabees, Philo, and Josephus, are also closer to Hellenistic histories. The New Testament Gospels, especially Luke-Acts, are also best assigned to the historical genre, mainly because "Biography" and "Gospel," as some scholars prefer to describe them, were not actual genre categories choose from.[274]

---

[273] Wills classifies Joseph and Aseneth as a Novel because of its similarities to other Jewish and Greek novels, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*, Myth and Poetics (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 2. I agree that it has shared elements with Greek novels but since "Novel" was not a designation in the ancient world, I connect its genre with history, although I think Historical Novel or Historical Fiction would be fine modern genre designations as well.

[274] Christopher Bryan, for example, explains the scholarly debate over how to best categorize the gospel literature. Some think it is *sui generis* (its own unique genre) or something akin to rabbinic midrash. He argues that the gospels—Mark in particular—are similar to Hellenistic literature. Bryan asserts that Mark is closest in literary form to the Hellenistic "Life" (βίος), even though he admits that this was not an actual designation that ancient writers

Biography was a popular form of writing in the ancient world but was still typically considered a form of history that focused on a person's life activities rather than a broad range of historical events.[275] What was meant by narrative? It depends on which genre category individual ancient authors intended to use when composing their texts. Identifying a narrative's genre leads to the next step of what the educational process was to craft a narrative that utilized specific genre rules and expectations.

---

used until around the fifth century CE. His argument rests on Mark sharing elements and features that are found in Hellenistic biographies. Bryan acknowledges that Mark does not include all the features normally associated with Hellenistic lives but explains that just because it does not have every example does not mean that the ancient reader would not have recognized it as such. Christopher Bryan, *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Settings* (New York: Oxford Press University, 1993), 11, 22–29. Green discusses the literary genre of the Gospel of Luke as historiography. He argues how the narratives of Luke-Acts features literary elements found in Greco-Roman histories, such as their introductions, travel scenes, speeches, and genealogies. Green points out that the author of Luke-Acts designates the writing as a "narrative" and therefore, the work should be read according to those standards, particularly those which align with historiography. He also mentions that not everyone agrees that Luke-Acts reflects the historical genre; instead, some contend that Luke-Acts should be classified as biography. Although Green accepts that Luke-Acts has been influenced by Hellenistic biography, its major features, particularly its introductions, are more consistent with historiography. Green also mentions that, when taken together, Luke-Acts does not fit a biography because it does not focus on a single figure. Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1997), 1–6.

[275] David Aune, while mentioning that not all share this view, discusses the many similarities between Greco-Roman "Biographies" and the Gospels. He refers to Biography as a type of writing separate from a history, although he recognizes their close association. The biography in this sense focuses more on the individual, often praising their past deeds, than on longer historical events. For his detailed discussion, see, David Aune, "Greco-Roman Biography," in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*, ed. David Aune (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1988), 107-125. I agree that some ancient authors focused their writings more on an individual, which made it more of a biography, but since that was not a narrative genre category, history is the larger genre category that it fits into. Even when Polybius, as Aune points out, describes writing about a person's life, they are still doing it in a historical style (Polybius, 10.21.5–8).

CHAPTER 4

Jewish Mimesis of Greek Narrative Rules

The subject of Jewish education during the Second Temple period, and particularly how scribes (authors) learned to compose their texts, has been hampered by a lack of explicit evidence from Jewish sources. The issue is further complicated when trying to describe the process Jewish authors underwent to learn Greek subjects (e.g., myth and philosophy) and to write using Hellenistic techniques. Scholars typically acknowledge that Jews encountered Greek education and attended institutions, such as the gymnasium, to learn Greek culture and writing practices, but the process of how and what specific lessons or instructions they received has not been fully articulated.

[276] The question of what authors thought about the content of their writings (e.g., did they believe their own accounts or miraculous events they wrote about) has also been cautiously avoided because we did not have access to the specific guidelines they followed. What we know about Jews learning Greek education or following rhetorical practices often comes in piecemeal or isolated texts. The information needed to piece the puzzle together is often scattered across academic fields, such as classical studies, where Greek and Roman sources would help to fill in the lacunae left in the Judaic record. Jews, for instance, are stated to have engaged in Greek education at gymnasiums and their texts exhibit similarities with Greek rhetorical techniques,

[276] For a helpful discussion on Jews receiving Greek education and problems with evidence, see, Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 90–92.

such as paraphrase; however, the specific structures, circumstances, and instructions used for learning are often unaccounted for. This study finally draws together Greek, Roman, and Jewish sources to reconstruct Jewish education, and especially compositional education, during these pivotal periods. Although combining sources across fields does not resolve every problem, it helps to provide a clearer image of an obscured period where little direct evidence from Jewish sources exits. Instead of being restricted to saying that Jews probably studied or learned Greek rhetoric at the gymnasium or observing that parts of a text followed Hellenistic writing techniques, for the first time we have a collective presentation from the perspective of actual authors, of the educational curriculum for composing texts. The reconstruction shows stages of education and specific instructions, such as rhetorical techniques, authors' expectations, narrative elements, and how narrative functioned. Now, when examining a text, we have a reconstruction of real-world exercises and expectations for writing based on what writers and rhetors from contemporary time periods communicated. The results of the reconstruction will show that the educational curriculum included instructions for writing narratives, that narrative included multiple sub-genres, diverse expectations and opinions about narrative, research methods, how authors viewed their texts, and that narrative primarily functioned in a didactic manner.

The reconstructed presentation of Greek compositional education for Jewish authors will be divided across three successive chapters. Chapter four will present the curriculum and writing style for learning Greek narrative. Chapter five will focus on the sources used for constructing our understanding of composing Greek narrative as well as its elements. Chapter six explores various ways that authors thought about narrative by examining various expectations and didactic functions for narrative.

I. Narrative Curriculum

Narrative Invention

The curriculum for composing narrative can be reasonably reconstructed by examining the comments of twelve writers, who range between the fifth century BCE to the second century CE, in addition to educational exercises.[277] They are: Thucydides, Plato, Aristotle, Polybius, Demetrius, Dionysius Thrax, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cicero, Theon, Quintilian, and Plutarch. Each author makes comments that allude to aspects of learning to compose texts; some comments are instructional, while others are mentioned tangentially or inferred. Based on their comments, the curriculum can be divided into four sub-categories: narrative creation, narrative styles, narrative elements, and esoteric techniques. The first sub-category, Narrative creation or invention, is generally discussed in relation to writing history or poetry. Invention in narrative writing presumes creating something new or expanding on something already in existence, whether plot details, characters, speeches, or events.[278] The alterations (additions or subtractions) can be miniscule or substantial. In some situations, the modifications to a familiar story could be understood as paraphrastic—a literary technique that Theon suggests—or as an emendation.[279] In each case, invention or creation involves presenting narrative elements that did not exist before but are treated as equally valid alternative versions of

---

[277] For a detailed and succinct summary of the compositional curriculum under the grammarian during the Hellenistic period, which includes the various writing exercises, rules, and narrative elements, see, Henri Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1956), 172–175.

[278] Invention (*inventio*) is not used here in the exact same sense as it is in rhetorical practice. Its rhetorical understanding is part of forming speeches for oration—particularly arguments. Invention, in this regard, entails finding preconceived ideas that are housed in places (Latin = *loci* or Greek = *topoi*) in one's memory and recalling them to for use based on the subject matter. See, for example, Quintilian *Inst.* 5.10.20ff.

[279] Theon's instruction on paraphrase (making changes to previous sayings) will be examined in the next chapter which involves case studies of Jewish texts that incorporate Greek rhetorical practices.

narrative accounts. The newly created parts of an account are sometimes presented as challenges or sources of clarification to older traditions of a story. In the cases of historical, poetic, or mythical narrative, the writer may intentionally invent some details of the account but the audience or reader—blind to the author's intention—may accept the content as accurate and authentic. Inventing portions of a writing appears to have been a common practice that had supporters and detractors; whether it was positive or negative depended on which contents were contrived and how the author was perceived. The Greek philosopher Plutarch (45–120 CE), for instance, offers a positive use of invention; he describes how poets are like philosophers, who use facts to teach, while poets use *fabricated things* and myths to teach others.

> Philosophers, at any rate, for admonition and instruction, use examples taken from known facts; but the poets accomplish the same result by inventing actions (ποιοῦσι πλάττοντες) of their own imagination, and by recounting mythical tales (μυθολογοῦντες). (Plutarch, *Adol. poet. aud.* 20c [Babbitt, LCL])

Invention is considered a positive attribute in this instance because of its use by poets for instruction. We must remember that poets and historians are included under the ancient category of narrative writers, so, literary techniques that a writer employs in either genre (poetry or history) can be considered a part of compositional education. Additionally, two earlier writers, the Greek historian Thucydides (fifth century BCE) and the Athenian philosopher, Plato (fourth century BCE) affirm the use of invention in narrative. Although both writers are earlier than our general time period, they demonstrate continuity for how invention was practiced in narrative texts. Thucydides, in his *History of the Peloponnesian War*, explains why inventing speeches or words for historical characters is an acceptable practice, particularly when what was said is difficult to replicate.

> As to the speeches that were made by different men, either when they were about to begin the war or when they were already engaged therein, it has been difficult to recall with strict accuracy the words actually spoken, both for me as regards that which I myself heard, and for those who from various other sources have brought me reports. Therefore the speeches are given in the language in which, as it

> seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion, though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said. (Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War* 1.22.1–2 [Smith, LCL])

Thucydides suggests approximating what a character said (trying to maintain their probable communication style), which validates inventing some words, due to the challenges of knowing exactly what historical figures communicated at specific moments. In another instance, creativity becomes relevant when Plato, quoting his teacher Socrates, suggests that poets should invent (literary "find out ways") ways to explain problematic portrayals of their divinities. For Plato, who argues for a new ideal for education in his *Republic*, the poets' inventions or new ways to interpret the activities of the gods are meant to counter their depictions in other poets' works, such as Hesiod and Homer.

> But if anyone writes anything in verse in which these lines occur, for example the sufferings of Niobe, or those of the house of Pelops, or the Trojan Wars, or anything else of this sort, then either we must not let them say that these are the work of god, or if they are, then they must search out (ἐξευρετέον) the reason that we are pretty much looking for now and say that god carried out good, just deeds, and that the people responsible have profited by being punished. We must not allow the poet to say that those paying the penalty were wretched and the one who brought this about was god. But if they were to say that evil men are wretched because they need punishment, and that they are benefited by god in being punished, we must allow that. We must resist at all costs anyone in his own state saying that god is the cause of anyone's evils, if it is to be well governed; or anyone, young or old, hearing it related either in verse or prose, on the grounds that such things given utterance are impious, and neither beneficial to us, nor harmonious within themselves. (Plato, *Resp.* 3.380a–c [Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL])

Although Plato does not mention inventing details directly, his suggestion that poets "find a way" to reinterpret the gods' behavior, strongly implies creating new material. The new explanations that poets create to explain the supposedly incongruous actions of the gods are not considered as deceitful; instead, their fabrications—which are deliberate alterations to the traditional stories—are *encouraged* to promote common and acceptable teachings for young students.

Demetrius (second century BCE) when discussing the Elegant style of writing, explains how adding an invented myth is recommended to make a text more attractive. The created material is entirely acceptable, provided that it meshes well with the story's context.

> A neatly introduced fable (μῦθος) is also attractive, either a traditional fable, like Aristotle's fable of the eagle: "It dies of hunger, when its beak grows more and more curved. It suffers this fate because once upon a time when it was human it wronged a guest." Here Aristotle has used a traditional, familiar fable. But we can often also invent fables (προσπλάσσομεν) which fit closely and match the context, for example one writer on the topic of cats said that they thrive and pine in phase with the moon, and then added his own invention, "and this is the origin of the fable that the moon gave birth to the cat." Not only will the new fiction in itself be attractive, but the actual fable is charming in making the cat the child of the moon. (Demetrius, *Eloc.* §157–158 [Innes, LCL])

Quintilian, the first-century CE Roman rhetor, teaches that a narrative, in this case history, should not be presented "baldly" or "without embellishment." When he says that a narrative should not be bald (*nudas*) it means naked/nude or unclothed; a narrative that is without embellishment (*inornatas*) means one that is unclothed. To present the facts is fine for Quintilian but they should also be accompanied by additional clothing—invented details—to make the literary presentation more pleasant for the reader. Although Quintilian does not directly state that details should be invented, his comment implies it.

> I shall discuss what I think to be the best principles of Narrative later, when I come to speak of forensic oratory. Meanwhile, it is sufficient to note that it should be neither quite dry and jejune (for why spend so much labour on our studies if it was thought satisfactory to set things out baldly and without embellishment?) nor, on the other hand, tortuous and revelling in those irrelevant Descriptions to which many are tempted by their wish to imitate the licence of poets. (Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 2.4.1–3 [Russell, LCL])

Quintilian condones inventing details when they complement plain facts without harming the integrity of the account; however, if invention changes the facts then it should be shunned. He criticizes writers who deliberately take liberty to invent (*inveneri*) details because their sources are difficult to trace or confirm.

> A further task will be the explanation of historical allusions; this must be scholarly, but not overloaded with superfluous labour. It is quite enough to expound versions which are traditional or at any rate rest on good authority. To hunt down everything ever said even by the most despised writer means either wretched pedantry or ostentatious vanity. … Commentaries by grammatici are full of this sort of

> lumber, and are scarcely known to their authors themselves. … This happens especially in mythology, and sometimes reaches ludicrous or even scandalous extremes, so that the most unscrupulous writer has plenty of scope for invention (*inveneri*), and can even lie in any way that occurs to him about whole books or authorities—all quite safely, because those which never existed cannot be found. When they venture on more familiar ground, such people are often caught out by the curious. (Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.8.18–21 [Russell, LCL])

Polybius, the second-century BCE historian, criticizes writers—particularly Timaeus, a rival historian—who use invention to skew facts because their fabrications are viewed as deception. He denounces creating false material, such as speeches, because it gives the appearance of accuracy and erodes trust in the work.[280] He claims that if one part of the historical work is untrue, then the veracity of the book and the author are brought into question.[281] Timaeus is a target of Polybius' rebukes; he accuses Timaeus of falsely appearing accurate and convincing in his history writing because his practice of invention damages its historical value.[282] These writers each show the diverse nature and understanding towards narrative invention. Invention could be viewed as an author's creativity for making a narrative more attractive or didactic, or it could be viewed as a deliberate act of deception. The *context* of invention—the author's intention, genre of writing, and purpose—influences whether it should be taken as positive or negative by the reader or critic.

Jewish Narrative Invention

The practice of invention is also seen in Jewish narrative literature of this time, particularly in pseudepigraphal texts. Writers invented new material (characters and circumstances) by expanding on traditional and famous literary accounts. Many of these narratives, both pseudepigraphal and anonymous, were written in a style that mimicked historiography (a sub-

[280] Polyb. 12.25b.4.
[281] Polyb. 12.25a.2.
[282] Polyb. 12.26d.1–5.

genre of narrative). Invention, similar to its use in creating speeches, could function to resolve problems or argue points of view. The Latin *inventio* generally meant "to find", and this could be to find ways to answer curiosities or complications in literary constructions. The story of Joseph and Aseneth is one example of how narrative invention could resolve textual difficulties. The precursor to Joseph and Aseneth comes from Genesis 41:45:

> Pharaoh gave Joseph the name Zaphenath-paneah; and he gave him Asenath daughter of Potiphera, priest of On, as his wife. Thus Joseph gained authority over the land of Egypt.

The passage is concise and offers no additional information about Aseneth or their subsequent marriage. The only other mention of Aseneth in the Bible is that she bore two sons to Joseph (Gen 41:50; 46:20). The passage itself does not give any indication that there was a problem with this arrangement. There was an injunction that forbade Hebrews from marrying alien women, but the original writer and audience may not have had any questions or issues with the scenario because other famous Hebrew figures, such as Moses, also married foreign women.[283] The law about marrying foreign women, however, does appear to be a concern for the later author of Joseph and Aseneth. The author focuses on reconciling how Joseph marries Aseneth to make it more compatible with Jewish law. The author uses invention to elaborate on what transpired before Pharaoh gave Aseneth to Joseph. What is unspoken in the Genesis narrative becomes the newly created material to justify their marriage. The problem of Aseneth being Egyptian and worshipping idol gods is rectified through Joseph's intercessory prayer for her, angelic intervention, her repentance, and confession.[284] Joseph's acceptance of Aseneth in the Genesis version also receives inventive treatment. He initially rejects Aseneth because she is Egyptian,

---

[283] For the prohibition against marrying foreign women, see Exod 34:15 and Deut 7:3–4. Moses marries Zipporah ("bird") a Midianite woman (Exod 2:21). She is also called a Cushite woman (Num 12:1).
[284] Joseph's prayer for Aseneth (Jos. Asen. 8.9), angelic intervention (Jos. Asen. 15.3–6, 15.9–11), Aseneth's repentance (Jos. Asen. 9, 10.8–17, 11.4–5), and confession (Jos. Asen. 12.3–6).

even citing his father Jacob's warning against associating with foreign women.[285] The author presents Joseph as having no interest in Aseneth at all, despite her virtuous lifestyle. Joseph reacts in all the appropriate ways that a Torah observant Jew should; he prays for Aseneth and is invulnerable to the attributes that make other men desire her.[286] The author goes through creative machinations to show that Joseph did not immediately agree to marry a foreign woman, thereby not breaking the law. The invented details, instead, show that Aseneth was a divinely appointed wife for Joseph and provides a justifiable reason why he marries her.[287] She possessed the requisite qualities of a heroine: beauty, chastity and nobility, but her adherence to Egyptian religion was flawed. When she repented and renounced following Egyptian gods, she then subscribed to following the God of Israel and became a Jewish in her religion. These inventions made Aseneth acceptable for marriage because Joseph was no longer marrying a foreign or pagan woman but a pious proselyte. Jewish and Greek narrative writers learned and practiced invention in their literary works for beneficial reasons and to support dishonest pretenses. Even without naming the practice directly, Jewish authors writing in Greek (as we shall see) held similar ideas about it as their Greek counterparts. The practice of invention was not necessarily learned through Greek education. Other Jewish literature from the Hellenistic and Roman eras also expanded or reinterpreted older Jewish traditions but were written in Hebrew or Aramaic (e.g., pesher texts from Qumran and Septuagint Apocrypha). The ones written in Greek, however, may have been influenced by Greek compositional rules but it is quite uncertain. The practice of invention then, could have been learned by Jewish writers under Jewish or Greek circumstances since it was practiced in both writing environments. Each writing must be

[285] Jos. Asen. 7.5.
[286] Jos. Asen. 8.5–6.
[287] For Aseneth's divine selection to marry Joseph, see, Jos. Asen. 15.6, 18.11.

evaluated on its own terms to see if it shows other features of Greek rhetorical influence. What is referred to here as "invention" is also called "Rewritten Bible" or "expansion" by some scholars; mainly as a genre type. These two terms will be addressed when discussing Jewish narratives.

II. Narrative Writing Styles

The more explicit expectations and guidelines for writing narrative literature will be divided into two sections; the first section briefly covers writing styles and what they entail, and the second section addresses specific elements that comprise a narrative. In both sections, the focus will be on what selected authors from the Hellenistic and Roman periods expected or learned for composing a narrative. This discussion will answer three things: what they (Greek and Jewish authors) said about writing narrative, how it was demonstrated in Jewish literature, and what its significance is for reading and interpreting Jewish narratives written in Greek. Writers, as we shall see, learned specific rules to write narrative. Narrative, however, was an umbrella category for sub-categories such as history, myth, poetry, and comedy.[288] These sub-categories, which we generally refer to as genres, each had certain rules associated with how they were composed and included *stylistic* expectations. While learning to write different genres of narrative, students also became familiar with various writing styles that could be incorporated into them.[289] Narrative was one aspect—written or oral—of engaging in rhetorical discourse and style entailed the compositional strategy for presenting it.[290] Different styles could be used and mixed into written

[288] Aristotle's *Poetica* also describes poetry as its own genre, which included epic, tragedy, and comedy among others (Aristotle, *Poet.* 1447a1–16); however, poetry, along with its subgenres, was still a type of narrative.
[289] Distinctions of styles for oratory and written works may go back as far as the fourth century BCE. Kennedy, for example, argues that three styles were known to Theophrastus (who developed his ideas from Aristotle) by using citations to his work *On Diction* (Περὶ λέξεως) from later authors, such as Diogenes Laertius, Cicero, and Quintilian. George Kennedy, "Theophrastus and Stylistic Distinctions," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 62 (1957): 93–104.
[290] According to Aristotle, there were different kinds of rhetorical discourse. Rhetorical discourse included types for debate, public speaking, law court presentations, and for writing (*Rhet.* 3.12.1). The different kinds of discourse used

narrative across its subgenres (e.g., history and poetry). In addition to guidelines for what should be included in a literary text, style was selected to compliment the intentions of the author's work. After choosing their subject and genre, the author had to also select what style (or styles) they were going to use to communicate their work. Style was not separate from the genre, it was simply how the author chose to express the details, whether written or spoken. Like rules for writing narrative, there was not absolute consensus on the definitions and boundaries of style. Categories and descriptions for style varied based on the instructor, location, and point in time. For this discussion, we will consider four major authors who fit into our time constraints, to introduce how style contributed to the formation of narrative literature.

Sources for Writing Styles

The primary sources on literary style in antiquity are Aristotle (*Rhetorica*), Demetrius (*De Elocutione*), Cicero (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De compositione verborum*). Each of their works discusses style: Aristotle uses λέξις, Demetrius uses ἑρμηνεία, Dionysius does not use a specific word but expresses that different compositions exist, and Cicero—using two words—says that different styles (*genera*) of composition are called types (*figura*).[291] Each authors' work and terminology describes ways to make a composition (σύνθεσις) for reading or oral delivery. The four authors follow a format that presents each style by explaining how they differ from one another and providing examples of their use in literature. Multiple examples are given from well-known classical authors, such as Homer and Herodotus, and across literary genres. The authors describe certain characteristics of

---

certain styles. The styles included deliberative, forensic, and epideictic. Each style could incorporate narrative in its own distinctive way to fit its purpose. Epideictic and Forensic styles were especially suited for written narrative (*Rhet.* 3.12.1, 5–6).

[291] Cicero refers to *genera* and *figura* as parts of *elocutio* (delivery), *Rhet. Her.* 4.7.10.

each style and their intended function for the writer. These separate descriptions include their negative attributes and positive benefits, as well as suggestions for when a particular style should be employed.

Aristotle on Style

Most styles describe the grammar and syntax for physically composing a discourse. Aside from Demetrius' *De Elocutione*, which offers a more complex and thorough explanation of style than the others, the other writers' explanation of style focuses on verbal arrangement and phonetics for oral delivery or reading. Aristotle (384–322 BCE) discusses three styles for presenting an oral discourse: epideictic, forensic, and deliberative.[292] He describes the epideictic style, which is used for speaking, as also being conducive to writing.[293] Aristotle even provides some practical guidelines for how to use the epideictic style in a narrative; explaining how it should be disjointed (not consecutive) and not too long.[294] The forensic and deliberative styles are both connected to legal discourse and presenting cases; however, Aristotle also mentions that the forensic style is suited for writing as well. Aristotle's discussion of style leans in the direction of oral court and legal presentations, although his expectations for epideictic carry over into narrative literature. While he clearly speaks about composing narratives for court cases, Aristotle's discussion on epideictic style also relates to narrative literature outside of the legal sphere. For example, the introduction (προοίμιον), also called the exordium, of the epideictic style is similar to what is found in some writings. Aristotle says that the exordium functions like the prologue in poetry; it occupies the starting point of a discourse and situates its subject matter

[292] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.12.5–6.
[293] From ἐπίδειξις ("an exhibition" or "display"). Aristotle says, "The epideictic style is especially suited to written compositions, for its function is reading; and next to it comes the forensic style" (*Rhet.* 3.12.6 [Freese, LCL]).
[294] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.16.1, 4.

and order of arrangement for the audience.[295] The same expectations and structure of an introduction are also found in literary works, such as historiography, encomion, and myth. Historians such as Polybius and Josephus offer explanations at the beginning of their works to their readers about their subject, rationale for writing, and in some cases their research methodology.[296] The exordium is also found across genres; In Philo's *De vita Mosis*—which is an encomion and not a history—he also includes an introduction that follows the parameters detailed by Aristotle and used by historiographers.[297] Based on these instances, Aristotle's explanation of compositional styles, particularly epideictic, demonstrates how it could be incorporated into different types of narrative literature.

Rhetorical ad Herennium

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, sometimes attributed to Cicero, mentions three styles of composition. Like Aristotle's *Rhetorica*, it describes styles of composition that are written for oral speeches but can also be transferred to literature meant only for reading. Authorship, dating, and its intended recipient are all matters of debate. While attributed to Cicero, scholars note that this designation is a late occurrence during the time of Jerome (345–ca 419) the Latin scholar and bible translator.[298] The date of the work is problematic due to the ambiguity of who the author is, but the text is generally dated around the second decade of the first century BCE (ca 91 BCE).[299] The recipient of the work, Gaius Herennius, is also difficult to identify because there is

[295] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.14.1. See also, Theon, who in his *progymnasmata* suggests that the *prooimion* should occupy the starting point of compositions such as *encomion* and myth. Theon 76, 111, (Spengel).
[296] Josephus, *Ant.* 1.1–9; *B. J.* 1.1–3 and Polyb. 1.1–2.2.
[297] Philo, *Mos.* 1.1–5. Philo's use of encomion and other rhetorical techniques will be addressed in more detail in Chapter Seven.
[298] Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Translated by Harry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954), vii–viii. Arguments have been made for Cicero and Cornificius, among others, as the author of the work. For a detailed discussion, see, Ibid., vii–ix.
[299] Ibid., vii.

nothing in the text that makes him distinguishable from those with a similar name.[300] The author describes three styles of composition in brief terms but with detailed examples.

> There are, then, three kinds of style, called types, to which discourse, if faultless, confines itself: the first we call the Grand; the second, the Middle; the third, the Simple. The Grand type consists of a smooth and ornate arrangement of impressive words. The Middle type consists of words of a lower, yet not of the lowest and most colloquial, class of words. The Simple type is brought down even to the most current idiom of standard speech. (*Rhet. Her.* 4.8.11 [Caplan, LCL])

The Grand (*gravem*), Middle (*mediocrem*), and Simple (*extenuatam*) styles designate the ways an author selects words and arranges them. The difference between the styles is how complex the words and their grammatical or syntactical arrangements are. As the author demonstrates by example, the subject matter can be the same, but the selection of words and their order distinguishes one style from another.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Dionysius of Halicarnassus' (60-7 BCE) *De compositione verborum* also emphasizes word selection and arrangement. He describes three styles of composition but his differs from *Rhetorica ad Herennium* in terminology and the function of his third category. Dionysius uses metaphorical designations as names for his styles; his first category is called Austere (αὐστηρός), the second, Polished (γλαφυρός), and the third, Blended or Well-Balanced (εὔκρατος).

> But for my own part, since I cannot find authentic names by which to call them, because none exists, I name them by metaphorical terms—the first austere, the second polished, the third well-blended. (Dionysius, *Comp.* 21 [Usher, LCL])

The order of his styles does not align with *Ad Herennium* either; the Austere style, which describes a plain writing without ornate words, is like the Simple style. The Polished style is closer to the Grand style because they both attempt to impress the reader or audience by word

---

[300] *Rhet. Her.* 1.1.1. For the problem of identifying Gaius Herennius, see, Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Translated by Harry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954), xv.

selection and arrangement. The major difference between Dionysius and *Ad Herennium* is the third style of Blended and Simple. While the Simple style is another level down in word selection and order from the Middle style and is closer to mundane speech, the Blended style mixes the Austere and Polished into a new hybrid form that contains a little of both. The methods are the same, choosing words and how they should be arranged for optimal sound and presentation, but the Well-Balanced style offers a composition that allows the author to combine two styles into one work.

Demetrius

The most distinct work of the four authors who discuss different composition styles is Demetrius' (second century BCE) *De Elocutione* (On Style).[301] While the other authors describe their styles in terms of word selection and arrangement, Demetrius does the same but also adds additional literary characteristics, such as the use of allegory, to define his compositional styles. His list is also the only one to include four instead of three styles. Demetrius' styles include: Grand (μεγαλοπρεποῦς), Elegant (γλαφυρός), and Plain (ἰσχνός), and Forceful (δεινότης).[302] The Grand style is like the Grand style in *Ad Herennium* and the Polished style in Dionysius because they each emphasize ornate eloquence by selecting impressive words and word order. Demetrius adds to his definition by explaining which other features form part of his Grand style. What makes the Grand style *grand* is not only word selection (for vividness) and arrangement (for

[301] The Greek title is Δημητρίου περὶ ἑρμηνείας ("Demetrius Concerning Style"). Although some have connected the author with Demetrius of Phaleron (ca 360–280 BCE), his exact identity is unknown. For a discussion of authorship, see, Aristotle, Longinus, Demetrius, *Poetics. Longinus: On the Sublime. Demetrius: On Style,* Translated by Stephen Halliwell, W. Hamilton Fyfe, Doreen C. Innes, W. Rhys Roberts. Revised by Donald A. Russell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 310–311.
[302] Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§38, 114, 128, 190, 240.

sound and conciseness) but also the use of metaphors, allegory, and a worthy subject.[303] For Demetrius, the Grand style encompasses not only grammar and syntax but also the topic and how it is presented through complex literary mechanisms. The inclusion of allegories and mysteries was a way of demonstrating the author's compositional acumen to complement their topic. Demetrius' Frigid style (ψυχρός), considered a faulty one, was the opposite of his Grand style—which meant a bare-bones text and presentation without any ornamentation; however, this style could include exaggerated thought and impossible or miraculous occurrences.[304]

Demetrius' next two styles, Elegant and Plain, are where he begins to deviate from the other writers' lists. The Elegant style could be similar to the Middle style of *Ad Herennium*. Demetrius describes the elegant style as speech with charm and lightness and used in poetry and comedy (in the theater).[305] Both genres were viewed as higher forms of composition than everyday common writing, but perhaps depending on subject matter and audience, were not expected to be as ostentatious as his Grand style.[306] Demetrius' Plain style eschews extravagance and appears as a lesser form than the Grand or Elegant styles but not quite as bare as his Frigid style (which is the opposite of Grand). While the Grand style intentionally strives for impressive words and syntactical arrangement, the Plain style, as its name implies, seeks a toned down or less ornate way to convey a writer's ideas. The Plain style features words that are easy to understand and uncomplicated grammatical constructions. Its style is probably most comparable to the Simple style in *Ad Herennium* and the Austere style in Dionysius. The Plain, Austere, and Simple styles

[303] For examples of the Grand style coming from metaphors, allegories, and subjects (such as battles, Earth, and Heaven) see, Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§75–76, 78–80, 99–102.
[304] Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§115.
[305] Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§128.
[306] Demetrius mentions that the Elegant style could be used to improve mythological writings, which demonstrates its flexibility across literary genres (Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§156–162).

were at the level of common language. This level was considered a style that could be used for narratives—including history, epic poetry, and tragedy—that were written for those who had less than an elite level of educational training.[307] Demetrius even states that the Plain style ought to be clear, vivid, persuasive, and have a simple subject, which made a writing easier to comprehend.[308] The Plain style did not include the kind of dense metaphors, mysteries, and allegories that were impressive features of the Grand style.[309]

The most unique of Demetrius' styles is the Forceful composition. Although it also entails word selection and arrangement, this style is not directly comparable to any of the others. The Forceful style (δεινότης) is somewhat similar to the Grand style because its subject matter contributes to its description; a grand subject makes it grand and a forceful subject can make a composition or speaker appear forceful.[310] The Forceful style still has more to do with contrived constructions. Brevity, for instance, in composition—compacting meaning into fewer words—is a technique that signals forcefulness along with combining words to make harsh sounds.[311] While this style could be employed for compositions meant for oral or written usage, it seems that it was more effective for audible use to impact listeners. The significance of the forceful style for narrative is that it can help explain certain nuances in literature. Demetrius mentions some characteristics of the Forceful style that are more conceptual than grammatical. He explains

---

[307] Dionysius asserts that Pindar (poetry), Aeschylus (tragedy), and Thucydides (prose), among others, were some of the best examples of austere composition, Dionysius, *Comp.* 22.

[308] For Demetrius' instructions on clarity, vividness, persuasiveness, and having a simple subject, see, Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§190–191, 209ff, 221–222. There was some overlap in features as well. Vividness in writing, for example, was also part of the Grand style but the word selection and order were more advanced than the Plain style. Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§50.

[309] Theon also offers instructions about style in narrative. He suggests, for instance, that writers should avoid certain word usages, "As for style, in aiming at clarity on should avoid poetic and coined words and tropes and archaisms and foreign words and homonyms" (Theon 81 [Kennedy]).

[310] Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§240.

[311] For brevity, Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§242–243, 253; for harsh sounds, *Eloc.* §§246.

that the inclusion of playfulness and expressing ideas with obscurity, instead of openly, are instances of forcefulness.[312] Additionally, he suggests that placing the most striking part at the end of a sentence lends to the forcefulness of a composition.[313] Identifying and understanding which techniques comprise this style helps to account for written details that appear in narrative texts.

Quintilian

Quintilian, the Roman rhetor (35–ca 90 CE), also discusses style in his twelve volume *Institutio oratoria*. His work addresses teachers and parents and offers ideal instructions for preparing students for rhetorical study. A student who used his instructions would be prepared to pursue a career as an orator or, perhaps before retirement, a historian.[314] Although written in Latin, Quintilian mentions that Roman instruction for rhetoric was a continuation of Greek education.[315] Quintilian, like other instructors, explains that style is intended for written and oral presentations. While other descriptions of style include grammatical details, Quintilian emphasizes the effect style has on the reader and listening audience (particularly court judges). For Quintilian, the stylistic rules for speaking and writing are the same, although he encourages improvisation.

> In my view, however, speaking well and writing well are one and the same thing, and a written speech is nothing but the record of a spoken pleading. (Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.51 [Russell, LCL])

[312] Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§254, 259.
[313] Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§249.
[314] Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.11.4.
[315] Quintilian explains why he desires for a child to learn Greek first, "I prefer a boy to begin by speaking Greek, because he will imbibe Latin, which more people speak, whether we will or no; and also because he will need to be taught Greek learning first, it being the source of ours too." *Inst.* 1.1.12 (Russell, LCL).

He also asserts that the orator should speak as well as he writes, further connecting the similarity in style and function between oral and written presentations.[316] Quintilian divides compositional style into three types—Plain (*subtilis*), Grand (*grande*), and Intermediate (*medium*)—which correspond to Greek categories.[317]

> There is another division—also into three parts—by which distinctions can be made even between correct styles of speaking. One style is defined as plain (*ischnon*, the Greeks call it), a second as grand and robust (Greek *hadron*), and to these has been added a third, called by some "intermediate," and by others "flowery" (for the Greeks call it *anthēron*). The guiding principle, more or less, is that the first supplies the function of giving information, the second that of appealing to the emotions, and the third, whatever name it is given, that of pleasing or, as others say, conciliating. (Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.58–59 [Russell, LCL])

The Greek name for the Plain style (ἰσχνός) is the same as what Demetrius uses in his *De Elocutione* and generally agrees with the Austere (Dionysius) and Simple (*Ad Herennium*) styles. Quintilian's Plain style gives information and requires incisiveness. This style is the least adorned and is best suited for narrative.[318] His Grand style, similar to the Grand and Polished styles of *Ad Herennium*, Demetrius, and Dionysius, uses more elevated language and compositional techniques (such as metaphors) than the Plain style.[319] Quintilian explains that the Grand style appeals to the audience and reader's emotions, which makes it effective when trying to persuade or impress. His third style, Intermediate, is described as the best of the three for important causes.[320] This style, like the Grand, is pleasing and persuasive, but Quintilian emphasizes the profound emotional effect it has on an audience, due to skillful oral delivery

---

[316] Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.55.
[317] Quintilian mentions that the Grand style is also referred to as "Robust" (*robustus*) and the Intermediate is sometimes called "Flowery (*floridus*)."
[318] Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.59.
[319] "The middle manner is richer in Metaphors and rendered more pleasing by Figures. With the prettiness of its digressions, its well-structured Composition, and its seductive sententiae, it is like a gentle river, clear but shaded by green banks on either side." Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.60 (Russell, LCL).
[320] Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.63.

(such as intonation).[321] Like Dionysius' Well-Blended style and Demetrius' suggestion that styles can be mixed, Quintilian also advises that a good orator or writer should master all the styles or delivery.

> Eloquence thus takes many forms; but it is very foolish to ask which of them the orator should take as his standard. Every variety which is correct has its use, and what is commonly called a "style" (genus dicendi) is not something that belongs to the orator. He will use all "styles," as circumstances demand, and as required not only by the Cause as a whole but by its various parts. (Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.69 [Russell, LCL])

The styles can, and should, be mixed into one speech or narrative. The strength of each style ought to be employed to fit the desire of the speaker or writer to craft a persuasive presentation. Compositional style, for oral or written works (since their rules are the same), is a tool to convey the author's message in the most convincing manner.

The relationship between composition styles and narrative elements is that style, whether Grand or Plain, is only one aspect of creating a narrative. The schematic outline is composition, genre, and style. A writer creates a composition (speech or literary text), selects a genre for the narrative composition (e.g., history or poetry), then selects which style or styles to use within their narrative genre. As some authors indicate, such as Demetrius, compositional styles can be used across literary genres and multiple styles can be mixed within a single narrative.

> We can see for ourselves that, with the exception I have mentioned of the two polar opposites, any style may combine with any other. In the poetry of Homer, for example, as well as in the prose of Plato, Xenophon, Herodotus, and many other authors, considerable grandeur is combined with considerable forcefulness and charm. (Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§37 [Russell, LCL])[322]

[321] Although Quintilian describes three main composition styles for oral or written delivery, he also mentions other extreme forms of each, which results in a variety of types. Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.66–67.

[322] He also mentions, however, that the Grand and Plain styles cannot be mixed, "There are four simple styles, the plain, the grand, the elegant, and the forceful. In addition, there are their various combinations, though not every style can combine with every other. The elegant combines with the plain and the grand, and the forceful similarly with both. Only the grand and the plain cannot combine, but the pair stand, as it were, in polar opposition and conflict." *Eloc.* §§36 (Russell, LCL).

Just as writers learned the rules for composing narrative at the genre level, they also had rules and ways to identify or distinguish the styles they employed within their narratives. Although when and where they learned the rules for style is not explicitly stated, the process and setting can be deduced from the broader framework of style. Style, as with other aspects of narrative composition, was primarily intended for oral presentations, particularly in legal settings. The effectiveness of rhetoric, methods of discourse, and argumentation could be enhanced by stylistic variations. The original use of style for oral delivery explains why stylistic variations emphasized details, such as how a delivery sounded (harsh words) or the use of forceful tones (putting the most striking at the end), to make one's case or argument more persuasive. Utilizing a mixture of styles in a narrative (spoken or written) to convince the audience or reader of their presentation was to the author or orator's advantage. Students who learned style also learned the larger subject of rhetoric, which was part of the training for professional writers. Narrative compositions were essentially rhetorical presentations that were meant to be read, instead of orally presented for a live audience. The training was probably concurrent with the secondary stage of education, which—considering the emphasis style places on word selection, syntax, and phonetics—included advanced grammar (with a Grammarian, Sophist, or Rhetor) and continued into adulthood. Aristotle and Dionysius, for instance, present their instructions on style as part of learning to compose and deliver speeches with the possibility of using the same methods for literary compositions such as history.[323] Numerous examples of style were given—for students to imitate—to show how authors from different genres used specific composition styles. Examples from poets, historians, and orators demonstrated the dual capacity (written and oral) that style

[323] Dionysius, for instance, explains that the austere style is effective across literary and oral mediums, "This style of composition had many keen exponents in the fields of poetry, history and civil oratory." Dionysius, *Comp.* 22 (Usher, LCL). Aristotle mentions that epideictic and forensic styles are good for oratory and writing (*Rhet.* 3.12.6).

could function in, and the close link between the rules and expectations for oral and written narrative.

Literary Style and Jewish Narrative

Literary composition styles for narrative are incorporated across genres and account for different textual nuances. Jewish narratives are notoriously difficult to qualify or categorize into modern genres because their content and structure often complicate or blur the boundaries. From a modern standpoint, historiography is generally understood as prose writing that reports facts. If it ventures too far into reporting false or fantastic events as "true," it is no longer accepted as a credible history; it may become classified as a myth. A writing's genre is determined by the rules and expectations that govern it. Some of these difficulties in identifying the genre of a narrative text, using modern standards, can be attributed to the practice of compositional style. Having multiple styles in one narrative can be confusing to the modern reader but for the original author, and perhaps audience, the stylistic nuances would have been common-place. Philo, for instance, in his *De vita Mosis*, reports what he considers historical events surrounding the life of Moses, but also mixes interpretive explanations using allegory into his narrative. This is not problematic for Philo because using allegory in one's narrative presentation was a demonstration of the Grand style and was considered impressive writing.[324] Philo's other works could include traits from multiple styles (allegory, brevity, metaphor) without compromising his chosen genre.

[324] Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§99.

The Gospel of Luke, which purports to be a narrative (διήγησις) without specifying its genre, also points out details, such as when Jesus was asleep in the boat with his disciples during a storm.[325]

> So they put out, and while they were sailing he fell asleep. A windstorm swept down on the lake, and the boat was filling with water, and they were in danger. They went to him and woke him up, shouting, "Master, Master, we are perishing!" And he woke up and rebuked the wind and the raging waves; they ceased, and there was a calm. He said to them, "Where is your faith?" They were afraid and amazed, and said to one another, "Who then is this, that he commands even the winds and the water, and they obey him?" (Luke 8:22–25)

The author or Luke describes the windstorm and waves, the boat filling up with water, and the disciples awaking Jesus from his sleep. The description is vivid in its own right; however, the author of the Gospel of Mark, whose narrative genre is debated, includes additional details.[326]

> And there arose a fierce gale of wind, and the waves were breaking over the boat so much that the boat was already filling up. And He Himself was in the stern, asleep on the cushion; and they awoke Him and said to Him, "Teacher, do You not care that we are perishing?" And being aroused, He rebuked the wind and said to the sea, "Hush, be still." And the wind died down and it became perfectly calm. And He said to them, "Why are you so timid? How is it that you have no faith?" And they became very much afraid and said to one another, "Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey Him?" (Luke 8:22–25)

In Mark's account, the storm receives even more description as well as the boat filling up with water, but the most expansion is given to Jesus sleeping in the boat. Whereas Luke (and Matthew) only mention that Jesus was asleep, Mark's gospel elaborates on where he was sleeping and what he was sleeping on. These two details follow the instruction of vividness (ἐνάργεια) as outlined in Demetrius' Plain style where he instructs his reader to use precise details and not to omit anything.[327] The concept of vividness in narrative is part of Demetrius' Plain and Grand styles—the two styles that cannot be mixed—but the two types of vividness are

---

[325] Luke 1:1. The author does not specify which narrative genre the writing is, but the content and structure align best with the ancient category of history. Biography and Gospel were not listed as genre categories.
[326] See Christopher Bryan's discussion on the Gospel genre debate in, *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Settings* (New York: Oxford Press University, 1993), 11, 22–29.
[327] Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§209.

distinct. Since vividness in the Grand style referred to word selection and arrangement, the author of Mark was probably using the vividness that corresponded to the Plain style—a style that was suitable for the historical genre of composition—which was used to offer greater visual descriptions in the text. Awareness of styles and what they entailed helps to identify parts of a narrative that are present in a text but may not fit the categories or descriptions in the progymnasmata.

The mixture of compositional styles in narrative literature is one symptom of why it is difficult to identify what genre a writing belongs to using modern categories. The combination of styles and their elements (e.g., allegory, metaphor, embellishments) fit closely to what Dionysius called the Blended or Well-Balanced style (εὔκρατος), which was the use of parts from the Austere and Polished styles. Those who received a Greek education and learned rules for composition, may have also learned instructions for style and their constituent parts.[328] Style, however, was only a portion of the framework for composing a narrative, each style would have to fit into the larger narrative element.

[328] We do, for example, see instructions for composition and style combined in Theon's *progymnasmata* (78–81).

CHAPTER 5

Narrative Elements

I. Sources

Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period, aside from epistolary literature, generally is categorized (in modern terms) as a form of narrative, whether novel, history, or apocalyptic. These narratives, whose authors are sometimes identified, anonymous, or pseudonymous, tell some type of message using recognizable compositional techniques. They may use fictional events, historical characters, symbolism, or various combinations. The narrative structure, which included how its contents were arranged, may at times appear entirely random, but were actually following a prescribed script. Scholars have observed for a long time, similar features between Jewish and Greek narratives. [329]

New Testament scholars have identified how Greek rhetorical techniques were used in the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John. While the correlations between Jewish authors and Greek writing techniques is undoubted—most scholars accept that at least some Jews (Hellenistic) participated in or received Greek education to some degree—the actual process (specific guidelines) for how they composed narrative has not been sufficiently demonstrated. Scholars claim that Jews received Greek education and that their writings reflect a familiarity or

[329] Marília Futre Pinheiro et al., eds., *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections*, Ancient Narrative. Supplementum 16 (Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing; Groningen University Library, 2012).

similarity to Greek literature; this section, however, seeks to understand what Jewish writers learned that made their writings appear so similar. Identifying parallels between narratives, whether in introductions or characters tropes, serves as plausible evidence that writers practiced a common technique or popular theme. To examine *why* the similarities occur, however, requires knowledge of their education in writing. Similar content and structure between Jewish and Greek narratives was not merely coincidence. Authors likely had shared educational experience or information about composing narratives, even if it was not in a school setting. Knowledge of the instructions and exercises that were taught to compose narratives is the most important step for understanding how narratives were intended to function and what their status was in the communities that read them. Narrative rules and expectations, particularly from the perspective of authors who were active during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, help to identify and match literary content to narrative instructions but it also offers another way to interpret details in the text.

Knowledge of why authors included information, such as lengthy genealogies, miraculous episodes, or seemingly meaningless dates, locations, or repetitions allows the reader of the ancient text insight into what motivated the author in presenting a narrative in a specific way. Knowing their rules and expectations helps to answer questions, such as if they were attempting to present truthful events, did they believe some of the miraculous accounts, and why they incorporated allegorical and metaphorical illustrations. This section presents selected rules and expectations for composing narrative from an author's perspective. The presentation is not exhaustive because some details focus more on grammar and syntax and are inconsequential to the larger questions of function and status. The main sources for narrative composition are

Aristotle (*Rhetorica*), Theon (*Progymnasmata*), and Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria*). Although Quintilian is a Latin rhetor, his instructions about narrative are influenced by and derive from Greek rhetorical practices.

Aristotle

Aristotle is included because his work demonstrates the continuity over time for narrative rules. Some of his terminology, teachings, and expectations carry over into the later works of Theon and Quintilian. In each authors' case, rules and expectations for narrative composition are suitable for oral or strictly written presentation. Aristotle in his *Rhetorica* discusses rules for narrative as part of a rhetorical delivery style called epideictic. Narrative in rhetoric is intended to persuade the audience or the reader. Epideictic is also suitable for written compositions meant to for reading; however, the parts of narrative are explained as they relate to public legal cases.[330] Narrative (διήγησις) as Aristotle describes it, has several features in the epideictic style.[331] The rules Aristotle mentions, however, are clearly transmitted to later instructions for narrative in written genres besides the legal sphere.

Theon

Theon, the Greek Rhetor, offers the most detailed information about narration in his *progymnasmata* (preliminary exercises).[332] His discussion is aimed at parents and teachers who provide instruction for young (νέος) students who desire a career in speaking or writing.[333] Theon's section on narrative focuses on six ideal elements (στοιχεῖον) and three virtues (ἀρετή)

[330] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.12.6.
[331] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.16.1.
[332] Theon (surnamed Aelius) is described in the tenth-century CE Byzantine encyclopedia called the *Suda* (reference designation is Θ 206) as a sophist from Alexandria, Egypt who wrote rhetorical works.
[333] Theon 70.

that every narrative (spoken or written) should have. His detailed information on the six elements differentiates his instruction about narrative from the other authors. While the others offer characteristics that narratives should have, Theon provides the characteristics with additional elaboration. Conciseness and clarity, for example, are mentioned by Aristotle but Theon not only offers examples of what they entail he also suggests what should be avoided.[334] Theon's value for understanding narrative composition comes from the opportunity to match specific rules and examples for what a narrative entailed to literary and rhetorical details present in Jewish literature. His exercises for narrative allow the modern reader a glimpse into the education and creative thought of a Greek writer. Theon also has exercise sections for Myth, Encomion, and Paraphrase, but these will be covered in the Case Study and Narrative Authority chapters.

Quintilian

Quintilian, while not as detailed as Theon, differentiates between three styles of narrative. He mentions *fabula* as a narrative type found in tragedy and poetry.[335] Fabula in narrative contains invented material (what might be called fiction in modern terms). The second type, Realistic Narration, is characteristic of comedy.[336] Quintilian explains that this type of narration has verisimilitude, whereas fabula does not need to appear grounded in reality. His third type is history, which is intended to be based in reality and present truthful facts.[337] Historical narrative would be consistent with the style and presentation of Josephus' historiographies, such as *Antiquitates judaicae* or *Bellum judaicum*. Quintilian's narrative instruction, like others, are meant for speaking and writing. His explanation of what a narrative should be, does not offer any

---

[334] Theon 83.
[335] Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.4.2. Poetry translates *carminibus* which has to do with "making verses." Quintilian also mentions separately, but in the same line, that the *grammatici* work with poetry (*poeticas*).
[336] Ibid.
[337] Ibid.

innovations, but agrees with prior compositional conventions. Due to the diachronic approach of considering rules for narrative composition, it should be clear that these instructions and expectations were not all practiced the same way, location, or at the same time. This approach helps to demonstrate the types of rules and expectations writers encountered or had when composing their texts.

II. What a Narrative Should Include

The components for composing narrative texts can be divided into two groups: include and what it should do. The first division deals with specific rules and details that can be observed in a narrative. The second division considers the more theoretical (although, still observable) side of what a narrative should accomplish. The rules and expectations are selective and not comprehensive; the grammatical rules have been omitted for the most part. The focus shall remain on the content of a narrative more than its syntactical traits.

Style of speech and writing has already been covered. Narrative suited for writing fits the parameters of the Plain, Austere, and Epideictic styles discussed by Aristotle, Dionysius, Quintilian, and Demetrius. The commonalities between these styles indicate that narrative ought to be, at least generally, concise and comprised of uncomplicated speech.[338] Theon, more than the others, offers specific examples of ways to ensure that a narrative remains clear and concise. The author, for instance, ought to avoid difficult words as opposed to the grammatical complexity found in the more polished vocabulary associated with the Grand style, omit unnecessary facts, and do not begin the account too far back in time.[339] Theon's expanded

[338] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.16.4; Demetrius, *Eloc.* §§190; Dionysius, *Comp.* 22; Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10.64.
[339] Theon 83.

explanation of conciseness and clarity are part of what he calls the virtues (ἀρετή) of narration—conciseness, clarity, and credibility—which will be covered in the next section, 'What Narrative Should Do.'[340] Narrative styles, however, could be mixed (depending on an author's needs) which meant that a single literary work could be composed using more than one style. This complexity helps to account for why a single narrative could have simplistic language overall but may also include details, such as metaphor or allegory which are more indicative of the Grand or Polished styles. The hybrid nature of some narratives is part of what Quintilian instructs as a narrative striking a balance between being overly dry or embellished. His point is that a respectable narrative should include both.

> Meanwhile, it is sufficient to note that it should be neither quite dry and jejune (for why spend so much labour on our studies if it was thought satisfactory to set things out baldly and without embellishment?) nor, on the other hand, tortuous and revelling in those irrelevant Descriptions to which many are tempted by their wish to imitate the licence of poets. Both are faults, but the one which comes from deficiency is worse than the one which comes from abundance. (Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.4.3–4 [Russell, LCL])

Selected Jewish Narratives

The rules and expectations for composing narrative—here the focus is strictly on written not oral—are flexible. The teachers of composition offer ideal instructions to their students who then applied them in ways that accommodated their written plans. Narrative (from a consensus authorial perspective) should contain: familiar details, positive and negative virtues, moral character, and maxims, in addition to the six elements that Theon suggests. One question, however, is which Jewish narratives should be considered when probing for Greek compositional elements? Although our concern is with Jewish narratives that exhibit Greek compositional techniques written during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, there were also Jewish writings written in Greek that did not appear to be influenced by Greek ideas. Jewish writings that clearly

[340] Theon 79.

fit the category of narrative and are written in Greek are found in modern collections of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.[341] In the Septuagint, the writings of Tobit, Judith, and Susanna—all composed during the Hellenistic Period—are written in Greek. These narratives each have similarities to the rules and expectations found in Greek compositional education. They have, for instance, protagonists and antagonists, mention specific or well-known details (e.g., people, places, and events), angelic appearances, miraculous occurrences, and include a moral to the story. These Jewish narratives are not entirely distinct from Greek narrative, but some of their aspects indicate that the author may not have been familiar with Greek compositional education.

The Jewish narrative tradition has a long history, going back before the Hellenistic and Roman periods under consideration. The Greek rules and expectations for composing narratives can be identified in Jewish texts which likely had no knowledge of or interest in Greek writing techniques. Jewish narrative, particularly in the Hebrew Bible, consisted of literature that had a historical presentation, such as the Pentateuch, 1–2 Kings, and 1–2 Chronicles; each of these works, despite their third-person reporting, included narrative episodes about central characters. These narrative episodes were built around legendary figures, such as Moses, David, and

---

[341] Some of the difficulties in making genre classifications can be seen when Nickelsburg discusses Jewish narratives, such as Tobit, Judith, and 3 Maccabees, as "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times." He also explains, however, that these narratives are difficult to classify and could be grouped with other texts referred to as "Rewritten" or "Expanded" Bible. Some of the distinguishing markers for these texts are that they expand and paraphrase prior biblical stories or imitate them. I think another challenge is that these genre labels are not clearly delineated, which makes grouping them appear arbitrary at times. See his discussions on both genre categories in, George Nickelsburg, "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, vol. 2 of Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud, ed. Michael Stone (Assen, Netherlands: Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress Press, 1984), 33–84 as well as in "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, vol. 2 of Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud, ed. Michael Stone (Assen, Netherlands: Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress Press, 1984), 89–152.

Solomon and were weaved into the larger historical framework of the writer's report; they were more so historical writings that featured multiple character narratives. Jewish narrative also had self-contained character stories; Ruth, Esther, Job, and Daniel, for example, were narratives that focused (for the most part) on the central figure of the book. These character-based narratives included many features found in Greek narratives as well, but also resemble foreign court narratives of the Ancient Near East, such as Ahiqar (sixth or seventh century BCE).

Some Jewish narratives were composed in Hebrew or Aramaic and were later translated into Greek; writings of the Hebrew Bible that are included in the Septuagint fit this description along with deuterocanonical writings, such as Tobit, Susanna, and 1 Maccabees.[342] Some Jewish texts were written in Greek without a Hebrew or Aramaic original but sought to mimic the style and structure of literature from the older biblical tradition, such as the Fourth Book of Ezra and perhaps 4 Baruch.[343] Literature referred to as Apocalyptic by modern scholars, tends to feature descriptions of final judgment, eschatological motifs, angelic appearances, heavenly tours, prognostication, and a previously hidden message revealed. Texts, such as The Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch), are more akin to the prophetic literature of the Hebrew Bible that also include many of these features. The narration in these types of texts tends to be either first-person, through an angelic mediator, or a combination of both.

[342] Regarding the possibility of a Hebrew original for the Maccabean collection, Origen, according to Eusebius, says that its Hebrew title was Sarbeth Sarbane El (Σαρβηθσαβαναιελ), Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6. 25. For possibilities of the meaning of the Hebrew title, which includes *Sefer Beit Sarevanei El* (the book of the house of those who strive for God) see, Grintz, Yehoshua M, "Maccabees, First Book Of," *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 316-17.

[343] Both books have arguments for a Greek or Hebrew original. For scholarly debates regarding their original language, see their introductions in S. E. Robinson, "4 Baruch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2.414 and B. M. Metzger, "The Fourth Book of Ezra," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1.519–520.

First and Second Maccabees are two different narrative styles of the same historical period.[344] Both recall the historical period and events leading up to the Maccabean Revolt, but they do so in different ways. First Maccabees presumably has a Hebrew *Vorlage* and its style resembles the historical books of the Hebrew Bible. Second Maccabees, while narrating some overlapping events of the same period with First Maccabees, focuses more on the events surrounding the Jerusalem temple and is written in the style of Hellenistic historiography. Second Maccabees, aside from the two letters affixed to it, begins with an introduction—like other Greek histories—that explains the aim of the history, its subject (Judas Maccabeus and the Purification of the Temple) and how it will benefit its readers.[345] In addition to Second Maccabees being an example of Greek historiography, it is also an *abridgement* of a prior history.[346] Second Maccabees' unknown author explains that the present work is a condensed version (σύντομον τῆς λέξεως) of a five-volume history made by Jason of Cyrene, of whom we have no other vital information.[347] The author explains that the abridgement relies on the historical accuracy of the original work of Jason and describes their own work as a recasting of the original historical narrative.[348] Additionally, the author explains the painstaking effort it takes to produce the abbreviation (e.g., loss of sleep), the concern for accuracy, and their desire to provide the reader with a didactic literary tool—just as other Greek historians do in their introductions.

[344] Attridge views First Maccabees as a continuation of biblical historical writing style, while 2 Maccabees is written in the tradition of Hellenistic historiography. For a discussion of the attributes of both, see, Harold Attridge, "Historiography," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, vol. 2 of Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud, ed. Michael Stone (Assen, Netherlands: Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress Press, 1984), 157, 171–183.
[345] 2 Macc 2.19–32.
[346] 2 Macc 2.26, 31.
[347] 2 Macc 2.23.
[348] 2 Macc 2.30.

Joseph and Aseneth, generally regarded as a Jewish-Hellenistic narrative, is similar to the category of a Greek novel or romance.[349] The book focuses on the figures of Joseph and Aseneth as protagonists who eventually find love and piety together after initial reluctance and social impediments. The themes of male and female love interests coming together, along with chastity, are central characteristics of Greek romance, such as Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoë* and *Longus' Daphne and Chloe*. Although Joseph and Aseneth is composed in Greek allusions to Greek culture are lacking, aside from the themes of the couple's love for each other, initial separation, conversion, and acceptance. The narrative generally includes Jewish ideals, such as the prohibition against marriage to foreigners, and expands on the narrative style of Joseph's account in Genesis.

Jewish-Hellenistic literature also encompasses other varieties of literature including, Poetry (Theodotus), Tragedy (Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge*), historical fragments (Eupolemus), shorter summaries of biblical characters (Artapanus), and philosophical works (Aristobulus) in addition to narrative.[350] The ones closest to representing Greek narrative rules and expectation, however, are the Letter of Aristeas, Joseph and Aseneth, 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees, the Gospel of Luke, and the writings of Philo and Josephus. Other texts certainly incorporate Greek elements and ideas but couch them in a structure that emulates the literary

---

[349] Wills categorizes Joseph and Aseneth as a Jewish Novel because it has features in common with Greek novel as well as Jewish narratives. Wills includes Esther (LXX), Daniel (with Susanna), Judith, and Tobit as Jewish Novels with Joseph and Aseneth. They are distinguished as novels because they feature shared elements with Greek novelistic literature, such as an idealized setting, adventure, having a happy ending, and a female antagonist. He uses "Jewish Novel" as a genre designation, although he asserts that their compositional makeup really does not fit well in any genre category. Lawrence Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*, Myth and Poetics (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 2, 7. I view Joseph and Aseneth as a history with mythical elements based on ancient genres instead of using modern terminology, such as novel.

[350] Most of these works are preserved in the writings of Eusebius and collected comments of Alexander Polyhistor (also preserved by Eusebius). For introductions and summaries of these works and others, see the supplement section on "Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works" in the second volume of Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.

style of their Hebrew predecessors. The text of 4 Maccabees, for example, infuses Greek philosophical ideals before venturing into the example of the martyrdom narrative of the Mother and her seven sons, which reflects more of a standard narrative without many allusions to Greek culture.[351] Philo uses his understanding of Greek philosophy to interpret the lives of patriarchal figures such as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He projects Greek education and virtues back onto their actions to demonstrate how their lives were intended as models to follow and how they correlated to Greek ideas or figures, such as what he calls the three Graces (Χάριτας) perhaps alluding to the three goddesses of Greek mythology; Abraham, for instance, symbolized instruction, Isaac, nature, and Jacob, practice.[352] These texts that contain aspects of Greek education will be the subjects of comparison to Hellenistic compositional rules and expectations.

Familiar Things

Aristotle suggests not narrating things that are well-known. Narrative is reserved or best suited for things that need explaining to the audience. Familiar actions done by characters only need a brief mention, while lesser known actions or events should receive a fuller narration. Narrative (in the epideictic style) for Aristotle is intended to be plain and easier for the reader to

---

[351] Some of the Greek philosophical ideals include typical discussions about virtues, such as wisdom, rationale judgment, justice, courage, and self-control (4 Macc 1.13–35).

[352] Philo, *Abr.* 51–54. Philo associates Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob's virtues with three graces, which probably were meant as the three Graces of Greek myth (named Aglaea, Euphrosyne, and Thaleia) who were typically portrayed as the daughters of Zeus (Hesiod, *Theog.* 907). They were generally associated with dance, festivity, and beauty. Philo, however, relates his three to instruction, nature, and practice. When he says the three graces, he might actually have in mind the three Muses who were also daughters of Zeus and closely associated with the Graces (Pindar, *Paean*. 3). The three Muses (named Melete, Mneme, and Aoede) were connected to the music, poetry, and the arts (Pausanias, *Descr.* 9.29.2); however, there were also other traditions of up to nine Muses with different names and parentage. Although the meaning of Philo's three do not completely align with either the three Graces or Muses, there is a connection between Jacob's practice (ἄσκησις) and one of the Muses named Melete (μελέτη) which can also mean practice, albeit using different Greek words. His emphasis on learning, Abraham symbolizing instruction (διδασκαλικός), would connect more naturally with the three Muses than the Graces, but two groups of Greek goddesses were so closely associated that their functions may have overlapped for Philo.

comprehend. The explanations may include familiar details, but they should not form the bulk of the narrative.

> Besides, a speech of this kind is simpler, whereas the other is intricate and not plain. It is only necessary to recall famous actions; wherefore most people have no need of narrative—for instance, if you wish to praise Achilles; for everybody knows what he did, and it is only necessary to make use of it. But if you wish to praise Critias, narrative is necessary, for not many people know what he did … (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.16.3–4 [Freese, LCL])

Aristotle's instructions are recognizable when narratives only mention certain details in passing, probably because the audience is already informed, and no further explanation is required. This situation may frustrate the modern reading audience because we desperately want to know details about key figures, ideas, and events—especially origin stories or the development of theological concepts—but it would have been more expedient for the author and less laborious for the reader to address lesser-known material. The rhetorical practice of mentioning well-known details and offering longer narrative for lesser-known actions can be observed in 4 Maccabees regarding Antiochus Epiphanes.

> When King Seleucus died, his son Antiochus Epiphanes succeeded to the throne, an arrogant and terrible man, who removed Onias from the priesthood and appointed Onias's brother Jason as high priest. (4 Macc 4:15–16)

The author describes Antiochus as succeeding Seleucus, removing Onias, and appointing Jason as High Priest. This description is meant to quickly introduce the character and situate the historical context of the narrative example that follows. The author offers three specific actions done by Antiochus and describes him as arrogant and terrible but without explaining why. The author could ascribe these two adjectives to Antiochus without any further elaboration because his reputation and actions against the Jews were already widely known. Recounting how he

suppressed Torah and desecrated the Temple was unnecessary; what needed narration was the more pertinent martyrdom account of Eleazer, the mother, and her seven sons.[353]

Good and Bad Virtues

For Aristotle, narrative should also include demonstrating the virtues of the protagonist while emphasizing the evil nature of the antagonist. The distinction between the two (or more) should be unambiguous.

> [O]ne must say all that will make the facts clear, or create the belief that they have happened or have done injury or wrong, or that they are as important as you wish to make them. The opposite party must do the opposite. And you should incidentally narrate anything that tends to show your own virtue, for instance, "I always recommended him to act rightly, not to forsake his children"; or the wickedness of your opponent, for instance, "but he answered that, wherever he might be, he would always find other children,'' an answer attributed by Herodotus to the Egyptian rebels; or anything which is likely to please the dicasts. (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.16.4–5 [Freese, LCL])

Aristotle is, of course, explaining narration for legal speeches, but his comments about why one should take this approach is instructive. He advises that the positive virtues are applied to the protagonist and the negative ones to the antagonist, not simply because the evidence or argument is true, but because author (speaker) wants to convince the judge (δικαστής) of the validity and veracity of their presentation of the case. Likewise, in written narrative, portrayals of characters are intended as "legal exhibits" in favor of or against a character's case. The judges in the literary scenario, however, are the reading audience, and they should have a clear perception of the story's hero and villain. 1 and 2 Maccabees, for instance, does not hesitate to present Antiochus, Jason, and the Jews who conspired with them, as apostates who betrayed the sacred traditions and laws of their Jewish heritage.[354] Jason, in collusion with Antiochus Epiphanes, receives the

---

[353] The Maccabean tradition of Antiochus' entering and desecrating the Jerusalem temple is told in 2 Macc 5:15–21. The story of the mother and her seven sons is also told in 2 Macc 7:1–42.
[354] 1 Macc 1:10–11; 2 Macc 4:7.

High Priesthood through corruption and turns to a Greek way of life.[355] The wickedness of Jason and his followers is asserted as the cause for later troubles against the Jews.[356] The evidence is blatantly presented; those who cooperated with living a Greek way of life under Antiochus were juxtaposed to those who fought (through rebellion) to keep the sacred traditions and uphold the Torah in the midst of persecution.

Moral Character

The accounts of Eleazar, who was a learned priestly scribe, a mother with her seven sons, and the Hasmonean family (particularly Judas Maccabeus) are presented as virtuous models for how to negotiate living as a Torah observant Jew when faced with persecution.[357] Aristotle's instructions that a narrative should present the case for characters who have good and bad virtues is closely connected to his advice that a narrative ought to also have moral character.

> And the narrative should be of a moral character, and in fact it will be so, if we know what effects this. One thing is to make clear our moral purpose; for as is the moral purpose, so is the character, and as is the end, so is the moral purpose. (Aristotle, *Rhet*. 3.16.8 [Freese, LCL]).

The moral or lesson of the story, in this case, is expressed through the martyrs' steadfast response to persecution and their faithfulness to God. Theon, as part of his six narrative elements, also mentions morality as one of the properties of a person in narrative.[358] Theon, however, uses a different Greek word for morality (προαίρεσις) than Aristotle's moral character (ἠθικός); Theon's usage deals with a character making a choice (a correct one) that reflects their individual morals, whereas Aristotle's usage entails an individual's intrinsic morals. Aristotle, however, does agree with Theon that moral purpose (προαίρεσις)—using the same Greek word

[355] 2 Macc 4:7–10.
[356] 2 Macc 4:16.
[357] 2 Macc 6:18–29, 7:1–42, 8:1ff.
[358] Theon 78.

as Theon—is a product of having moral character (ἠθος). A character's choice in action is evidence of their morals. Jewish narrative has both types. The accounts of Eleazar, the mother and her seven sons in 4 Maccabees (a work that combines Greek and Jewish ideals) demonstrate the moral and religious zeal of the characters during their martyrdom scenes.[359] Antiochus, again, is set as the antagonist of the story who threatens to torture the pious Jews if they do not succumb to renouncing Torah legislation and eating forbidden.[360] The Jewish protagonists—Eleazar, the mother and seven sons—all resist the Kings threats and choose to endure horrific physical tortures instead of renouncing their religion and accepting the benefits of a Greek way of life offered by Antiochus. The Jewish characters are portrayed as embodying the highest moral standards (Eleazar is even known for his philosophy) while Antiochus is vilified. As the main characters proceed through their trials, beginning with Eleazar, they are repeatedly described as enduring the test of torture by overcoming intense emotions through divine reason (λογισμός) and philosophy.[361] The main protagonists believe they have a moral obligation to uphold the sacred Torah, despite the threat of torture, just as previous legendary figures, such as Daniel (in the lions' den) and the three Hebrew youths (Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael) in the fiery furnace did.[362] Their resistance to Antiochus is described with Greek ideals of virtue; they are referred to as noble and courageous for welcoming physical punishment.[363] The Greek concepts of honor (τιμή) and shame (αἶσχος) are present as they express their hope in being welcomed by the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, after their deaths. By not bringing

---

[359] deSilva demonstrates the connections that 4 Maccabees has with Hellenistic composition. He explains how the tortures and martyrdoms of the Jewish characters reflect aspects of the Greek encomium and funeral oration. The character's virtues (e.g., courage and piety) and good deaths are features that are mentioned, for example, in Aristotle's *Rhetorica* and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (among other sources). deSilva suggests that the characters' virtuous behavior, when challenged to forgo Jewish convictions for pagan temptations, was intended to be emulated by the readers. David DeSilva, *4 Maccabees*, (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 76–97.
[360] 4 Macc 5:1–3.
[361] 4 Macc 8:1, 15.
[362] 4 Macc 16:21.
[363] 4 Macc 9:26, 11:2.

shame (μὴ καταισχύνῃς) to the Patriarchs, it is implied that they will be honored because they were willing martyrs.[364]

> For if we so die, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob will welcome us, and all the fathers will praise us. Those who were left behind said to each of the brothers who were being dragged away, "Do not put us to shame, brother, or betray the brothers who have died before us." (Macc 13:17–18)

A repeated theme in their sufferings is how the Greek concept of reason helps them to overcome emotions (πάθος) or desire (ἐπιθυμία), which is a principal concern in Greek philosophical thought that becomes abundantly present in Jewish-Hellenistic thought.[365] The author offers another Greek image when summarizing the accounts of the main characters' public torture. The author of 4 Maccabees compares their encounter with Antiochus to a Greek athletic contest.

> Truly the contest in which they were engaged was divine, for on that day virtue gave the awards and tested them for their endurance. The prize was immortality in endless life. Eleazar was the first contestant, the mother of the seven sons entered the competition, and the brothers contended. The tyrant was the antagonist, and the world and the human race were the spectators. Reverence for God was victor and gave the crown to its own athletes. Who did not admire the athletes of the divine legislation? Who were not amazed? (4 Macc 17:11–16)

The Jewish martyrs compete in the contest (torture), the tyrant (Antiochus) is the antagonist they compete against, the public are the spectators, and the prize is immortality. Victory is assured because of their virtuous morals which have been demonstrated by reason and unwavering faith in God.

Vivid Details

Descriptive details are another facet of narrative which serves to persuade the reader to a thought or opinion. Main characters are introduced and meant to elicit emotions through their words and behavior. Narrative characters are designed, through their speech and inherent abilities, to be

---

[364] For a discussion of the themes of honor and disgrace and their relation to this passage, see, David DeSilva, *4 Maccabees*, (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 86–91.
[365] 4 Macc 13:1; Let. Aris. §§256; T. Jud. 8.6.

received as protagonists or antagonists. Aristotle advises that characters' details and descriptions, as part of the narration, ought to appeal to the reader or audience's emotions (πάθος).

> Further, the narrative should draw upon what is emotional by the introduction of such of its accompaniments as are well known, and of what is specially characteristic of either yourself or of the adversary: "And he went off looking grimly at me"; and as Aeschines says of Cratylus, that he hissed violently and violently shook his fists. Such details produce persuasion because, being known to the hearer, they become tokens of what he does not know. (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.16.10 [Freese, LCL])

These types of positive and negative descriptions are often seen in Jewish narratives as well. The narrative of 3 Maccabees—which purports to be a history but liberally includes embellishment (as Quintilian suggests)—centers on the religious conflict between Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–204 BCE) and Jews living in Jerusalem and Egypt.[366] The main (singular) antagonist is Philopator, while the Jews (as two groups) serve as the protagonists. Only two Jewish characters are specifically named: Dositheus, an apostate who saved Philopator from death, and Eleazar, a virtuous elder who is revered by the Jewish priests.[367] Aside from Eleazar's personal description, the Egyptian diaspora Jews and those forcefully transported from Jerusalem are described as law-abiding to Ptolemaic governance and to Torah tradition. When facing persecution by Philopator and his military associates, they are fortuitously recipients of God's miraculous deliverance. On one occasion, two angels descend to fight on their behalf, recalling images of Elisha and the heavenly army (with chariots of fire) that accompanied him when he was out

[366] Wills describes 3 Maccabees as "Historical Novel", while acknowledging other designations, such as "Novelistic Histories" and "Popular History." He explains Historical Novel as a subgenre of Novel but with shared elements. He differentiates the two by saying that Novel has features of the Greek novel/romance, while Historical Novel uses historical characters and tries to give the appearance of history but also introduces elements found in Greek novelistic literature. For Wills, despite having miraculous material, Historical Novels were probably understood as history and not entertainment (which he claims was the function of the Jewish Novel). He also notes that other scholars prefer genre labels, such as "pathetic history", "tragic history", and "rhetorical history" to describe 3 Maccabees; however, the labels are contested because of their irrelevance to ancient authors who likely did not distinguish between their texts in this way. Wills mentions that while ancient authors accused some histories of having false or fictitious information, it did not preclude them from being histories. They were just considered "poor histories." Lawrence Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*, Myth and Poetics (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 185–186, 194, 205.

[367] 3 Macc 1:3, 6:1.

numbered.[368] Although the Jews as a group—aside from those who chose to avoid persecution by accepting Philopator's offer to join the mystery cult and receive Alexandrian citizenship—are described in positive terms. The author, however, goes to descriptive lengths to make his main adversary's unsavory character vivid. Philopator is constantly referred to as a tyrant and even compared to another wicked dictator named Phalaris.[369] After initially appearing supportive and respectful of the Jews, he quickly veers into the function of antagonist upon being denied entry into the Jerusalem temple's holiest sanctuary.

> When he arrived in Egypt, he increased in his deeds of malice, abetted by the previously mentioned drinking companions and comrades, who were strangers to everything just. He was not content with his uncounted licentious deeds, but even continued with such audacity that he framed evil reports in the various localities; and many of his friends, intently observing the king's purpose, themselves also followed his will. (3 Macc 1:9–15)

Philopator's despicable demeanor, intentions, and actions are given explicit detail, further emphasizing his role as central villain. Just as Aristotle suggests, these explicit details set him apart from his military companions and Hermon (the Elephant keeper), the only other named character in his company.[370] Philopator, when devising his retaliation against the Jews for denying his entry into the Temple sanctuary, is described as increasing in maliciousness toward the Jews which fueled his actions. The author makes it clear through these details that Philopator was enraged, which culminated in the utterly outrageous consequences he inflicted upon the Jewish communities. The over-the-top nature of his behavior was meant to insist that despite giving the appearance of civility and benevolence (through his edicts), he was impious towards God and barbaric towards the Jewish faithful.[371] The author accomplishes this by descriptively

[368] 2 Kgs 6:14–18.
[369] 3 Macc 5:20, 42.
[370] 3 Macc 5:1.
[371] 3 Macc 3:12–29.

drawing attention to Philopator's hot-tempered behavior.[372] Theon, although without mentioning it directly, as Aristotle does, also views adding details as a benefit to narration. His details will be covered under his six elements of narrative.

Maxims

Interspersed within Greek narrative genres, especially in historiography, are wise sayings often quoted from revered figures of long ago. Jewish literature, like ancient near eastern texts, already had a collection of wisdom texts such as Proverbs, Sirach, and Ecclesiastes. These writings contain axioms (ἄξιος) and aphorisms (ἀφορισμός) from known and unknown sources. Some texts of the Hebrew Bible even became sources of maxims as later Jewish communities viewed the words or actions of famous figures—for instance, passages in the Psalms attributed to David and especially words of the Torah that were attributed to Moses—as authoritative, worth quoting, and divine. The book of Proverbs, a collection of wise sayings, is attributed to Solomon, a famous Jewish king, who was reputed for being the wisest man alive; he was known for his vast knowledge and for being a sorcerer supreme and exorcist.[373] Some writings of the New Testament are also replete with allusions to and quotations of sayings from the Hebrew Bible. The quotations of what was said or done by figures, such as Abraham (e.g., his faith in God), are understood as actions to be emulated, similar to how the Greeks saw the behavior and characters

[372] For example, "When the impious king comprehended this situation, he became so infuriated that not only was he enraged against those Jews who lived in Alexandria but was still more bitterly hostile toward those in the countryside; and he ordered that all should promptly be gathered into one place, and put to death by the most cruel means." (3 Macc 3:1).
[373] Josephus mentions that Solomon was known as a prolific writer who composed songs, parables, and incantations. He says that Solomon was also a skilled exorcist who used incantations, along with a special ring, to expel demons, Josephus, *Ant.* 8.42–49. In the Testament of Solomon, an apotropaic ring is given to Solomon by the Archangel Michael which allows him to exert dominion over various malevolent spirits and demons, T. Sol. 1.5–7.

in Homer's writings as models for virtuous and courageous living.[374] The Christian Apostles, James and Paul, for example, interpreted Abraham's demonstration of faith in God as support for their convictions for how the relationship between faith and works should be understood.[375] In the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Jesus of Nazareth is tempted by Satan in the wilderness. Satan offers Jesus opportunities for a life of prestige, power, and to prove himself as God's son.[376] Jesus responds to the temptations (some of which are also biblical quotations) with quotations from the book of Deuteronomy as general wise principles for how to think and live piously towards God.[377]

Jewish Literature Quoting Greek Maxims

Jewish authors also quoted or alluded to maxims from Greek poets and philosophers in their writings.[378] Already in the book of Proverbs, wise sayings from other cultural traditions were appropriated which established a precedent. Although traditionally attributed to Solomon, chapters 30 and 31 of Proverbs were associated with Agur and King Lemuel.[379] Some scholars believe that these two figures were not Israelites but were Massaites (from Massa) and were

---

[374] The Apostle Paul explains how the past has didactic relevance for the present, "For whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction (διδασκαλίαν), so that by steadfastness and by the encouragement of the scriptures we might have hope." Rom 15:4.
[375] Jas 2:14–24 (esp. 23–24); Rom 4:1–3.
[376] Matt 4:1–11; Luke 4:1–13.
[377] Satan quotes Psalm 91:11–12 to tempt Jesus into testing God's protective power over him. Jesus counters Satan's offers by quoting Deuteronomy 6:13, 16, 8:3.
[378] Renehan, for instance, examines the use of Classical Greek quotations in the New Testament. He asks how many direct quotations are found in the New Testament literature as well others that may not be as clear. He also distinguishes between Greek quotations, derivative sayings, and those that are structurally similar or coincidental. Renehan concludes that there are three unambiguous direct quotes of Greek authors in the New Testament, found in Acts 17:28, 1 Corinthians 15:33, and Titus 1:12. His examination is very useful for clarifying complex historical mistakes made by ancient and modern scholars when trying to trace the origins of the quotations. He also provides numerous lesser known examples of New Testament sayings that may have underlying connections with Greek authors. Robert Renehan, "Classical Greek Quotations in the New Testament," in *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Georges Vasilievich Florovsky on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 195, ed. David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin (Roma: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1973), 17–46.
[379] The Babylonian Talmud attributes the composition of Proverbs, as well as Isaiah, Song of Songs, and Qohelet, to King Hezekiah and his associates (b. B. Bat. 15A).

connected to Ishmael, Abraham's son by Hagar. The use of non-Jewish maxims was already a literary practice in Jewish wisdom literature and would continue into the Hellenistic period. Jewish authors who attained Hellenistic education would have learned maxims and sayings from Greek literature and figures. Familiarity with Greek works by Jewish authors is evident from their quotation, reinterpretation, and polemical use of extracts from Greek authors, such as Homer, Menander, Epimenides, and Aratus. Two views, for example, on the use of maxims in narrative are given by Aristotle and Theon. Aristotle recognizes the usefulness of maxims (Γνώμαις) in narrative as additional support for showing moral character (ἠθικὸν).

> Moral maxims, on the other hand, should be used in both narrative and proof; for they express moral character… (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.17.9 [Freese, LCL])

Theon, on the other hand, offers an opposing view for adding a maxim (γνώμην) to narrative. He believes they are inappropriate and should be reserved for theatrical occasions.

> To add a maxim to each part of the narration is called *epiphonêin*. Such a thing is not appropriate in historical writing or in a political speech but belongs rather to the theater and the stage. (Theon 91 [Kennedy])[380]

Together, Aristotle and Theon demonstrate the fluidity of opinions, particularly over time, about which narrative elements should be included. Even in Theon's case, his criticism of adding maxims to narratives implies that there were those who approved of it and engaged in the practice. The practice of using maxims in narrative writing then, was part of compositional education (at least for some) during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Jews who participated in Greek learning would have learned to include Greek maxims in their narratives (or not, depending on the opinion of their instructor), possibly in addition to learning maxims from their cultural heritage.

[380] ἐπιφωνεῖν from ἐπιφωνέω, which means "to mention or tell."

Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon are two Jewish texts that represent wisdom literature of the Hellenistic period. Sirach—also called Ecclesiasticus ("the Church's Book")—was composed in Hebrew by Jesus ben Sira (ca 180 BCE) and later translated into Greek by his grandson (ca 132 BCE) during the reign of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II Physcon (170–116 BCE).[381] Sirach appears to continue the proverbial literature tradition in Proverbs, although chapters 44–48 show some similarities to features of the Greek encomion (panegyric).[382] The Wisdom of Solomon (first century BCE or CE) was composed in Greek and also continues the proverbial literature tradition of Proverbs. While Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon represent the continuation and development of Jewish wisdom and philosophy during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, the Wisdom of Solomon features more interplay between Jewish and Greek ideologies. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon readily combines preexistent Jewish ideas (or at least ancient Near Eastern ones), such as the personification of wisdom (Hebrew = חָכְמָה and Greek = σοφία) and God's creative action through his spoken word with Greek philosophical concepts. The Jewish concept of wisdom, as a separate entity that accompanies or assists God in the heavens with creation, begins to merge with Greek notions of the God or the divine and reason (λόγος). While the concept of the *logos* in Greek thought is varied and complex, some explanations from philosophical viewpoints (e.g., the Stoics) can be discerned in Jewish texts, such as the Wisdom of Solomon. The Wisdom of Solomon, for instance, presents wisdom (σοφία) as a partner in

[381] The grandson mentions the challenges of translating from Hebrew to Greek in his edition of his grandfather's work, "You are invited therefore to read it with goodwill and attention, and to be indulgent in cases where, despite our diligent labor in translating, we may seem to have rendered some phrases imperfectly. For what was originally expressed in Hebrew does not have exactly the same sense when translated into another language. Not only this book, but even the Law itself, the Prophecies, and the rest of the books differ not a little when read in the original." *Sirach Prologue*.

[382] Chapters 44–48 praise legendary figures such as the Patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, and Elijah, among others. Some of their praises are short, while others are longer and include details, such as aligning the figure's fame with their deeds ("good works") as instructed for composing encomions. These sections, however, do not use any of the nomenclature that Greek rhetors, such as Theon, suggest.

creation with God; whereas, the logos is also understood as collaborating with the deity in Greek thought. Chrysippus (280–207 BCE), a Stoic philosopher and understudy of Cleanthes (331–232 BCE), describes the logos as the "logos of the cosmos (ὁ τοῦ κόσμου λόγος)" which was active in establishing the world or universe.[383] The *Poimandres* (Ποιμάνδρης), the first tractate in the *Corpus Hermeticum*, describes the "holy logos (λόγος ἅγιος)" as participating in the creative process alongside the divine Mind (νοῦς).[384] The logos is also personified like Wisdom in creation. In *Poimandres*, the same logos that is active in creation is also recognized as son of God (υἱὸς Θεους), and—although not in a creative context—logos is understood as being the same as Zeus in Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*.[385] Philo, in agreement with Greek philosophical notions, describes the logos as a separate entity that ranks second in the heavens with God (δεύτερος ὁ θεοῦ λόγος).

> But the primal existence is God, and next to Him is the Word of God, but all other things subsist in word only, but in their active effects they are in some cases as good as non-subsisting. (Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 2.86 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

Although he is not entirely consistent with his explanations of the logos or in full agreement with Greek thought, he does express that the logos, as a hypostasis of the divine, is the image of God (λόγος δ᾽ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν θεου) and functions as a participant in universal creation.

---

[383] Chrysippus' comments about the logos are quoted in Stobaeus' Ἐκλογαί, Hans Von Arnim, ed., *Chrysippi Fragmenta Logica et Physica* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, Inc., 2010), 264.

[384] The *Poimandres* ("Shepherd of Men"), one of fifteen tractates collected in the *Corpus Hermeticum*, is a revelatory account from a divine being named Poimandres presumably to Hermes Trismegistos (not mentioned directly in the text), which relays details about the created order, Corp. Herm. I, 5. Dating for the *Corpus Hermeticum* is debatable; the *Poimandres* could be as early as the first century BCE or as late as the third century CE. For general introduction to the Hermetic literature and *Poimandres*, see, Bentley Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures: A Translation with Annotations and Introductions*, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1987), 447–451. Regardless of the possible later date, the point is that there were multiple understandings of the logos' interaction with the deity in creation.

[385] The logos, a primordial being and son of God, is not only active in the creation with the elements (fire and water) of the universe but is also understood as an emanation of the Mind, which is the divine Father of all, Corp. Herm. I, 6. Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* is preserved in Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 1.1.12, 20. Zeus is referred to as the one "Eternal Reason" (λόγον αἰὲν).

> And the image of God is the Word through whom the whole universe was framed. (Philo, *Spec.* 1.81 [Colson, LCL])

Philo's conception of the logos as image or God and partner in the creative process is closely connected to how the heavenly figure of Wisdom is portrayed in the Wisdom of Solomon.

> [F]or wisdom, the fashioner of all things, taught me … For she is a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation (ἀπόρροια) of the glory of the Almighty; therefore nothing defiled gains entrance into her. For she is a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God, and an image (εἰκὼν) of his goodness. (Wis 7:22, 25–26)

Greek Maxims in Philo and Paul

Whereas Jewish students of Greek composition studied their own literary tradition and freely quoted them as maxims (often as a means of enculturation)—just as Greek students learned maxims from poets and philosophers—not every narrative included maxims. Maxims, like other features of narrative, could be included or excluded on an *ad hoc* basis depending on the author's persuasive needs. While Jewish authors certainly quoted sayings from their cultural heroes, Philo and Paul demonstrate their open use of quoting Greek writers as well. Philo, for instance, liberally quotes selections from Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to support his theological interpretations of biblical passages.[386] Philo quotes Homer's Odyssey when explaining how the mind travels (migrates) as a vessel in the body. The mind, through philosophical study, begins to comprehend what external forces affect it while in the body. Philo quotes Homer to indicate all the good and bad issues that occur while in the body.

> Next it [the mind] enters upon the consideration of itself, makes a study of the features of its own abode (οἶκον), those that concern the body and sense-perception, and speech, and comes to know, as the phrase of the poet puts it, All that existeth of good and of ill in the halls of thy homestead (ὅττι τοι ἐν μεγάροισι κακόν τ' ἀγαθόν τετέτυκται). (Philo, *Migr.* 195 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

[386] Some examples of Philo quoting Homer's writings to support his arguments include, *Aet.* 132 (*Il.* 6.147); *Prob.* 112 (*Il.* 6.409); *QG* 1.76 (*Od.* 12.118).

For Philo, the connection to Homer's line is that the body is a house (οἶκος) for the mind (νοῦς).[387] The line in Homer, however, is merely relaying how the goddess tells Odysseus who he can talk with to find out what has happened, good and bad in his home (μέγαρον) since he has been away.

> And he will tell you, fostered by Zeus, if so you wish, what evil and what good has been done in your halls (ὅττι τοι ἐν μεγάροισι κακόν τ᾽ ἀγαθόν τε τέτυκται), while you have been gone on your long and grievous way.' (Homer, *Od.* 4.392 [Murray and Dimock, LCL])

The good and bad in Odysseus' house is linked to the good and bad that occurs in the physical body, which is the *house* for the mind. Philo's selection and reinterpretation of Homer's verse fits with interpretive practices of texts, such as the *pesharim* (e.g., 1QHabakkuk Pesher), that reappropriated the use and meaning of biblical passages.

Paul uses spoken, which was closer to what Aristotle and others envisioned when listing rules for narrative, and written narratives that show how quoting Greek maxims could support his arguments. In the Acts of the Apostles, Paul (as depicted by the author) presents his narrative speech to the Athenians concerning their ignorance of the true God, whom they call the "unknown god," which he believes is the God of Israel.[388] Paul argues that the Athenians, as well as other Gentile nations that did not recognize YHWH as the one true God, were in fact close to and not far from knowing him.[389] He emphasizes that the Athenians, since all nations are descendants from one common ancestor, could know God because he is intimately connected to humanity's existence and movements.[390] Paul supports his argument that all nations are connected to God, due to their genealogical relation to the first created man and woman, with a

[387] Philo, *Migr.* 194 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).
[388] Paul indicts his Athenian audience saying, "For as I went through the city and looked carefully at the objects of your worship, I found among them an altar with the inscription, 'To an unknown god.' (Ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ) What therefore you worship as unknown, this I proclaim to you" (Acts 17:23).
[389] Acts 17:27.
[390] Acts 17:26.

well-known pagan quotation. He quotes a line from the *Phaenomena*, written by the Greek poet Aratus (third century BCE), to support his genealogical argument that all nations are God's offspring.

> From one ancestor he made all nations to inhabit the whole earth, and he allotted the times of their existence and the boundaries of the places where they would live, so that they would search for God and perhaps grope for him and find him-- though indeed he is not far from each one of us. For 'In him we live and move and have our being'; as even some of your own poets have said, 'For we too are his offspring.' (τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν) (Acts 17:26–28)

The opening lines of Aratus' celestial poem offers praise to Zeus for his omnipresence and beneficence toward humanity. Zeus shows concern for mortals because they are his children and need his favorable acts in their lives.

> From Zeus let us begin; him do we mortals never leave unnamed; full of Zeus are all the streets and all the market-places of men; full is the sea and the havens thereof; always we all have need of Zeus. For we are also his offspring (τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος εἰμέν); and he in his kindness unto men giveth favourable signs and wakeneth the people to work, reminding them of livelihood. (Aratus, *Phaen.* 1–5 [A. Mair, G. Mair, LCL])

Paul reappropriates Aratus' line that all are Zeus' offspring to assert a familial connection, not with Zeus, but with YHWH. Paul's argument is that the poet Aratus was correct in stating that humanity is (his) God's offspring and as a result can be known to them.[391]

Paul in his letter to the Corinthian Church, argues that members of the congregation ought to be concerned with their personal conduct and proper morals. The urgent need for accountable living is because, as Paul sees it, the end of the age is near, which entails resurrection to a new life and judgment of those who lived a wicked lifestyle. Apparently, some among the congregation rejected the notion of an afterlife that included consequences for personal actions. Paul's argument with his audience is to beware of those who scoff at his message and warning.

[391] Jerome, the fourth-century CE theologian and scholar, associates this quotation with Aratus, "And when he is arguing with the Athenians upon the Areopagus he calls Aratus as a witness citing from him the words "For we are also his offspring;" in Greek τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμεν, the close of a heroic verse." Jerome, *Epist.* 70.2 (*NPNF* 6:149).

He quotes either one of Euripides' plays or Menander's *Thais* to bring authority to his plea not to associate with those who will risk eternal ruin for their lives.[392]

> If the dead are not raised, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." Do not be deceived: "Bad company ruins good morals." (1 Cor 15:32–33)

Both Euripides and Menander are possible sources for Paul's quotation, with Euripides probably being the source for Menander due to his earlier activity as a writer.[393] Euripides' lost play is too fragmented to comment on without its full context. Menander's line in *Thais*, however, is clearly about a flawed but beautiful and enticing woman who should be avoided, lest she breed unwanted corruption.[394]

> . . . and then to use . . . all those who seem . . . knowing that . . . bad company ruins good morals. (Euripides, *Fragment* 1024 [Collard and Cropp, LCL])

> Sing to me, goddess, sing of such an one as she: audacious, beautiful, and plausible withal; she does you wrongs; she locks her door; keeps asking you for gifts; she loveth none, but ever makes pretence. Communion with the bad corrupts good character. (Menander, *Thais* 218 [Allinson and Greenleaf, LCL])[395]

---

[392] Euripides was a fifth-century BCE Athenian tragic poet and Menander was a fourth/third century BCE comedic playwright. The Athenian Christian scholar, Clement of Alexandria (155–220 CE), acknowledges Paul's use of a tragedy in quoting the line but does not name the writer, "Accordingly to the Corinthians (for this is not the only instance), while discoursing *on the resurrection* of the dead, he makes use of a tragic Iambic line, when he said, "What advantageth it me if the dead are not raised? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die. Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners."" Clement, *Strom.* 1.14 (*ANF* 2:313–314). Jerome attributes the quote to Menander, "In another epistle Paul quotes a line of Menander: "Evil communications corrupt good manners."" Jerome, *Epist.* 70.2 (*NPNF* 6:149).

[393] The quotation is also thought to be a cliché by Paul's time and was also attributed to other authors, see discussions in, Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000), 1254 and Bradly S. Billings, ""As Some of Your Own Poets Have Said": Secular and Non-Canonical Literature in the New Testament and Some (Post)Modern Parallels," *The Expository Times* 123, no. 10 (2012), 483. The line is also quoted by other writers, such as Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, but without naming Menander or Euripides as the original author, J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy after Meineke, Bergk, and Kock, Augmented, Newly Edited with Their Contexts, Annotated, and Completely Translated into English Verse*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), 626.

[394] For a thorough discussion of Thais as a historical figure and stock hetaera (prostitute) character in comedic plays, as well as ancient sources for Menander's play, see, A. Traill, "Menander's "Thais" and the Roman Poets," *Phoenix* 55, no. 3/4 (2001).

[395] Menander's *Thais* is not extant as a complete work; it is partially reconstructed based on references to it from writers, such as Plutarch, Paul, and Jerome (*Epist*. 70.2), J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy after Meineke, Bergk, and Kock, Augmented, Newly Edited with Their Contexts, Annotated, and Completely Translated into English Verse*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), 626–627. Plutarch identifies the prologue to Menander's *Thais* saying, "[J]ust as Menander in the prologue of his Thaïs has written: Oh, sing to me, my muse, of such a girl, One bold and fair, and of persuasive tongue, Unjust, exclusive, and demanding much, In love with none, but always feigning love." *Adol. Poet. Aud.* 9a (Babbitt, LCL).

Paul argues that those who oppose his teaching and warning are analogous to the character of Thais; people who look or sound appealing but bring moral corruption and consequently eternal danger to them. Paul's letter to Titus and the Church congregation living in Crete, also demonstrates the use of Greek maxims to add persuasiveness to a narrative's argument. Paul offers instructions to Titus (a young Church leader and associate of Paul's) and the Church congregation in Crete regarding deceptive teachings from rival teachers; some of whom were presumably Jews since they are referred to as "those of the circumcision" (οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς).[396] Paul's main contention is not only that rival teachers are offering false instruction (including Jewish myths), but that they do it for monetary gain.[397] The fact that they are Cretans, along with the deceptive and manipulative nature of their activity within the Church community, leads Paul to refer to them using a Greek invective. Paul associates these false teachers with a famous quote attributed to Epimenides (sixth or seventh century BCE), a legendary Greek seer, philosopher, and poet.

> It was one of them, their very own prophet, who said, "Cretans are always liars, vicious brutes, lazy gluttons." (Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί) (Titus 1:12)

Epimenides' line about Cretans being liars, along with "In him we live and move and have our being" are addressed in a ninth-century CE commentary written by Isho'dad of Merv. Isho'dad, Bishop of Hedatta, in his Syriac commentary on Acts about the altar to the unknown God, references someone he calls the "Interpreter" to give further details on the passage. The Interpreter is thought to be Theodore of Mopsuestia (250–427 CE) who was also a Bishop, scholar, and theologian. According to the Interpreter, Paul's quotation of "In him we live and

[396] Titus 1:10.
[397] Titus 1:11, 14.

move and have our being" and "For we too are his offspring" are lifted from pagan sources.[398] The Interpreter explains that the line "In him we live and move and have our being" is quoted from a speech made by Minos to his father Zeus. Minos' praise refutes the Cretan lie that Zeus was a mere human prince who was attacked and killed by a wild boar and buried in a tomb at Crete. Minos' praise asserts that Zeus was, indeed, not dead and buried in a tomb but alive, which led to his famous proclamation "In thee we live and are moved, and have our being."[399] The Interpreter asserts that Paul took the line from Minos, just as he quoted "We are his offspring" from Aratus.[400] Minos' praise to Zeus is usually attributed to Epimenides, although he is not mentioned in Isho'dad's or the Interpreter's commentary directly. The main source that connects Minos' words and Paul's quotation to Epimenides is from Diogenes Laertius' description of Epimenides in his *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, which mentions Epimenides composing a work on Minos and Rhadamanthus.[401]

Aside from the later Syriac version, Clement of Alexandria also attributes Paul's quotation of Cretans being liars to Epimenides.[402] A shorter (and later) version of the same quotation is in the Greek poet Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*, which may have Epimenides as its source. In

---

[398] J. Rendel Harris and Margaret Dunlop Smith Gibson, *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hadatha (C. 850 A.D.) in Syriac and English*, Horae Semiticae, V-Vii, X, Xi (Cambridge: University press, 1911), 29. Paul quotes the line in Acts 17:28.

[399] Ibid., 29.

[400] Ibid., 29.

[401] For discussion of scholarly debates and sources attributing Paul's "In him we live and move and have our being" to Epimenides, see, J. Rendel Harris, "The Cretans Are Always Liars," *Expositor* 7, no. 2 (1906): 309–310 and T. Nicklin, "Epimenides' Minos," *The Classical Review* 30, no. 2 (1916), 33–37. The case for connecting Minos' line to Epimenides is tertiary; the most tangible evidence rests on Diogenes Laertius mentioning that Epimenides wrote a work on Minos and Rhadamathus and therefore, Minos' praise of Zeus was probably part of that work. Diog. Laert. 1.10.112.

[402] Clement explains Paul's use of Epimenides' quotation among other Greek authors, "Epimenides the Cretan, whom Paul knew as a Greek prophet, whom he mentions in the Epistle to Titus, where he speaks thus: "One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, *The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.* And this witness is true." You see how even to the prophets of the Greeks he attributes something of the truth, and is not ashamed, when discoursing for the edification of some and the shaming of others, to make use of Greek poems." Clement, *Strom.* 1.14 (*ANF* 2:313–314).

Callimachus' version, the negative stereotype of Cretans is applied because they built a tomb for Zeus, which insults and denies his immortality. Callimachus' critique of the Cretans is a condensed version of Isho'dad's report of the Cretan's story of Zeus' death, supplied from his Interpreter source.

> How shall we sing of him—as lord of Dictea or of Lycaeum? My soul is all in doubt, since debated is his birth. O Zeus, some say that thou wert born on the hills of Idaa; others, O Zeus, say in Arcadia; did these or those, O Father, lie? "Cretans are ever liars." (Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται) Yea, a tomb, O Lord, for thee the Cretans builded; but thou didst not die, for thou art for ever. (Callimachus, *Hymn. Jov*. 4–9 [A. Mair, G. Mair, LCL])

Ironically, Epimenides was also a Cretan; however, his comments that Cretans were liars was entirely apropos, in Paul's mind.[403] Paul was able to apply the quotation to them because they were Cretans and engaged in deception; their behavior in addition to the derogatory quote allowed him to vilify his opponents by creating an image of distrust. He deduces that because of the Cretan stereotype, these unsound teachers should be rebuked not only for the teachings but because they deny God by their actions.[404] To Paul, they were "detestable, disobedient, unfit for any good work" just as Cretans were deplorable.[405]

Maxims, whether Jewish or Greek, were learned by students of composition. They were typically employed, whether spoken or written, to show an author's knowledge of other (often obscure) texts but especially to impress or persuade an audience of their claims. The presence and use of maxims in Jewish narrative (particularly Greek ones) provides evidence of Hellenistic compositional practices for narrative. Philo and Paul were familiar with Greek authors and their

---

[403] Harris argues that Epimenides' criticism that Cretans are liars has more to do with a specific lie about Zeus rather than an inherent defect in their character. The lie about Zeus, according to the Interpreter (presumably Theodore of Mopsuestia), was that he was a human prince who was killed by a wild animal and subsequently buried in Crete. The bad Cretan reputation was because of the spread of this story and the claim that Zeus' tomb was with them. For Harris discussion and related sources for Paul's quotation, see, J. Rendel Harris, "The Cretans Are Always Liars," *Expositor* 7, no. 2 (1906): 309–310.

[404] Titus 1:13–16.

[405] Titus 1:16.

maxims. How they applied them to lend authority and veracity to their oral and written narrative arguments makes their reception of Greek compositional education plausible.

III. Theon's Narrative Elements

One of the most fascinating aspects of reading a narrative is attempting to discern the author's intention or reasoning for including certain details in the story or report. Interpreting the facets of a narrative, what is said about an event, characters' words or actions, the inclusion of miraculous moments, or deciphering an obscure allegory, becomes difficult when the reader is not privy to the author's compositional habits. Theon offers explicit details for what young aspiring Greek writers should include in a narrative. His instructions help to explain why readers find similar kinds of content across multiple narratives. Main characters, for example, are introduced with a litany of positive traits, some of which appear as stock descriptions that have been applied to other figures. The protagonist (male or female) of a narrative, particularly in a hero motif, is often physically attractive, strong, chaste, virtuous, and pious. Theon's writing instructions offer insight into the frequency of these repetitions in narratives.

Joseph and Aseneth Comparison

The narrative of Joseph and Aseneth, which fits the genre form of history (as discussed in Chapter four), will be instructive for understanding how Jewish authors might have incorporated rules like Theon's into their works.[406] Joseph and Aseneth was written in Greek, composed

[406] Wills categorizes Joseph and Aseneth as a Jewish Novel because it has features in common with Greek novel as well as Jewish narratives. Wills includes Esther (LXX), Daniel (with Susanna), Judith, and Tobit as Jewish Novels with Joseph and Aseneth. They are distinguished as novels because they feature shared elements with Greek novelistic literature, such as an idealized setting, adventure, having a happy ending, and a female antagonist. He uses "Jewish Novel" as a genre designation, although he asserts that their compositional makeup really does not fit well in any genre category. Lawrence Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*, Myth and Poetics (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 2, 7.

during Greco-Roman period, and is perhaps from a prime Jewish-Hellenistic setting (Alexandria, Egypt). The account has already been compared to the Greek romance and has several characteristics in common with its typical contents.[407] The story, however, also features elements from Jewish narrative literature, such as Judith, Esther, and Ruth, where female lead characters are central.[408] Due to its hybrid contents, the genre and purpose of Joseph and Aseneth remains debatable, but is typically understood by scholars as a work of fiction.[409] Joseph and Aseneth may represent a nexus between Jewish and Greek composition conventions merging a Jewish story about Joseph with Greek narrative elements; however, in the biblical account, Joseph is the protagonist, while Aseneth is the main character in Joseph and Aseneth.[410] Selected instructions

---

[407] For general introductory comments to Joseph and Aseneth's comparison to Greek and Jewish narratives and its similarities to Greek romance genre, see, C. Buchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2:183–185, 186–187. Joseph and Aseneth is generally classified as Jewish fiction and has similarities to both Jewish stories and Greek romances, although the direction of influence is not entirely certain.

[408] Nina Braginskaya argues, through comparison, that Joseph and Aseneth was not directly influenced by the advent of the Greek novel; instead it has more in common with preexistent literature from the Judeo-Hellenistic literature, Septuagint, and Apocrypha. Her comparative work interacts with Greek examples, such as Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, and *An Ephesian Tale*. Nina Braginskaya, "Joseph and Aseneth," in *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections*, ed. Marília Pinherio, Judith Perkins, and Richard Pervo (Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing; Groningen: University Library, 2012), 80–83. I agree that Joseph and Aseneth had connections with Jewish literature, but I also think that some of the details were factors of training in Greek education, even without a specific Greek novel in mind.

[409] Docherty argues that the genre of Joseph and Aseneth is "Rewritten Bible" and that its purpose is to fill in problematic "gaps" (e.g., contradictions or immoral behavior) that the Genesis version of the Joseph does not address. She demonstrates how Joseph and Aseneth relies heavily on Joseph's Genesis account and other biblical imagery for its narrative, in addition to having some connections with Hellenistic romance. Rewritten Bible is a genre category created by modern scholars that attempts to identify common characteristics of Jewish writings that expand and reinterpret biblical stories, for example, Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. Docherty summarizes the scholarly views of Rewritten Bible as a genre designation, a generally accepted category, and how its characteristics are found in Joseph and Aseneth. I think Rewritten Bible as a modern genre category is useful; however, I would prefer using ancient designations to better understand genre and purpose because it would give greater insight into what the authors from antiquity thought of the writing. Rewritten Bible as a genre, groups writings across time periods and languages (Hebrew and Greek) based on similarities that scholars observe in them. It does not account for the rules and expectations writers learned, which is the aim of my study. While there are similarities across languages, time, and location, knowing which rules were active during the Hellenistic period, I think, is more precise in determining the genre and function of a work than modern categories or observations. Susan Docherty, "Joseph and Aseneth: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35, no. 1 (2004): 27-48.

[410] Joseph is the main character in the Genesis version with Aseneth making a minor appearance as his wife towards the end of the story, "Pharaoh gave Joseph the name Zaphenath-paneah; and he gave him Asenath daughter of Potiphera, priest of On, as his wife … Before the years of famine came, Joseph had two sons, whom Asenath daughter of Potiphera, priest of On, bore to him." (Gen 41:45, 50). Wills describes the desire to create novels (such

from Theon's *progymnasmata* for composing narrative will be compared to Joseph and Aseneth's contents (primarily chapters 1–21), which focuses on the interaction between Aseneth and Joseph. This comparison will demonstrate what a Jewish writer learned to incorporate Greek narrative elements into their work.[411]

IV. Theon's Narrative Elements and Virtues

Theon's instructions for narrative consist of content choices (for characters and events) as well as stylistic, syntactical, and grammatical decisions. His comments, for example, about style being concise and clear are similar to what was taught by Demetrius and has already been covered. The focus of this section will mainly be on Theon's instructions for content rather than style and grammar. Theon centers his discussion about narrative around what he refers to as its six "elements (στοιχεῖα)" and three "virtues (Ἀρεταὶ)." His six elements are ways for a writer to describe a character in a narrative, while the three virtues are more about style and effect on the reader. Theon, through the elements, advises a writer to elaborate on a character's background, constitution, and especially their action. In addition to Theon's instruction for what a narrative ought to contain (six elements), he also explains one aspect of a narrative's theoretical function. According to Theon, a narrative (Διήγημά) is an explanatory discourse (λόγος) that tells of things (πραγμάτων) that have already take place.

---

as Joseph and Aseneth) using older oral stories and mixing them with narrative devices (among other things) as a "novelistic impulse." Lawrence Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*, Myth and Poetics (Ithica and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), 5.

[411] Some Jewish texts contain similar elements as mentioned by Theon but are written in Hebrew or Aramaic instead of Greek. This makes distinguishing between whether a Jewish author learned to incorporate certain details from their Jewish writing education or whether it was part of learning Greek techniques. In some cases, we need to look for additional indicators to see if the author is following Greek rules for narrative. It is certainly possible that some overlap exists between Jewish and Greek writing techniques, and perhaps even reflects the long cultural history of writing narratives. In other words, Theon's instructions for writing narrative could also reflect what was generally thought to be good in older narratives from other cultures.

> Narrative is language descriptive of things that have happened or as though they happened. (Theon 78 [Kennedy])

His initial assertion that narrative tells of things in the past aligns with what other rhetoricians, such as Aristotle, who taught the same. Theon, however, makes one addendum to narrative relaying things about the past that other writers do not mention; he says that narrative can also tell things *as though they happened* (πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ὡς γεγονότων). This extra detail about how a narrative should function expands the possibilities that an author had to invent new material (about characters or events) or embellish existing details. This comment is significant for how readers interpreted a narrative. The boundaries of what was presented as true or false to them were dependent on the author's narrative intention. For a narrative to be persuasive, the writer was expected to tell events of the story—even if all the details were not factual or never occurred—with the same fervor as if they had taken place. As we will see in another of Theon's points of instruction, the openness to invent was not a license to report wildly without restraint. His advice about narrative virtues includes maintaining a level of credibility within the narrative, although the limits were lax compared to modern standards.

Theon's Six Elements

For Theon, the content of what is relayed about the past (whether historical or imagined) consists of his six elements. The narrative can tell of events and other scenarios, but it inevitably centers around a character or multiple figures (real or otherwise). The narrative's central character, often the protagonist, is referred to as the "Person" (πρόσωπον). The six elements describe various attributes of the figure; as the protagonist, the traits are generally positive, but if an antagonist, the features are mostly negative. The person's actions receive emphasis because they are the

persuasive evidence of the author's presentation and moral point. Details about the character's actions include, the location of the action, when it was done, how it was accomplished, and its cause, in addition to establishing the character's background. For Theon, a complete narrative (τελεία διήγησις) contains all six elements.

> Elements of narration are six: the person, whether that be one or many; and the action done by the person; and the place where the action was done; and the time at which it was done; and the manner of the action; and sixth, the cause of these things. Since these are the most comprehensive elements from which it is composed, a complete narration consists of all of them and of things related to them and one lacking any of these is deficient. (Theon 78 [Kennedy])

Theon's six elements also have sub-elements that allow an author to further enhance his presentation of the character. Theon, when describing the element of "Person", advises the writer to report details that would be informative for the reader and support the main character's status as protagonist.

> The properties of person are origin, nature, training, disposition, age, fortune, morality, action, speech, (manner of) death, and what followed death. (Theon 78 [Kennedy])

As with other parts of narrative, the author does not have to slavishly include each sub-element every time. The sub-elements serve the writer's purpose and fit the character's role in the narrative. In Joseph and Aseneth, for instance, Aseneth does not die in the story, so it is unnecessary to include her death or information about what events followed her death. Other details about her life, however, are provided which demonstrate the author's adherence to a template for what to include about the main character. Some of the sub-elements of "Person" that Joseph and Aseneth uses to describe Aseneth include, her general origin, age, nature, disposition, fortune, and morality. Her origin (γένος), which closely follows the Genesis account, explains that she is the daughter of Pentephres (Potiphera) a nobleman serving Pharaoh and a Priest of On in Heliopolis.[412] Much like other narratives that introduce their protagonists, Aseneth is

[412] Gen 41:45; Jos. Asen. 1.4–4.

presented as connected to a family of status and prestige, even if it is under a pagan (Egyptian) guise. Her age (18 years) is mentioned with her disposition (διάθεσις), which is described as tall and extremely beautiful, as well as exhibiting features of famous Hebrew women, such as Rebecca, Rachel, and Sarah.[413] Aseneth's nature (φύσις) is initially boastful and rude to others; however, this changes as part of the character's development arc as she learns to become a positive figure. Her fortune (τύχη) is told and unfolds through a heavenly manifestation and encounter with an unnamed Chief of the Lord's host (presumably Michael). During her meeting and conversation with the heavenly being, she receives approval, through Repentance (another heavenly entity) who has been interceding on her behalf, as a proselyte and future wife of Joseph.[414] The Chief Angel explains to Aseneth that her name was already written in the Book of the Living.[415] As Aseneth is renamed by the angel, he also informs her that he has already prepared her and Joseph for marriage; something he will also tell Joseph at a later time.[416] These events occur in Aseneth's life as a "turn of events" orchestrated by the Chief Angel who operates in place of the Greek goddess Tyche/Fortuna (τύχη).[417] Aseneth's fate of suffering the consequences of a negative life are fortuitously interrupted by angelic intervention on behalf of God. The author depicts Aseneth's morality (προαίρεσις) mainly through a series of confessional and repentant episodes. The word choice for morality indicates the impetus behind the character's choices. Her choice to be chaste, pious, and later repentant shows that she has chosen

[413] Jos. Asen. 1.6–7.
[414] Jos. Asen. 15.6–8.
[415] Jos. Asen. 15.3.
[416] Jos. Asen. 15.9.
[417] The Greek goddess Tyche (Roman equivalent was Fortuna), personified fortune or luck, was a daughter of Zeus and sometimes identified as one of the Fates (Μοιραι). She was thought to preside over the affairs of the world as well as individual human lives. Good or bad events that occurred in life could be attributed to her will, for example, "But truly, if Fortune disapproves, nothing can turn out right for any mortal, and neither wise planning nor shrewd remedies can overturn or reshape the pre-ordained arrangements of divine Providence." (Apuleius, *Metam.* 9.1 [Hanson, LCL]). The Greek historian Polybius also sees Tyche (Fortune) as directing the events of history, "Fortune has guided almost all the affairs of the world in one direction and has forced them to incline toward one and the same end." (Polyb. 1.4.1 [Paton, Walbank, Habicht, LCL]).

the better way of living. While her chastity remains a consistent moral value throughout the story, her piety undergoes a theological transformation.[418] Aseneth switches her allegiance from Egyptian religion and devotion to their deities, to making a profession of faith in Joseph's patron deity.[419] The actions (πρᾶγμα) of the main character are extended into the other five elements and their sub-divisions. Actions, like "Person," allows for a variety of choices to describe what the character has done. Theon teaches that the element of action should describe what type of deed it was for the character.

> Those of action are great or small, dangerous or not dangerous, possible or impossible, easy or difficult, necessary or unnecessary, advantageous or not advantageous, just or unjust, honorable or dishonorable. (Theon 78 [Kennedy])

Again, the author is not obligated to use every example listed, only what is deemed appropriate to the character and aim of the story. Aseneth's actions can be described as either just (δίκαιος) or honorable (ἔνδοξος). Her major acts in the narrative are how she openly and completely rejects her previous devotion to Egyptian religion by fasting, mourning, and ridding herself of any physical vestiges of idols, food, or accessories (including donating to the poor).[420] Aseneth's submissive actions of prayer, confession, and repentance before Joseph's God may also be the author's way of showcasing her honorable or just actions as redemption from her former pagan lifestyle.[421] The place (τόπος) and time (χρόνος) of the character's actions are also essential to a narrative.

> To time belong what has gone by, what is present, what is going to be; what was first or second and so on; or what is appropriate to life in our time, what in ancient times; in call cases, the dates people have set in public or private life; then whether in winter or spring, summer, autumn, during the night or by day, whether the action took place during a meeting of the assembly or during a procession or festival; and whether at weddings or a reception of friends or in time of grief or any such circumstance of life. To place belong size, distance, near a city or town, whether the place was sacred or unhallowed,

[418] Jos. Asen. 7.10, 15.1–2.
[419] Jos. Asen. 2.3–6.
[420] Jos. Asen. 9.1; 10.2, 11–14.
[421] Jos. Asen. 11.10–11, 12.4–7.

> owned or someone else's, deserted or inhabited, strong or insecure, flat or mountainous, dry or wet, barren or wooded, and all similar things. (Theon 78–79 [Kennedy])

The author of Joseph and Aseneth provides ample instances of when and where Aseneth's actions take place. The introduction to the book places the general setting and location in Heliopolis, Egypt, during the harvest time, which is why Joseph is present.[422] Aseneth's pious actions of prayer, mourning, and repentance almost exclusively occur in one of her chambers (in her father Pentephres' house) and either at night or early morning.[423] Theon next explains that the main character's manner (τρόπος) of action should be described.

> To manner belong unwilling or willingly, and each of these is divided into three things: the unwilling into done by ignorance, accident, and necessity; the willing into whether something was done by force or secretly or by deceit. (Theon 79 [Kennedy])

In Joseph and Aseneth, Aseneth's actions can be categorized as being done willingly, but in secret (λάθρα) and unwillingly due to ignorance (ἄγνοια). Aseneth's acts of lamentation, repentance, and refusal of Egyptian religion are described as happening discretely. Aseneth intentionally tries to avoid her seven virgin sisters when she wants to mourn her prior idolatrous actions.[424] When she decides to throw away her religious accessories and food, she does so in a clandestine manner at night.[425] Aseneth confesses that her previous devotion and participation in Egyptian religion, although portrayed as pious, was done in ignorance.[426] The author emphasizes her ignorance and error towards Joseph's God and makes them responsible for her misplaced belief and participation in Egyptian religion. The cause (αἰτία) of the character's actions is the sixth element of narrative that Theon includes.

> To the cause of actions belong whether it was done to acquire good things or for the sake of escape from evil, or from friendship or because of a wife or for children or out of the passions: anger, love, hate, envy, pity, inebriation, and things like these. (Theon 79 [Kennedy])

[422] Jos. Asen. 1.1–3, 3.7–8.
[423] Jos. Asen. 10.1–2, 18; 14.1–7.
[424] Jos. Asen. 10.6–8.
[425] Jos. Asen. 10.12–14, 17.
[426] Jos. Asen. 13.8–9.

Initially, Aseneth's character is unwitting sinful but also chaste and pious, albeit in the service of pagan Egyptian deities. The causes behind her change from boastful idolater to humble and devoted proselyte are to avoid evil and to acquire good things. The evil Aseneth avoids is a life of pagan worship—which God hates—in place of proper reverence for Joseph's God.[427] The good things she gains for humbling herself and choosing to follow the God of Israel are his eternal gifts.[428]

Theon's six elements of narrative offer insight into the kinds of detail that authors sought to include in their literary works. These elements allow the reader to nuance their consideration of narrative details and content. Knowing what authors were taught and trained to include in their narratives gives the reader additional leverage when interpreting the meaning (literally or symbolically) of a text. Likewise, knowing what authors tried to include in their works also provides insight into how they thought about specific details, whether hero tropes, miraculous occurrences, or the veracity of the main character's virtues. Theon's *progymnasmata*, in conjunction with the details of what a narrative should include, leads into the theoretical side of what a narrative should do.

V. What Narrative Should Do

Theon's Narrative Virtues

In addition to Theon's instructions regarding the six elements of narrative, he also teaches that narratives should exhibit three virtues (Ἀρεταὶ). The virtues are essentially the style that the six elements are expressed in, along with expectations of how the narrative should function. Style

[427] Jos. Asen. 11.7–9.
[428] Jos. Asen. 12.7, 12; 13.1.

encompasses observable virtues, such as clarity and conciseness, which entails word selection, syntax, grammar, and subject matter. On the theoretical and more subjective side is the third virtue, credibility (πιθανός).

> "Virtues" of a narration are three: clarity, conciseness, credibility. Best of all, if it is possible, the narration should have all these virtues … One should always keep to what is credible in the narration, for this is its most special feature. (Theon 79 [Kennedy])

Theon teaches his readers that it is preferable for a narrative to possess all three virtues, but that credibility should be present for the sake of believability. He offers another comment about a narrative's credibility that presents an intriguing interpretive challenge for ancient and modern readers. He explains how, along with other forms of style, narration should explore things that are considered extraordinary.

> One should briefly add the causes of things to the narration and say what is incredible in a believable way … (Theon 84 [Kennedy])

For Theon, to "say what is incredible in a believable way (τὸ ἀπιστούμενον πιστῶς λέγειν)" means that the unbelievable or miraculous is not a deterrent or something to be avoided; instead, if it is useful to the author's literary needs, it should be embraced and communicated in a believable (πιστῶς) manner. Theon's comment about describing unbelievable occurrences is one of the most fascinating, yet perplexing aspects of narrative features. Narratives that mention locations and historical or unhistorical human characters were probably mundane and unsurprising to readers. The supernatural, however, certainly arrests the audience's attention because it is naturally outside the realm of everyday reality. An author uses supernatural occurrences to further enhance the point of the story and to make it more interesting or entertaining. Quintilian, positing a similar idea, sees embellishing texts as a literary tool to keep historical writings from being too bland.[429] Theon's explanation of keeping a narrative believable

[429] Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.4.3.

is also connected to his earlier comment that narrative should present what actually occurred or report information as if it took place.[430] Aristotle offers similar advice to his readers. When he discusses how to present facts in a narrative, he says that one can "create the belief that they have happened (ποιήσει ὑπολαβεῖν γεγονέναι)" if it supports and makes the facts clearer for the audience.[431] In each instance, Aristotle, Theon, and Quintilian, the writer or speaker is encouraged to create details in a narrative for persuasively supporting their claims. According to these instructions, the believability of the narrative, how persuasive the author's claims or presentation are, can supersede the necessity of how factual the details are. Truth or reality can be obscured for the sake of being convincing. In the author's hands, invention and embellishment can be useful literary tools aimed at guiding the audience into the writer's desired viewpoint. An author who introduces unhistorical details is not necessarily engaging in subterfuge. They may be well-intentioned, attempting to present a convincing case using the accepted conventions of their time. Perhaps the readers would have also recognized some of the more overt moments that included supernatural feats and otherworldly beings.

Theon's advice to communicate the incredible in a credible manner is also evidenced in Joseph and Aseneth. The main scene before Aseneth's acceptance as Joseph's wife, features her interaction with a chief heavenly entity. The heavenly figure's entrance, appearance, message to Aseneth, use of a special food, and departure are each narrated in spectacular fashion, while presented in prose form. Nothing in the narration suggests that the encounter is meant to be understood as fictitious. The heavenly figure, later described by Aseneth as a god (and some manuscripts as the angel of the Lord), enters the scene with astrological portents, such as the

---

[430] Theon 78.
[431] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.16.4 (Freese, LCL).

morning star and a bright light, and descends from heaven.[432] He is also described as a man (ἄνθρωπος) who makes an unlikely entrance into Aseneth's secured chamber atop her father's residence.[433] The unmistakably incredible nature of the encounter increases once the heavenly man identifies himself as Chief of the Lord's house and Commander of its hosts.[434] It would have been utterly surprising to have one of God's elite commanders make a special trip to visit a foreign Gentile woman who did not acknowledge Israel's supreme deity so she could be personally approved by heaven; after all, other legendary Jews, who were higher in stature than Aseneth, did not receive such a rare honor. Perhaps more paradoxical than incredible is the man having a similar appearance to Joseph, but also displaying otherworldly attributes.[435] Despite somehow resembling Joseph, the man also has a face like lightening, eyes like sunshine, hair like fire, and feet and hands like iron with sparks flying out of them.[436] Again, the description of the heavenly man is told with a matter of fact tone that feigns reality. The author also includes the heavenly man's message to Aseneth; she is in the book of life and her fortune is to become Joseph's bride.[437] The surprise, aside from the messenger's presence, is that Aseneth has such a fortunate opportunity afforded by the God of Israel, in spite of her status as an outsider to Judaism.[438] The last two unbelievable or miraculous occurrences during Aseneth's encounter with the heavenly man involves a special food and the man's departure. The heavenly messenger tells Aseneth, who is imploring him to have a meal with her, to bring him a honeycomb.[439] Although Aseneth is convinced that a honeycomb is not in her chamber, she finds exactly what

[432] Jos. Asen. 14.1–4, 17.6.
[433] Jos. Asen. 14.5–6.
[434] Jos. Asen. 14.6–7.
[435] Jos. Asen. 14.8–9.
[436] Jos. Asen. 14.9–10.
[437] Jos. Asen. 15.5.
[438] Jos. Asen. 15.3–5.
[439] Jos. Asen. 16.2.

the man told her would be there.[440] In addition to its sudden appearance in her room, the honeycomb imagery itself is miraculous because it is food that heavenly angels and bees dine on which also results in eternal life.[441] Lastly, the angel's departure evokes spectacular imagery; he leaves riding a flaming quadriga, drawn by horses that appears as lightening towards the heavens.[442] The entire encounter between Aseneth and the angel is visually stunning and positioned at the center of her character's turning point. Aseneth, as a regular human being, faces a life transformation not on her own but with divine guidance. For the reader to be convinced of her change, and that she is actually a good character (despite her prior faults), the author confirms her new positive status through heavenly intervention. The angelic figure, as a chief and leader in heaven, represents God's authoritative approval of Aseneth's conversion. The encounter itself is told in a believable manner, with Aseneth's character serving as a proxy for the reader. The "believable manner" is that the improbable encounter is reported in the same prose tone that the rest of the narrative is told in. The author presents the supernatural as historical and credible facts to support the rationale for Aseneth's acceptance by God.

VI. Esoteric Writing Techniques

Allegorical Writing

Narrative literature sometimes also included what can be described as esoteric compositional techniques or elements. While most narratives were constituted using a prose style, some authors wanted to deviate from the rather plain writing to include material that would have demonstrated the author's advanced education, since mixing styles was acceptable. Some of these esoteric techniques involved using obscure etymologies, allegories, and metaphors, often for interpretive

[440] Jos. Asen. 16.4.
[441] Jos. Asen. 16.7–8.
[442] Jos. Asen. 17.6.

purposes. Instruction on composition from writers, such as Demetrius, Dionysius Thrax, and Plutarch, often included techniques or details that were more pedantic, while also explaining how they benefited the narrative itself. Demetrius and Plutarch describe how allegory could be used in narratives at different stages of education. Demetrius, while speaking of narrative styles, explains how allegory can be implemented to evoke strong emotions (particularly fear or awe) in the reader/audience.

> Allegory is also impressive, particularly in threats … What is implied always strikes more terror, since its meaning is open to different interpretations, whereas what is clear and plain is apt to be despised, like men who are stripped of their clothes. This is why the mysteries are revealed in allegories, to inspire the shuddering and awe associated with darkness and night. In fact allegory is not unlike darkness and night. Here again in the case of allegory we should avoid a succession of them, or our words become a riddle … (Demetrius, *Eloc*. §99–102 [Russell, LCL])

Allegory accomplishes this because it is stronger in its possibilities than plain writing where the meaning is clear. Allegory elicits awe and fear mainly because it can be interpreted in different ways, so the reader does not always understand or know how to receive the message. Ambiguity in meaning, especially as it relates to "the mysteries in allegories (τὰ μυστήρια ἐν ἀλληγορίαις)," inspires strong emotions probably due to the desire to understand their true connotation. Although allegory is viewed as a positive attribute in narrative, Demetrius still advises against an over indulgence of them for the sake of the reader's comprehension. Plutarch does not discuss the use of allegory in composition directly but infers its use when explaining how writers expect allegory to affect their audience.

> By forcibly distorting these stories through what used to be termed "deeper meanings,'' but are nowadays called "allegorical interpretations" … (Plutarch, *Adul. poet. aud.* 19f [Babbitt, LCL])

The writer, obviously, must choose which style they want to use in their narrative, the interpretive point they want to make, and which allegory will best achieve their goal. The connection between allegory and compositional education comes where Plutarch describes how some distort writings (e.g., Homer) for their own end to teach children. The distortion of the

story is intentional as the writer or interpreter looks for, what used to be called, "deeper meanings (ὑπονοίαις)" in the text, which he says are now referred to as allegories (ἀλληγορίαις). The connection to composition is that the one inventing the allegory can do so in writing as well as speaking. Philo and Paul, as Jewish writers, also use allegory in their narratives. Both writers, for example, interpret the biblical narrative in Genesis of Sarah and Hagar's relationship with Abraham in different ways. The account in Genesis is plain, simply telling how Sarah intends to use Hagar to assist Abraham with having a child.

> Now Sarai, Abram's wife, bore him no children. She had an Egyptian slave-girl whose name was Hagar, and Sarai said to Abram, "You see that the LORD has prevented me from bearing children; go in to my slave-girl; it may be that I shall obtain children by her." And Abram listened to the voice of Sarai. (Gen 16:1–2)

Philo allegorizes the Genesis passage to explain the relationship between virtue and encyclical paideia and its use for a student (Abraham) as he moves through the stages of educational develop.[443] Sarah, of course, is the superior and coveted virtue (ἀρετή), while Hagar is the very useful education (παιδεία). The relationship between Sarah and Hagar epitomizes the connection students should make with virtue and education, they should have both.

---

[443] Amir demonstrates Philo's knowledge of Greek myth and skill to apply it allegorically in new biblical contexts. He explains how Philo's allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in *Congr.* 77–79 has a precursor in Homer's *Odyssey* account of Penelope, her maidens, and suitors (Homer, *Od.* 1.365, 420). Plutarch, while explaining education for children, comments on an explanation of Homer's passage given by a philosopher named Bion. "And it was a clever saying of Bion, the philosopher, that, just as the suitors, not being able to approach Penelope, consorted with her maid-servants, so also do those who are not able to attain to philosophy wear themselves to a shadow over the other kinds of education which have no value. Wherefore it is necessary to make philosophy as it were the head and front of all education." (Plutarch, [*Lib. Ed.*] 10 [Babbitt, LCL]). Bion saw a connection between a student's attitude towards philosophy and other educational subjects, and the suitors' interest in the maidens and Penelope. Although he does not interpret Homer's account as an allegory, the association of the suitor's pursuit of the maidens and Penelope with the pursuit of general education and philosophy, set a precedent for Philo. Philo could then appropriate Homer's myth with Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar as symbols for learning, philosophy, and general education through Bion's observation. In addition to Philo's use of Penelope and the maids in Homer's Odyssey and its interpretive explanation in Plutarch, Amir also shows how Philo appropriated details from other Greek myths to form biblical allegories, such as the Two Hemispheres of the Dioscuri compared to the Cherubim and High Priest Stones, the Charites (Graces) and the three Patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), and the Hercules' labor against the Hydra with Adam and the Serpent in the Garden of Eden. Yehoshua Amir, "The Transference of Greek Allegories to Biblical Motifs in Philo," in *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*, ed. Frederick Greenspahn, Earle Hilgert, and Burton Mack (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984), 15–25.

> Sarah, virtue, bears, we shall find, the same relation to Hagar, education, as the mistress to the servant-maid, or the lawful wife to the concubine, and so naturally the mind which aspires to study and to gain knowledge, the mind we call Abraham, will have Sarah, virtue, for his wife, and Hagar, the whole range of school culture, for his concubine. (Philo, *Congr.* 23–34 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

Paul uses allegory to explain the exact same passage in Genesis but has a different aim. He is interested in using Sarah and Hagar's relationship as a way of expressing the status of his new religious community.

> For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a slave woman and the other by a free woman. One, the child of the slave, was born according to the flesh; the other, the child of the free woman, was born through the promise. Now this is an allegory: these women are two covenants. One woman, in fact, is Hagar, from Mount Sinai, bearing children for slavery. Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the other woman corresponds to the Jerusalem above; she is free, and she is our mother. (Gal 4:22–26)

He equates Sarah to the new Jerusalem that is above and whose community (his own) is free, and Hagar to the older Sinai covenant whose adherents are in bondage. For Paul, Sarah represents the Christian community that is free and follows the new covenant, while Hagar represents Jews who still follow the Mosiac Covenant given on Sinai.

In addition to allegory and offering new interpretations of texts in their narratives, authors were also taught to include a host of other esoteric details. Dionysius Thrax, in his grammar (γραμματικη,), lists a variety of subjects and techniques that authors, such as prose writers (ϲυγγραφεῦϲιν) and poets learned. He mentions that they used interpretation (ἐξήγηϲιϲ), glosses (γλωϲϲῶν), firsthand interpretation of history (ἱϲτοριῶν πρόχειροϲ ἀπόδοϲιϲ), etymologies (ἐτυμολογίαϲ), analogies from reason (ἀναλογίαϲ ἐκλογιϲμόϲ), and judgment of poets (κρίϲιϲ ποιημάτων).[444] Although Dionysius does not specifically state that these are supposed to be used in narrative literature, he does say that poets and prose writers—whose writings are categorized as narratives—use them, which means they had to learn them at some point in their careers. The

[444] Dionysius Thrax, *Ars grammatica* 5–6.

inference that these techniques and subjects were learned by students of Greek compositional education is further evidenced when they appear in Jewish author's writings in Greek. Philo is one clear example of a Jewish author whose writings show agreement with Dionysus' instructions. Philo, for example, uses allegory, interpretation, and judgement of poets (as we have already seen), as well as etymologies (ἐτυμολογία) and analogies (ἀνάλογος).[445] Jewish students of composition would have had the opportunity to acquire such techniques from Grammarians during their youth (νέος) as part of the secondary stage of education. Plutarch, for instance, mentions how young students learned to study glosses (a method he critiques) and philological matters from Grammarians.[446]

Esoteric methods of interpretation and details were not only found in Greek settings for learning to write. Jewish literary tradition (in the Hebrew Bible and Christian texts) also had its own long history of incorporating allegories, metaphors, similes, and analogies into their narrative literature.[447] Ben Sira, for example, when describing the vocational interests of the Scribe, mentions how they work with the narratives of famous men and the complexities of parables.[448] Philo describes the Jewish sect of the Therapeutae and their Sabbath gatherings for study. He explains how they apply philosophy to their sacred writings and understand their contents as containing allegories.[449] While neither example directly connects with composing narratives, the use of allegorical and philosophical methods was not foreign to Jewish writers and students. Although learning these methods was familiar to writers and could take place in a

[445] For Philo's use of etymology and analogy, see for example, *Plant*. 165 and *Somn*. 1.188.
[446] Plutarch, *Adol. poet. aud.* 22f.
[447] For some examples of Jewish and Christian allegories, metaphors, and analogies, see, Ps 23; Ezek 17:1–10; John 10; Eph 6:10–17.
[448] Sir 39:2.
[449] Philo, *Contempl.* 28.

Greek or Jewish setting, the subject matter is what began to change. Jewish allegories, for instance, often focused on YHWH's interaction with Israel, while allegories in Jewish literature written in Greek sometimes directly addressed Hellenistic education, such as Philo's explanation of Sarah and Hagar with encyclical *paideia* and virtue. The direction of influence depends on the subject matter but the practice of including esoteric details in Jewish narrative did not entirely originate from Greek study; however, some of the topics (e.g., soul, mind, and virtue) were almost certainly influenced by Greek philosophy and education. The writing instructions that Demetrius, Dionysius, and Plutarch taught their students helps to explain how and when Jewish authors could have learned them. The appearance of these esoteric methods and details in Jewish narratives further indicates their contact with Hellenistic education for composing literature. The next step is to connect what they learned in the Greek curriculum for composing narrative with *expectations* for writing that were not explicitly mentioned by grammarians or collated in their handbooks.

CHAPTER 6

Narrative Expectations and Function

This section will cover two topics: narrative expectations and function. The first section will demonstrate how what authors expected in writing narratives also agrees between Jewish and Greek authors. This agreement in expectation about difficulties in writing, research methods, narrative goals, and general writing practices is another source for understanding what authors learned to write that is not always included in handbooks. Jewish and Greek authors who agreed on these rules are another form of evidence that they learned the same Hellenistic writing techniques. The second section will show, from Jewish and Greek authorial comments and comparative examples, how narrative had a mainly didactic function based on its intended use by authors.

I. Narrative Expectations

In addition to the curriculum for composing narrative, evidenced by explicit instructions from writers and teachers, expectations for narrative were another sort of learning that was typically found in writer's comments. Expectations for narrative were generally things learned through trial and error or by experience; not often listed as explicit rules but they became a type of unspoken rule for writing. The lack of absolute consensus for expectations in writing narratives is what probably led to a state of fluidity regarding what was considered acceptable or unacceptable writing practices. Expectations for composing narrative were typically expressed in

relationship to historiography; particularly, its research methods and which practical obstacles preceded composition. Greek authors' descriptions and complaints about writing narrative were echoed by Jewish writers who likely learned to expect the same techniques and standards, which accounts for structural similarities between their historical works. Greek historiographers, such as Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Polybius, and Thucydides describe various expectations they had when writing historical narrative. Their comments and descriptions across location and time also appear in Jewish narrative literature. Josephus' historical works, for instance, often agree with the expectations that Greek historians had when composing their texts, despite him probably learning Greek later in life. Although individual authors made many comments that provide insight into writing habits, we will address four recurring expectations that our four authors (Diodorus, Dionysius, Polybius, and Thucydides) express. They explain what they believe narratives should entail using four main categories: difficulties in writing, research methods, narrative goals, and general writing practices.

Difficulties in Writing

Difficulties in writing constitutes the practical challenges of composing a historical text in the ancient world. Authors complain about or confess that the process of researching and writing a historical text is practically cumbersome. Based on their admission, those who seek to compose a narrative ought to be aware of the challenging conditions that must be endured. Writers, such as Polybius, are expected to encounter the high costs of research which included monetary expenses and hardships.[450] The costs of travel to various locations, some of them dangerous, and the need to acquire resources to conduct research, was notably arduous. From a physical standpoint,

[450] Polybius, when describing his research experience, explains how personal inquiry (despite its value) can be laborious and expensive (Polyb. 12.27.6–7). He also mentions the difficulties that Timaeus (his competitor) faced which included the cost of collecting notes (Polyb. 12.28a.3).

research and writing took a long time. The number of hours, months, and years of one's life spent in libraries reading numerous works was a common complaint of historians. Diodorus and Josephus describe some of the labors they faced when attempting to compose their histories. Diodorus, for example, explains how a comprehensive history that covered a long period of time would be most beneficial but because it is impractical (sifting through the many literary sources) and too hard, no one has done it.[451]

> For this reason, since both the dates of the events and the events themselves lie scattered about in numerous treatises and in divers authors, the knowledge of them becomes difficult for the mind to encompass and for the memory to retain. (Diod. Sic. §1.3.4 [Oldfather, LCL])

> The reason for this is that, in the first place, it is not easy for those who propose to go through the writings of so many historians to procure the books which come to be needed, and, in the second place, that, because the works vary so widely and are so numerous, the recovery of past events becomes extremely difficult of comprehension and of attainment … (Diod. Sic. §1.3.8 [Oldfather, LCL])

Diodorus also describes how research can be dangerous and time consuming.

> And so we, appreciating that an undertaking of this nature, while most useful, would yet require much labour and time, have been engaged upon it for thirty years, and with much hardship and many dangers we have visited a large portion of both Asia and Europe that we might see with our own eyes all the most important regions and as many others as possible; for many errors have been committed through ignorance of the sites, not only by the common run of historians, but even by some of the highest reputation. (Diod. Sic. §1.4.1 [Oldfather, LCL])

Josephus shares many of Diodorus' concerns regarding the inherent challenges of writing a history. He mentions the scope of the task, how time consuming it is, incurred expenses, and the labor required for gathering numerous literary sources.[452]

---

[451] Polybius also agrees that the research and compilation required for composing a history is long and arduous, comparing it to the time doctors spend in libraries reading in preparation for the work, "Some of those again who appear to be justified in undertaking the composition of history, just like the theoretical doctors, after spending a long time in libraries and becoming deeply learned in memoirs, persuade themselves that they are adequately qualified for the task, seeming indeed to outsiders to contribute sufficient for the requirements of systematic history" (Polyb. 12.25e.4 [Paton, Walbank, Habicht, LCL]).

[452] Josephus, when criticizing some Greek historians for being lackadaisical in reporting and composing their histories, subsequently mentions the necessity of rigorous research, "As for the native Greeks, where personal profit or a lawsuit is concerned, their mouths are at once agape and their tongues loosed; but in the matter of history, where veracity and laborious collection of the facts are essential, they are mute, leaving to inferior and ill-informed writers the task of describing the exploits of their rulers. Let us at least hold historical truth in honour, since by the Greeks it is disregarded." (*B. J.* 1.16 [Thackeray, LCL]).

> However, since the compass of such a theme was excessive, I made the War into a separate volume, with its own beginning and end, thus duly proportioning my work. Nevertheless, as time went on, as is wont to happen to those who design to attack large tasks, there was hesitation and delay on my part in rendering so vast a subject into a foreign and unfamiliar tongue. (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.8 [Thackeray, LCL])

> For myself, at a vast expenditure of money and pains, I, a foreigner, present to Greeks and Romans this memorial of great achievements. (Josephus, *B. J.* 1.16 [Thackeray, LCL])

Research Methods

Acceptable methods of research were also an expectation that writers had to abide by. When composing their narratives, they had to anticipate how their work would be received by others, especially by those who held historical works to specific standards and expectations. Again, some of the standards were not written explicitly in compositional handbooks, but writers' comments about what they thought were good or bad writing or research techniques became an unwritten consensus—although there was still room for variability. Some of the recurring comments—from authors, such as Diodorus and Dionysius—about what to expect or do in research included, how to use other writer's reports, making one's sources (especially literary) known to the reader, the proper use of interviews, and the preferred use of eyewitness accounts over hearsay reporting. Diodorus, for example, explains how Rome provided him with numerous sources to compose his history. He additionally consulted "legends of the Greek and Barbarians (μυθολογουμένων παρ᾽ Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις)" to inform his account (Diod. Sic. §1.4.2–5). Dionysius of Halicarnassus consults others' reports for his historical works. He also advocates for informing his readers of which sources (λόγος) and records (ὑπομνηματισμός) were used because he understands that they want to know how he procured his information. He also lists the various ways that he researched and gained his information, which included, interviews and receiving teaching (*Ant. rom.* 1.1.4; 1.7.1–3). Jewish authors, such as Philo, Luke, and Josephus,

also shared these same concerns when describing their research methods. Philo, for instance, describes how he combined reading the sacred books (βίβλων τῶν ἱερῶν) with hearsay information gathered by interviewing the elders (πρεσβυτέρων) to compose his *Moses*.

> But I will disregard their malice, and tell the story of Moses as I have learned it, both from the sacred books, the wonderful monuments of his wisdom which he has left behind him, and from some of the elders of the nation; for I always interwove what I was told with what I read, and thus believed myself to have a closer knowledge than others of his life's history. (*Mos.* 1.4 [Colson, LCL])

The author of the Gospel of Luke, since he was not present, credits his information to those who were eyewitnesses to the events and his own investigative efforts (perhaps reading?) into what took place. How the information was handed down to him is unclear; it could have been through interviews or a written medium.

> … [J]ust as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word, I too decided, after investigating everything carefully from the very first … (Luke 1:2–3)

Josephus also provides details about his research practices for writing his histories. He mentions his sources, which included the sacred writings, as well as the works of foreign authors (e.g., Manetho and Berosus) to support his claims.[453] Josephus also implies that eyewitness accounts are preferable to those writing who have no actual experience with the historical event.

> As for the witnesses whom I shall produce for the proof of what I say, they shall be such as are esteemed to be of the greatest reputation for truth, and the most skilful in the knowledge of all antiquity, by the Greeks themselves. (*Contr.* 1.4 [Whiston])

> … [E]veryone that undertakes to deliver the history of actions truly, ought to know them accurately himself in the first place, as either having been concerned in them himself, or been informed of them by such as knew them. … and as for the History of the War, I wrote it as having been an actor myself in many of its transactions, an eyewitness in the greatest part of the rest, and was not unacquainted with anything whatever that was either said or done in it. (*Contr.* 1.53–55)

[453] Josephus, *A.J.* 1.4, 26, 59, 107.

Narrative Intentions

Authors also communicated what they thought was the expected *aim* of writing a historical or poetic narrative (narrative function will be addressed separately). The aim or goal of narrative, based on the writer's subject and intention, was to provide accuracy, truth, justice, and in some cases to appease a ruler who probably commissioned a work.[454] Several authors, including Thucydides, Polybius, Diodorus, Dionysius, and Josephus, attest to the long-held expectation that a historical narrative should embody accuracy. Beginning as far back as Thucydides, historians expressed a concern for accurate reporting to counter misinformation and fraudulent accounts that were circulating.

> But as to the facts of the occurrences of the war, I have thought it my duty to give them, not as ascertained from any chance informant nor as seemed to me probable, but only after investigating with the greatest possible accuracy (ἀκριβείᾳ) each detail, in the case both of the events in which I myself participated and of those regarding which I got my information from others. (Thuc. 1.22.3 [Smith, LCL])

Subsequent historians from the Hellenistic and Roman periods under consideration expressed the same expectation of having histories with accurate details using a form of the same word for accuracy (ἀκρίβεια). Polybius implies his concern for accuracy as he criticizes Timaeus for only giving an appearance of accuracy and describes how eyes are superior in their accuracy for reporting historical details than the ears are.

> For here he makes such a fine show owing to his affectation of accuracy (ἀκριβολογίας) and the bitter tone in which he confutes others that one would think all writers except himself had dozed over events and made mere random shots at what was befalling the world, while he alone had tested the accuracy (ἀκρίβειαν) of everything and submitted to careful scrutiny the various stories in which there is much that is genuine and much that is false. (Polyb. 12.26d.3 [Paton, Walbank, Habicht, LCL])

> Nature has given us two instruments, as it were, by the aid of which we inform ourselves and inquire about everything. These are hearing and sight, and of the two sight is much more veracious according

[454] Dionysius of Halicarnassus criticizes historians for writing histories that merely appealed to authorities but held no real scholarly value, "And yet why should I mention men at large, when even some historians have dared to express such views in the writings they have left, taking this method of humouring barbarian kings who detested Rome's supremacy,—princes to whom they were ever servilely devoted and with whom they associated as flatterers,—by presenting them with "histories" which were neither just nor true?" (*Rom. Ant.* 1.4.3 [Cary, LCL]).

> to Heracleitus. “The eyes are more accurate (ἀκριβέστεροι) witnesses than the ears,” he says. (Polyb. 12.27.1 [Paton, Walbank, Habicht, LCL])

Likewise, Diodorus, Dionysius, and Josephus each communicate to their readers the value and importance of having accuracy in a historical report. They claim that their research represents an accurate portrayal of events, often as a rational for writing or as a polemical tool against a rival historiographer.

> Concerning, however, every race of men, and all events that have taken place in the known parts of the inhabited world, we shall give an accurate account (ἀκριβῶς), so far as that is possible in the case of things that happened so long ago, beginning with the earliest times. (Diod. Sic. §1.6.3 [Oldfather, LCL])

> For no accurate (ἀκριβὴς) history of the Romans written in the Greek language has hitherto appeared, but only very brief and summary epitomes. (Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 1.5.4 [Cary, LCL])

Josephus, in his *Jewish Antiquities* and *Jewish War*, repeatedly expresses his desire to have accuracy in his historical report. Along with using a similar word for accuracy as previous Greek historians did, he also shares their research concerns regarding properly handling sources and the veracity of eyewitness testimony. His strongest plea for accuracy comes as he criticizes the former historical works that recount the events of the war. His criticism includes condemning their shoddy research practices and misguided intentions.

> The precise details (ἀκριβῆ) of our Scripture records will, then, be set forth, each in its place, as my narrative proceeds, that being the procedure that I have promised to follow throughout this work, neither adding nor omitting anything. (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.17 [Thackeray, LCL])

> In this connexion I shall describe the admirable discipline of the Romans on active service and the training of the legions; the extent and nature of the two Galilees, the limits of Judaea, the special features of the country, its lakes and springs. I shall give a precise (ἀκριβείας) description of the sufferings of the prisoners taken in the several towns, from my own observation or personal share in them. For I shall conceal nothing even of my own misfortunes, as I shall be addressing persons who are well aware of them. (Josephus, *B. J.* 1.22 [Thackeray, LCL])

> Of these [Historians], however, some, having taken no part in the action, have collected from hearsay casual and contradictory stories which they have then edited in a rhetorical style; while others, who witnessed the events, have, either from flattery of the Romans or from hatred of the Jews, misrepresented the facts, their writings exhibiting alternatively invective and encomium, but nowhere historical accuracy (ἀκριβὲς). (Josephus, *B. J.* 1.1–3 [Thackeray, LCL])

Another narrative whose prologue exhibits historical features is the Gospel of Luke.[455] The author addresses Theophilus as the recipient of the narrative (διήγησις), offers the sources for his work, and claims to compose an accurate account of what has been taught regarding Jesus of Nazareth.

> Since many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word, I too decided, after investigating everything carefully (ἀκριβῶς) from the very first, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, so that you may know the truth concerning the things about which you have been instructed. (Luke 1:1–4)

The expectation for truth in historical narrative, for instance, is expressed by Dionysius and Josephus. Dionysius, as he describes his motivation for writing his history, explains that a history should be done out of regard for truth and justice.

> And I, who have not turned aside to this work for the sake of flattery, but out of a regard for truth and justice (ἀληθείας καὶ τοῦ δικαίου), which ought to be the aim of every history … (Dion. Hal. *Rom. ant.* 1.6.5 [Cary, LCL])

Josephus claims that his history, in addition to being accurate, is truthful in its presentation of facts and is designed for those who love truth.[456]

> Here we close the history, which we promised Epilogue. to relate with perfect accuracy (ἀκριβείας) for the information of those who wish to learn how this war was waged by the Romans against the Jews. Of its style my readers must be left to judge; but, as concerning truth (ἀληθείας), I would not hesitate boldly to assert that, throughout the entire narrative, this has been my single aim. (Josephus, *B. J.* 7.454–455 [Thackeray, LCL])

Conversely, for some authors, poor historical narratives reported falsehood or invented details.[457] The accusation of creating a false or inaccurate history was dependent on the, at times, subjective claims of the opposing historian. A true or accurate historical representation often relied on

[455] For a discussion of the literary genre of Luke-Acts and its relationship to Hellenistic historiography, see, Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1997), 1–6.
[456] For Josephus' history being written for lovers of truth, see *B. J.* 1.30.
[457] This, of course, is in contrast with compositional teachers who felt and taught that some creative invention or embellishment was a positive feature of narrative.

reading older works and the testimony of local strangers, both of which contributed to the proliferation of variant accounts (another complaint of historiographers). Poets, however, were expected to invent fables that promoted a good image and character, undoubtedly as training models for children or young students.[458] These examples of shared expectations between Greek authors and Jewish writers of narrative demonstrates the interaction and overlap between practices. Jewish authors writing in Greek likely learned these unwritten rules in a Hellenistic setting along with other Greek educational practices and subjects. The consistency in expectations between the two groups certainly suggests that Jewish authors were taught the same principles for writing narratives that their Greek counterparts learned. The significance of similarities in curriculum and expectations can be further expanded to help understand the function of Greek narrative literature for Jewish authors.

II. Narrative Function

Up to this point, the questions have been, what did Jews learn to compose narrative and what does it say about its function? We have seen many similarities between Jewish and Greek narratives through the lenses of the narrative curriculum and expectations. The influx and merger between Greek and Jewish education provided the setting and opportunity for Jewish authors' narratives to appropriate some Greek compositional standards. Jewish students who learned through a Hellenistic educational curriculum now had the tools and techniques to compose narrative texts that looked Greek in their structure (and in some cases content), but also embodied traditional Jewish themes and interests based on their sacred literature and figures. This combination of Greek compositional learning and Jewish religious, philosophical, and theological ideals led to new types of literature being produced in the Second Temple Period.

[458] See, for example, Plato, *Resp.* 3.401b.

Jewish authors could convey what they learned not only through Greek literary mechanisms but also by retrofitting Greek myths, characters, and philosophical concepts to serve their purposes. Hades, the Greek mythological god and eponym for the underworld, could be reinterpreted and expanded as the holding place for Jewish characters in place of the previous Hebrew version of Sheol. Philosophical virtues, which were usually attributed to Greek heroes, could now be projected back onto legendary Hebrew characters such as Moses and Abraham. The Jewish student learning in a Hellenistic setting was now capable of synthesizing what they learned in their homes with curriculums that taught Greek literacy, poets, and grammar. The result of this hybridization was a new breed of Jewish literature that became difficult to categorize. Mixing Greek elements and rules for writing meant incorporating styles, content, and expectations that were not always a featured part of Jewish literature. Learning these techniques, however, also entailed learning the opinions and values they placed on composing narratives. When a student learned the practical rules for composing a narrative from instructors like Theon, they also learned that it was acceptable to tell unbelievable things in a credible manner. Writing then, was not only a physical undertaking to produce a narrative, it was also a display of the writer's ingenuity and perspective. On one hand, the writer was explicitly taught to expand and invent in narrative, but in doing so, they also implicitly learned that it was acceptable to engineer details that were not entirely factual to make their point.

The relationship between the techniques for oral and written narratives is inextricably connected to its function. To understand the function of Jewish narrative that is written in Greek and demonstrates elements of Hellenistic composition, we must examine its constituent parts and how they were understood by their authors. Showing what was learned in the Greek

compositional curriculum and what authors expected, provided specifics into the rules and what they thought about writing narratives. One constant theme, regarding function, was how the writer or speaker was trying to convey a message to the reader/audience using techniques for persuasion. The connection between the author/orator and the audience/reader is how literary tools, such as style, embellishment, and allegory are intended to persuade the recipient towards the orator or writer's viewpoint. The rules for composition, particularly narrative, were *repurposed* from oral delivery to a written medium; their function, however, remained unchanged. Narrative, both oral and written, has a primary function of persuading which also includes teaching. Whether historiography, historical fiction, or poetry, they each have a function (purpose) in mind. Narratives typically elucidate information through a story or facts to convince the reader/audience of the author's position or presentation. The aim of narratives is closely connected with its function. The function of historical narratives may not be directly stated, but when the writer communicates their aim—to give an accurate and truthful account—it implies that they want to teach and convince the reader their version of the story. Although the function of a narrative may be unspecified by the author, sometimes the writer will offer precisely what they want their work to accomplish. When a writer clearly indicates the function of their work, it allows us to further extrapolate what other writers (who used the same compositional techniques but did not express their intentions) may have intended. The function of Jewish narrative—often referred to as Jewish Novel, Jewish Romance, or depending on the text, Historical Novel—is generally considered to be for entertainment, enculturation, or propaganda.[459] I think multiple

[459] Wills, for instance, sees the function of the Jewish Novel as entertainment for a literate audience, which were crafted due to what he calls a "Novelistic Impulse" (the desire to put oral stories into written mediums using a host of narrative techniques). He also mentions that Jewish Novels have some connections to the "National Hero" romances. For Wills, Jewish novels attempt to have verisimilitude while also entertaining the reader. Although Wills uses Jewish Novel as a genre designation, he makes it clear that using modern genres is problematic. Lawrence Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*, Myth and Poetics (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 5–6, 29, 233.

possibilities can be included in the didactic function of narrative. In the case of entertainment and propaganda, narratives can still serve to inform the reader. Narrative can simultaneously be educational and entertaining when teaching morals or using humor to convey the author's ideas. If a narrative was used as propaganda, the function would have still been to teach and persuade the reader to the desired outlook of the text. Narrative written for enculturation is by nature didactic; especially when it is used to rear children and instruct youth.

Didactic Function of Narrative

The function of narrative literature, based on the Greek compositional curriculum and expectations, was didactic. Greek narratives, for example, myths and poetry, that were used by nurses and grammarians were utilized as instructional tools for children and youth. We have already seen what role poetry, myth, and the works of historians played in the education and enculturation of youths under Grammarians and Sophists at local gymnasiums. Although the function was educational, it does not preclude it from having a propaganda or entertainment factor; the theater was educational in a sense too. In addition to those prior examples, authors of narrative offer explicit expressions of the teaching function of their works, often embedded in their introductions or in epilogues. Four instances of the didactic function of narrative can be demonstrated from Jewish and Greek author's direct comments: Recipient Education, Learning from the Past, Poetic Learning, and Narrative as Educational Exercises.

Learning from the Past

Historical Narrative's didactic function is evident in two ways: first historiographers understood their works as instructional resources for gaining knowledge that would otherwise be lost to

time, and second, it preserved the events of the past as teachable moments for succeeding generations. The historian's research effort, compilation of hard to find details, and synthesis into a compositional whole, was intended to be read and to serve as a new source of knowledge about the past. Writers, such as Polybius and Josephus, typically expressed the understanding that they underwent the task of writing a history out of necessity, because no one else had produced one yet, or to correct some flagrant misinformation.[460] They expected their work to be read as an authoritative monument to the past, sometimes directly indicating this sentiment to their readers. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for example, communicates the importance of history, particularly how he expects the reader to be well-informed after digesting his work.[461] Polybius, Diodorus, and Dionysius all express history's educational value in a generalized manner as well, while Aristeas, Philo, and Josephus directly address their recipients concerning history's didactic worth. Although the recipient is sometimes unspecified, some authors identify their recipients by name. They usually applaud the reader's interest or passion for learning as the historical work is produced as a favor for them. One of the most direct examples of narrative being used in a didactic manner is often found in the prologue or introduction to historical (or fictive history) works. Authors would sometimes address their works to specific individuals and express their desire to fulfill the addressee's interest in learning. The writer is positioned as the content specialist with inside information, while the reader is an eager student who is ready to absorb

---

[460] Polybius laments that his motivation for writing his history was due to the absence of one done by any of his contemporaries, "Indeed it was this chiefly that invited and encouraged me to undertake my task; and secondarily the fact that none of my contemporaries have undertaken to write a general history, in which case I should have been much less eager to take this in hand. As it is, I observe that while several modern writers deal with particular wars and certain matters connected with them, no one, as far as I am aware, has even attempted to inquire critically when and whence the general and comprehensive scheme of events originated and how it led up to the end." (Polyb. 1.4.2–3 [Paton, Walbank, Habicht, LCL]). Josephus explains how he decided to write his histories partially to correct how rival historians were distorting the truth of the events, "For, having known by experience the war which we Jews waged against the Romans, the incidents in its course and its issue, I was constrained to narrate it in detail in order to refute those who in their writings were doing outrage to the truth." (*Ant*. 1.4 [Thackeray, LCL]).

[461] Dion. Hal. *Rom. ant*. 1.5.3.

new and instructive information. Sometimes the reader requested information from the writer and other times the writer composed the work for a wider audience, although still for didactic purposes. The text, usually meant to be a historical one, was composed as new material for a lover of learning and was primarily didactic in its function. The Letter of Aristeas, Luke-Acts, and Josephus are examples of authors who identify the recipients of their works and describe the didactic nature of the literary exchange.[462]

> A trustworthy narrative has been compiled, Philocrates, of the meeting which we had with Eleazar, high priest of the Jews, arising out of your attaching great importance to hearing a personal account of our mission, its content and purpose. By detailing each aspect I have tried to give you a clear exposition of it, realizing your scholarly disposition (φιλομαθῆ), which is a supreme quality in any man who has tried continuously to increase his learning and understanding, whether from the accounts (of others) or by actual experience. (Let. Aris. §1–2 [Shutt, *OTP*])

> Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile an account of the things accomplished among us, just as those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word have handed them down to us, it seemed fitting for me as well, having investigated everything carefully from the beginning, to write it out for you in consecutive order, most excellent Theophilus; so that you might know the exact truth about the things you have been taught. (Luke 1:1–4)[463]

> However, there were certain persons curious about the history who urged me to pursue it, and above all Epaphroditus, a man devoted to every form of learning (παιδείας), but specially interested in the experiences of history, conversant as he himself has been with large affairs and varying turns of fortune, through all which he has displayed a wonderful force of character and an attachment to virtue that nothing could deflect. (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.8 [Thackeray, LCL])

The introduction to the historical narrative of Second Maccabees, although it does not address a specific recipient, also has an explicit didactic function. The author produces an abridged version of Jason of Cyrene's five-volume history, which was intended to make it easier for the reader to digest and memorize.

> [A]ll this, which has been set forth by Jason of Cyrene in five volumes, we shall attempt to condense into a single book. For considering the flood of statistics involved and the difficulty there is for those who wish to enter upon the narratives of history because of the mass of material, we have aimed to please those who wish to read, to make it easy for those who are inclined to memorize, and to profit all readers. (2 Macc 2:23–25)

[462] See Bryan's discussion of how Mark, the Gospels, and Hellenistic lives functioned as education, entertainment, and propaganda. Christopher Bryan, *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Settings* (New York: Oxford Press University, 1993), 59–61.
[463] See also Acts 1:1–2.

Learning from Past Figures

Historical Narrative, in addition to its general importance for learning, also had a more specific value for its readers. Historiography, while preserving events of the past, was also intended as didactic model for its audience. The central task, as historiographers understood it, was to capture in writing what took place in former times for posterity. Preserving the past, however, was not merely a superfluous exercise of record keeping, but it was intended to have an acting and lasting behavioral effect on current and future generations. Past events and people were considered to embody educational life lessons for the here and now reader. Antiquity was revered for its literature as well as its vast list of influential figures and memorable events. Usually, the more ancient the text or nation, the more significance it held. Novelty was not celebrated in the same way. New religious or philosophical groups and recent literature sought to ascribe their claims (e.g., national and traditional) to famous figures or events of the past.[464] The further back in time, the more significance it held. The same reverence for the past was also applied to historical events and figures, especially legendary ones recounted in historical literature. Historiographers captured these accounts not only for learning pieces of data about the past, but also as educational templates for their audiences to learn from. What took place in the past could be interpreted as a lesson or foreshadowing of what happens currently or in the future. The type of event, positive or negative, was inconsequential; the reader could learn a lesson from both. The virtuous or wicked actions of historical figures, no matter how distant, could be models for people to emulate or avoid.

[464] The author of Luke-Acts, for instance, connected the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Gentiles to the prophetic words of David and Joel (Acts 2:16–41).

Longevity was associated with truth. What had been proven over the course of time, actions, sayings, or traditions, typically held more veracity than newer occurrences. A writer, for example, who wanted to support their claim or prove that a certain legal ruling was best, often attached a wise saying attributed to a figure of the past or cited a prior ruling for validity. The precedent of revering former events and actions of ancient figures was inherent to historiography. Authors were aware of this understanding and communicated it to their audience. Historians, such as Polybius and Diodorus, reiterated how learning from the past was invaluable for a successful life. The actions and involvements of historical figures served as flag posts for which direction one's life could go. While historians preserved the past, it had the dual capacity of teaching those who were alive and those who would come after them. Hence, the author's admonition to read and learn from their works, not simply information but also lessons for life.

> The peculiar function of history is to discover, in the first place, the words actually spoken, whatever they were, and next to ascertain the reason why what was done or spoken led to failure or success. For the mere statement of a fact may interest us but is of no benefit to us: but when we add the cause of it, study of history becomes fruitful. For it is the mental transference of similar circumstances to our own times that gives us the means of forming presentiments of what is about to happen and enables us at certain times to take precautions and at others by reproducing former conditions to face with more confidence the difficulties that menace us. (Polyb. 12.25b.3 [Paton, Walbank, Habicht, LCL])

> For although the learning which is acquired by experience in each separate case, with all the attendant toils and dangers, does indeed enable a man to discern in each instance where utility lies … yet the understanding of the failures and successes of other men, which is acquired by the study of history, affords a schooling that is free from actual experience of ills. (Diod. Sic. 1.2–3 [Oldfather, LCL])

> [S]o likewise the historians, in recording the common affairs of the inhabited world as though they were those of a single state, have made of their treatises a single reckoning of past events and a common clearinghouse of knowledge concerning them. For it is an excellent thing to be able to use the ignorant mistakes of others as warning examples for the correction of error, and, when we confront the varied vicissitudes of life, instead of having to investigate what is being done now, to be able to imitate the successes which have been achieved in the past … For this reason one may hold that the acquisition of a knowledge of history is of the greatest utility for every conceivable circumstance of life. (Diod. Sic. 1.4–5 [Oldfather, LCL])

Jewish writers, such as the Apostle Paul and Josephus, also commented on the didactic function of historical writings, particularly emphasizing the purpose of prior actions as models to emulate.

The importance of traditional texts, of course, goes back to daily instruction in the Torah (Law of Moses) as commanded in Deuteronomy.[465] Paul and Josephus consider the sacred biblical narratives—about the events, actions, and lives of famous Hebrew characters—as pedagogical material that teaches faith and piety.

> For whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction (διδασκαλίαν), so that by steadfastness and by the encouragement of the scriptures (γραφῶν) we might have hope. (Rom 15:4)
>
> All scripture (γραφὴ) is inspired by God and is useful for teaching (διδασκαλίαν), for reproof, for correction, and for training (παιδείαν) in righteousness, so that everyone who belongs to God may be proficient, equipped for every good work. (2 Tim 3:16–17)
>
> Again the Law does not allow the birth of children to be made occasions for festivity and an excuse for drinking to excess. It enjoins sobriety in their upbringing from the very first. It orders that they shall be taught to read, and shall learn (παιδεύειν) both the laws and the deeds of their forefathers, in order that they may imitate the latter, and, being grounded in the former, may neither transgress nor have any excuse for being ignorant of them. (Josephus, *Contr.* 2.204 [Thackeray, LCL])

The didactic value of history for a reader's life was not restricted to history proper. This was also the function of historical fiction. Of course, the authors of such works would not refer to them with this designation; they likely did not distinguish their works from those that included fewer miraculous occurrences. As in a writing like the Letter of Aristeas, the supernatural could also be believable as a writing technique that supported the claim of the author. The supernatural in a narrative that looked like history did not necessarily diminish its veracity for the reader. These comments can be attributed to historiography as well as Historical Fiction. Historical Fiction, such as 3 Maccabees and the Letter of Aristeas, were written in a historical format but included generous amounts of supernatural moments, which were mechanisms to persuade readers. Writings like these, have not only the shared structure and presentation but also the same function as their more factual counterparts. The number of embellishments is only a tool for the author and not necessarily an indicator that it was meant for pure entertainment.

---

[465] Deut 6:4–9.

Poetry and Myth for Teaching

In addition to history, poetry and myth (two other genres of narrative) also served a didactic function. Like history, both genres were used to teach morals and life lessons to children and youth. The selection of poets and myths, however, was not universally accepted. Depending on the teacher, some poets and their myths were deemed appropriate for instructing youth; however, some, such as Homer and Hesiod, were condemned for promoting false attributes and thereby corrupting young student's minds and morals. Plato and Diodorus express differing views about the usefulness of some poets and myths:

> Whatever opinions they have formed at their age are hard to wash out and usually become ingrained. Perhaps then for these reasons we must make it of prime importance that the first stories they hear are the finest tales (μεμυθολογημένα) possible to encourage their sense of virtue. (Plato, *Resp*. 2.378e [Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL])

> For these reasons we must stop such tales (μύθους) in case they cause an indifference to vice among our young (νέοις). (Plato, *Resp*. 2.392a [Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, LCL])

> For if it be true that the myths which are related about Hades (ᾅδου μυθολογία), in spite of the fact that their subject-matter is fictitious (πεπλασμένην), contribute greatly to fostering piety and justice among men, how much more must we assume that history, the prophetess of truth, she who is, as it were, the mother-city of philosophy as a whole, is still more potent to equip men's characters for noble living! [Diod. Sic. 2.2 (Oldfather. LCL])

Plutarch describes poetry and myth's didactic function as an introduction for young students to philosophy. Both are studied as a primer for students who will go on to pursue the higher subjects of philosophy.

> For as the mandragora, when it grows beside the vine and imparts its influence to the wine, makes this weigh less heavily on those who drink it, so poetry (ποίησις), by taking up its themes from philosophy and blending them with fable (μυθῶδες), renders the task of learning light and agreeable for the young. Wherefore poetry should not be avoided by those who are intending to pursue philosophy, but they should use poetry as an introductory exercise in philosophy, by training themselves habitually to seek the profitable in what gives pleasure, and to find satisfaction therein … (Plutarch, *Adol. poet. aud.* 15.f [Babbitt, LCL])

Just as Greek myth and poetry was used for didactic purposes, the same educational practices occurred with Jewish sacred literature as already described in Deuteronomy and Josephus. The collection of writings contained historical and poetical (as well as philosophical and proverbial) works that were understood as valuable for practical learning and enculturation.

Narrative as an Educational Exercise

There is one enlightening example of historiography being used as an educational exercise for youth in a school setting. Josephus explains how some men were employing one of his histories as an instruction tool for young students.

> There have been, indeed, some bad men, who have attempted to calumniate my history (ἱστορίαν) and took it to be a kind of scholastic performance (σχολῇ) for the exercise of young men (μειρακίων γύμνασμα). (Josephus, *Contr.* 1.53 [Whiston])

Although he describes the men as using his work in a negative way, the setting is still a didactic one. While Josephus did not originally write his history to be used in school settings, this description, along with the numerous examples from teachers, demonstrates that historiography could be adapted for instructional purposes. Some purposes included using excerpted samples from histories as instances of correct or incorrect composition skills, as teachers, such as Theon did.[466] The combination of Josephus' history and its presentation to students, offers another possibility for how historical texts were used in educational ways.

III. Conclusions

This discussion sought to answer two questions: What did Jewish authors, who lived during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, learn to write narratives, and how were their texts intended to function? Both questions have proven to be elusive, especially for literature belonging to the

[466] Theon 83–84.

Second Temple Period. This presentation, however, has aimed at the heart of the matter by precisely identifying which writing techniques were in vogue at the time. The narrative compositional curriculum was reconstructed from exercises and authorial expectations that were current during the time. Due to the absence or lack of Jewish sources that inform what was learned to write narrative, it was essential to base the reconstruction on extant exercises and comments that authors made regarding writing. The combination of exercises and comments (expectations) about writing provided a unique viewpoint for how to understand the narrative composition process. The reconstruction of what Jewish authors learned for writing shows that their narratives followed Hellenistic literary rules and held common expectations for composition that their Greek counterparts did. Jewish narratives, such as 3 Maccabees and Joseph and Aseneth, when compared to Hellenistic writing instructions, demonstrate how authors knew and utilized specific Greek compositional practices from exercises and authorial expectations. Knowing that authors were familiar with Greek compositional rules and shared opinions about what narratives should entail, also means that they likely agreed with how their writings were supposed to function for readers. Based on the exercises and expectations for narrative composition, their writings were intended to serve as pedagogical reference tools. I say that narratives had a didactic function because narrative's initial *rhetorical purpose* (e.g., informing and persuading) was extended into written form as described by their authors. This function was shown, particularly with one example of Josephus' history being used in an educational setting. Even texts that had a historical appearance but contained more fanciful material, had a persuasive and educational purpose for its audience.

Another significant factor is that the reconstruction of the curriculum is based on the author's perspective. The sources and focus were on what writers themselves communicated about writing exercises and conventional practices. This provides insight into the author's sentiments about the compositional process, such as specific compositional rules, included or excluded content, and research methodologies. Presenting the author's perception from writers living in the Hellenistic and Roman eras further helped to identify the variation of practices and opinions about composing narrative. Now, when reading a Jewish author, because of the diversity of practices and opinions, it is unnecessary to try to fit a narrative into one literary mold. As we have seen, a writer could combine various elements into one text, and use multiple techniques at their disposal. Now that we have a working Hellenistic curriculum, expectations, and function for narrative production, we can view practical samples of how these aspects of composition inform our knowledge and interpretation of Jewish narrative.

CHAPTER 7

Philo's *De vita Mosis*: An Exemplar of Hellenistic Writing

Introduction

Now that a reconstruction of the compositional curriculum for writing narrative has been established, we can consider how this knowledge can be applied. Two case studies, the first with Philo's *De vita Mosis* and the second the Letter of Aristeas (Chapter 8), will demonstrate different ways that understanding compositional education from an authors' perspective can inform the modern reader of questions about genre, education, research practices, the intended function of the text, as well as the author's views about its content. The goal of both examples is to evaluate the texts primarily from the vantage point of what writing trends were current for Jewish authors during the Hellenistic and Roman eras. The writing practices include what was learned from compositional handbooks and what writers expressed about narratives in their texts. Each study will stand on its own to maintain its coherence, which means some details or references will be repeated to demonstrate specific points. Philo's *De vita Mosis* will be compared to Theon's progymnasmata (specifically on narrative and encomion) to demonstrate what was learned by a Hellenistic Jewish author to compose a narrative text. The Letter of Aristeas will be examined in conjunction with the narratives of Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus to show how narrative writing practices and expectations resulted in variant literary traditions of the "Septuagint" translation. Each evaluation will provide insight into narrative composition,

specifically from authors who wrote during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, which informs what Jewish authors (who wrote in Greek) also learned when composing their narratives.

One of the major questions that arises concerning literature of the Second Temple Period involves the intersection and interaction of Jewish literary thought with its surrounding Hellenistic environment. It is clear that previous Jewish theological concepts were impacted by their neighbors in unique ways and probably vice versa as well. Scholarship on Philo and Jewish education has primarily focused on understanding its connection (positive or negative) with Greek culture and education. Some of the common questions are whether Jews in Palestine or the diaspora participated in Hellenistic educational institutions such as the gymnasium and to what extent Greek culture was tolerated in the community. With specific regard to Philo, questions about education often focused on his terminology and the encyclical education model. The descriptions of the general educational curriculum, which included subjects such as grammar, geometry, and music, are used as evidence for what may have been common learning for at least aristocratic Jews. This type of approach examines Philo's corpus not only for its descriptions of education but also for Philo's comments about his own experience. Philo’s appropriation of encyclical education onto legendary figures of Israel's past (such as Moses) are used to help explain what education during Philo's time entailed. Philo has been invaluable in this regard for bringing clarity to an otherwise opaque view of education in the Second Temple period. Although this approach to Philo and Jewish education is extremely valuable, there is another aspect of education that has gone without much attention. The question of literary, or more precisely compositional education, has not been adequately addressed for valid reasons. There are very few direct statements or evidence that describes what Jewish compositional training

entailed. Studies on Jewish scribes tend to deal with their origin, status, and function (often as teachers and tradents) in the community.[467] The scribe's education is, understandably, described in relationship to the content of specific biblical works (e.g., Wisdom literature) or through well-known scribal descriptions such as Sirach 39:1–10. Although these studies are of immense value, they do not offer much insight into the process of composition beyond mentioning editing practices or issues such as shared literary tropes. The works that come closest to examining compositional education (that I have come across) are by Emmanuel Tov, Burton Mack, and Michael Martin. Tov's research focuses primarily on the texts found in the Judean desert and discusses the scribal peculiarities found in the manuscripts, such as handwriting and editing practices, while the present study makes Hellenistic rhetorical techniques its central point of comparison.[468] Although Tov and others mention the production of texts as part of the Scribe's professional duty, an explanation of *how they learned* to produce a text in terms of arrangement and content is not provided. Mack and Martin's research on Philo and his relationship to Greek rhetorical writing shares some questions and conclusions with the present study; however, there are also significant differences between sources, comparative focus, and results. Mack, for example, focuses on one of Philo's commentaries, while Martin compares multiple progymnasmata and "biographical" texts in addition to Philo's *De vita Mosis*. Mack's

---

[467] There are several influential works on the subject of scribes and their origin, status, and function which include: K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2007), Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 291 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
, Richard A. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), David W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah a Socio-Archeological Approach*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 109 (Sheffield, England: Almond Press, 1991). Susan Niditch's study offers a unique view of how oral issues impact the production of texts, Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature*, Library of Ancient Israel (Louisville, KY: Westminister John Knox Press, 1996), 5.

[468] Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, V. 54 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004).

methodology and questions are similar to mine. He asks what Philo's education was and what he learned specifically to write his commentary on Genesis (4:2) in *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*.[469] Overall, I ask what Jewish authors learned to write narratives and approach the issue by reconstructing what exercises were available and what writers said about composition. Regarding Philo, I ask what he learned to compose his texts and compare it to available exercises too. Mack addresses Philo's view of scripture, interpretation method, and how he uses Hellenistic thought. He demonstrates Philo's education—how he was trained in composition—and uses the *progymnasmata* of Theon and Hermogenes to prove how his work aligns with exercises and rules for the "elaboration of the *chreia*." The difference between our studies, however, is that he is working with one of Philo's works (*Sacrifices*), while my study focuses on a wider scope of Jewish texts. When I do turn my attention to Philo as an exemplar, I use his *De vita Mosis*. Another difference is that he questions how Philo wrote his Genesis commentary using *chreia* exercises, which entails its own set of rules, while my study deals with narrative composition, and in Philo, encomion. Mack uses *chreia* and exposition in later progymnasmata from Hermogenes, while I use the narrative and encomion sections of Aelius Theon's progymnasmata. We share the same conclusions that Philo's works demonstrate knowledge of and training in Greek rhetorical techniques and should be read with them in mind.

Michael Martin's work on the use of progymnasmata topic lists discusses how they were employed in what he calls *bios* (biography) by writers, such as Philostratus, Josephus, Plutarch,

[469] Burton Mack, "Decoding the Scripture: Philo and the Rules of Rhetoric," in *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*, ed. Frederick Greenspahn, Earle Hilgert, and Burton Mack (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984), 81–115 (esp. 82–84, 115).

and Luke the Evangelist, as well as in Philo's *De vita Mosis*.[470] Martin argues that these topic lists are templates that were used for composing biographies. I agree that they are templates, but I think for composing an encomion, instead of biography. His approach focuses on multiple authors (whom he calls Theorists) of progymnasmata including Theon, Hermogenes, Aphthonius, and Nicholaus, and compares their topic lists to the biographical contents of the four writers he covers. Although Martin draws on multiple authors and progymnasmata, the discussion here focuses only on Philo and Theon's exercises and attempts to answer questions about Jewish compositional education in the Second Temple Period. Instead of asking about education in general, I propose to inquire specifically about compositional education for Greek narrative literature. How did a Hellenistic-Jewish author living in Alexandria, like Philo, learn to produce *De vita Mosis*?[471] If we can understand what the writer's experience was, either leading up to or while producing the text, then we can provide plausible answers to open issues, such as genre and function of texts. Additionally, further insight can be gained into some of the general educational questions (such as location) as well as how to read and interpret the texts.

[470] Michael W. Martin, "Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other Bioi?," *NTS* 54 (2008): 18–41.

[471] Scholars generally agree that there are not a lot of details available to fully understand Philo's life or educational background (aside from later testimonies). Philo mentions part of his educational experience in *De congressu eroditionis gratia* (74–76). He describes how he learned subjects, such as grammar, writing, reading, poets, history, geometry, and music. Although Philo describes his learning curriculum, he does not include any details about the circumstances surrounding his training, such as location, his instructors, or the duration of his study. Philo could have learned from a private tutor (*Paidagogos*, Grammarian, or Sophist) at home, at the gymnasium, at the synagogue, or a combination of all three. For further discussion about Philo's educational upbringing see, Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 5, 15; Peder Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," in *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud*, ed. Michael Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 254–255; David Scholer, Foreword to *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*, trans. C.D. Yonge (Hendrickson Publishers, 1993), ix–x.

This discussion will center on how Philo's *De vita Mosis* can inform our understanding of Jewish compositional education in the Second Temple Period.[472] If we know the process behind how a literary work was composed, then we can extrapolate what an author learned to produce the text.[473] This is a way of reverse engineering compositional education, which allows us to view composing the text from the author's perspective, using their categories, terms, and expectations. One way to test this hypothesis is by applying comparative structural and content analysis of Philo's *Mos.* with Theon's *Progymnasmata* (Preliminary Exercises).[474] I argue that Philo's *Mos.* follows the compositional instructions for the genre called *encomion* (ἐγκώμιον) that Theon outlines for his students.[475] By tracing how Philo's work aligns with these instructions and comments, plausible conclusions can be made regarding the text's genre, function, and general aspects of compositional education including research methods and locations. The discussion will proceed with a comparative analysis of Philo's *Mos.* with the encomion section of Theon's *Progymnasmata* followed by further considerations regarding compositional education, as well as, education in general during Philo's era.

---

[472] I use the terms compositional and literary education throughout the discussion. By compositional education I mean specifically how the author learned to arrange the text based on the structure and content. By literary education, I mean learning how to read and write (not necessarily creating texts) in general as well as other elements that were associated with grammatical learning.

[473] Of course, Cribiore's excellent detailed work on education in Hellenized Egypt describes the teachings of a grammarian and what types of exercises students engaged in. Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 185–219. My intention is to show what Philo had to learn based specifically on the construction of *De vita Mosis* and not the full range of grammatical and compositional education in general.

[474] Theon (surnamed Aelius) is described in the tenth-century CE Byzantine encyclopedia called the *Suda* (reference designation is Θ 206) as a sophist from Alexandria, Egypt who wrote rhetorical works. There are other ancient writers that have *progymnasmata*, which discuss compositional elements similar to Theon's. I have chosen to compare Philo to Theon because the other writers, Hermogenes of Tarsus (second century CE), Aphthonius (fourth century CE), and Nicholaus of Myrna (sixth century CE), are relatively later. See Kennedy's introduction for a very useful discussion on the relationship and transmission of the progymnasmata of these writers in George Kennedy, *Progymnasmata Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric,* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), xii.

[475] Theon defines *encomion* as a type of praise or celebration of a character's life and deeds (Theon 109.26–28). He says that the word is related to reveling (κῶμος) and the eulogies of the gods at the festivals (παιδιά).

The Genre of *De vita Mosis*

Philo's works are difficult to categorize with one precise genre classification, in part because the writings are composed of different elements that make it problematic to assign one label like "Allegory." Scholars, such as Goodenough and Sandmel, have used different labels to categorize Philo's works. Philo's texts are typically divided between two modern categories: commentaries or exposition of Moses' laws.[476] Commentary usually begins with a biblical reference and includes allegorical exegesis, while exposition forgoes the verse-by-verse approach for narrative, but still may include allegorical interpretations. Philo's *De vita Mosis* is often grouped under exposition of law; however, it is also referred to as "Rewritten Bible," paraphrase, and epideictic.[477] Although its similarities to Greek biography are sometimes mentioned, it is still considered exposition.[478] Alexandre evaluates *De vita Mosis* based on rhetorical techniques.[479] Although he mentions its similarities with Greek biographical narrative and historical features, he classifies it as epideictic genre.[480] The problem with designating *De vita Mosis* as exposition, Rewritten Bible, is that the labels are modern evaluations that were unknown in the ancient

---

[476] Erwin Goodenough, "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De Vita Mosis," *Harvard Theological Review* 26 (1933): 109–125. Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 47.
[477] Peder Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," in *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud*, ed. Michael Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 233–234. Borgen divides Philo's writings into allegorical interpretations, thematic and philosophical writings, and exposition of the law of Moses. The expositional texts are further divided into creation, historical, and legislative parts. Borgen also suggests that *De vita Mosis* could be classified as Rewritten Bible because it is similar to Jewish texts, such as Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon (234).
[478] Borgen and Maren Niehoff mention *De vita Mosis*' connections to Greek biography, Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," 235; Maren Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria,* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 169–171. Niehoff mentions that she sees Moses's biography as part of exposition (171, note 9).
[479] Manuel Alexandre, *Rhetorical Argumentation in Philo of Alexandria,* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1999), 109–110. Alexandre compares the structure of *De vita Mosis* to five parts of epideictic narrative: exposition, narration, confirmation, and peroration (110).
[480] Ibid., 109–110.

world. Even epideictic, although a known rhetorical term in the ancient world, is not precise enough as a *written genre* designation. These labels are helpful for modern readers to classify texts based on similar features, but they do little to assist with how ancient writers classified their writings. Instead—regardless of how helpful our modern genre categories are for discussion—to refer to ancient writings by the classifications that their authors (or detractors) used to describe them would be more precise. Initially, it appears that Philo refers to *Mos.* with a classification that was known in antiquity as *bios*, thereby eluding the difficulty of trying to give it a modern category. Philo explicitly states that he, "thought to write the life [of Moses] (τὸν βίον ἀναγράψαι διενοήθην) who according to some is a lawgiver and an interpreter of the law" (*Mos.* 1.1). However, when searching the ancient literary exercises for a category, such as bios or biography, it is not listed as something that people learned to write.[481] This assertion by Philo is our starting point for examining the remainder of the composition in relationship to experience and expectation.

When Philo mentions at the outset of his work that he is writing a life of Moses, it immediately presumes that he has received training in writing, but the issue at hand is what did he learn to write and how did he learn it?[482] There are a number of (what we refer to as) biographies that existed from the ancient world and some have similarities to elements found in *Mos*. Diogenes Laertius (ca. second century CE) is an example of a writer who produced biographies about famous figures, such as Solon, Pythagoras, and Socrates in his *Lives of*

[481] It is true that Plutarch and others mention *bios* as one of their aims, for example, "the writing of parallel lives (περὶ τὴν τῶν βίων τῶν παραλλήλων γραφήν)" (*Thes.* 1.1). However, Plutarch and Philo's use of the term can be understood as describing their compositional action but not a categorical label. In other words, Philo can write about the life of Moses as his subject while employing the genre of encomion to praise his life.
[482] βίος in this usage means more of "manner of life" or how he lived as opposed to ζωή which would emphasize more of one's external substance or property, although it too can refer to one's existence in general as well as a secondary meaning.

*Eminent Philosopher*s. Although Philo was writing a "life" of Moses, it does not mean that he was writing a "Biography" in terms of a specific compositional category.[483] The content of *Mos*., instead, resembles more of what is known about an actual compositional (and oratory) category called encomion as described by ancient writers, such as Aristotle (384–322 BCE) and Theon (first century CE).[484] Instead of comparing ancient encomia for similarities and differences between them, it will prove to be more beneficial to understand the inherent rules for writing an encomion, and whether or not Philo follows some or all of them, as opposed to the compositional rules of writing a personal letter or a tax receipt. Additionally, we can consider what Philo himself says about writing and education within the text to further elucidate what kind of education he received. Lastly, we will consider literary decisions Philo makes that are part of the wider consensus of writers within the Second Temple timeframe to identify other elements of writing that are not included in the exercises but may have been common expectations.

Encomion in Aristotle and Theon

From the second century BCE through the first century CE, several compositional categories were known to writers, such as history, epic, satire, and comedy among others. What is peculiar for modern readers is that the boundaries and characteristics of these various categories were not always entirely clear in how they were used or understood by different writers. One author may refer to a literary work as a myth (μῦθος) while another may view the writing as a historical (ἱστορία) text despite their similar structure or contents. Josephus, for example, in his *Contra Apionem*, accuses the Egyptian historiographer Manetho of using fraudulent sources in his work

[483] Our first use of biography (βιογραφία) comes from Damascius the philosopher (ca. fifth or sixth century CE) in his *Vita Isidori* §8.
[484] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.9.33.

(1.287). Josephus credits Manetho on the veracity of some of his accounts (especially those that agree with Josephus' own characterization of the Jews) but at other times he derides him for either telling lies outright or for resorting to "anonymous myths (ἀδεσπότους μύθους)." Whether Josephus is right or wrong in his assessment of Manetho's sources, the point is that Manetho believed his literary sources were credible enough to support his history, while Josephus considered them as myths.

Another example of how fluid the boundaries were between literary categories is found in the Roman rhetor Quintilian (35–90s CE) who explains the various types of narrative (*narratio*) writings in his *Institutio oratoria* 2.4.2. Although in modern terms, one might think of a narrative as being one specific kind of writing with distinct characteristics, Quintilian mentions three different types of narrative: myth (*fabula*), argument (*argumentum*), and history (*historia*), which all have their respective elements.[485] This literary diversity makes it apparent that authors learned to distinguish between different types of writings. Each category of writing, despite having some overlap in description or content, had its own expectations of what it should entail.[486]

Several elements can be observed in the structure of *Mos.* which correlate with writing exercises and authorial comments during the Second Temple era. It is true that looking at writing experiences and expectations diachronically is suspect to anachronism, but this concern can be somewhat alleviated due to the level of consistency over time. Despite the apparent time gap

---

[485] Quintilian also mentions that poetry is a form of narrative but says that is given to the grammarians, "*grammaticis autem poeticas dedimus*" (*Inst.* 2.4.2).

[486] For example, Quintilian explains that *fabula* is found in tragedy and "poetry" (*carmen*) which do not fully present truth (*veritas*), while historical narrative presents "the narration of actual events (*est gestae rei expositio*)" (*Inst.* 2.4.2 [Russell, LCL]).

between educators such as Aristotle and Theon (almost three centuries), their descriptions of what an encomion should entail consists of numerous similarities. The authors share considerable agreement regarding the content of an encomion often using closely related words and phrases. A few comparative examples from both authors will suffice to demonstrate the continuity over time in expectations for writing an encomion. Both Aristotle and Theon describe the function of an encomion as praising a figure who has virtuous deeds:[487]

> Ἔστι δ᾽ ἔπαινος λόγος ἐμφανίζων μέγεθος ἀρετῆς … τὸ δ᾽ ἐγκώμιον τῶν ἔργων ἐστίν (*Rhet.* 1.9.33)
>
> Now praise is a discourse showing greatness of virtue … but the encomion is about great works[488]
>
> Ἐγκώμιόν ἐστι λόγος ἐμφανίζων μέγεθος τῶν κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν πράξεων (Theon 109.20)
>
> Encomion is a discourse showing greatness of actions according to virtue

Both authors also mention a person should be praised for being the only one, the first, or one of a small group that accomplishes a deed:

> εἰ μόνος ἢ πρῶτος ἢ μετ᾽ ὀλίγων … (*Rhet.* 1.9.38)
>
> If [he is] the only one or first or with a group of others …
>
> καὶ εἰ μόνος ἔπραξέ τις ἢ πρῶτος, ἢ ὅτε οὐδείς, ἢ μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων, ἢ μετ᾽ ὀλίγων … (Theon 110.20)
>
> [A]nd if he alone did something, or [was] the first, or no one else [did it], or [he did] more than others, or with a few others …

Additionally, both Aristotle and Theon describe the benefit of comparing the deeds of a virtuous person to previous famous figures both using a form of ἀντιπαραβάλλω:

---

[487] The standard Greek edition of Theon's work is found in Spengel's two volume work of the *Rhetores Graeci*, Leonhard von Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana. S.G. (Lipsiae: in aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1894). The section on Theon's *Progymnasmata* is in volume two of his work pp. 56–130. The references are according to Spengel's page and line numbers in the second volume. For an English translation of Spengel's work that includes detailed introductory information about Theon (and the other authors of the progymnasmata) as well as manuscripts and transmission see Kennedy's *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. See especially xviii in Kennedy for matching the pages and sections in Spengel's Greek to Kennedy's English translation.

[488] Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

πρὸς ἄλλους ἀντιπαραβάλλειν … (*Rhet.* 1.9.38)

[To] compare [him] to others …

ἀντιπαραβάλλοντα ἐκείνων τὰ ἔργα πρὸς τὰ τῶν ἐγκωμιαζομένων … (Theon 111.1–3)

[C]omparing their works to the works of those who were praised …

Along with these three examples, Aristotle and Theon also share other instructions for composing an encomion, such as the importance of emphasizing a character's birth and education (*Rhet.* 9.33; Theon 110.1-5). In both texts the authors use the same terms to refer to the central character's noble birth (εὐγένεια and εὐγένεια ἀγαθόν) and their education (παιδεία) as external factors of their outstanding features. Differences, however, also exist between Aristotle and Theon's instructions. The most noteworthy difference is that Aristotle's instructions are primarily for oral presentations, while Theon's are for those aspiring to a career in public speaking or professional writing (Theon 70.22-28). Indeed, literary and oratory rules were similar because written mediums were also performed or read aloud for the listening audience. This is one reason why Aristotle's and Theon's rules for narrative and encomion are so similar despite the passage of time. Aristotle's rules remained significant enough that the practice of orally delivering an encomion also became the guidelines for writing one.[489] The elements which appear to demonstrate compositional education in *Mos*. include some that are well known and others that require an explanation from Theon's preliminary exercises, as well as other ancient authorial comments on writing. The familiar elements that demonstrate compositional education include sections in Philo's text that ascribe Greek educational features to the figure of Moses (e.g., *Mos*. 1.23–24). The recognizable elements in *Mos.* that indicate compositional education for an encomion include: an introduction, a checklist of Moses's praiseworthy

[489] This can also be seen in the similarities of topics covered between the authors. Aristotle and Theon both provide treatments for *encomion*, *diegesis*, *prooimion*, and *ekphrasis* with several similarities between their instructions.

achievements, and descriptions of his character traits. Each of these elements in Philo's text will be treated respectively.

The structure of *Mos*. aligns (in some cases almost exactly) with the encomion instructions of Aristotle and Theon. An analysis of *Mos*. in conjunction with their suggestions for writing an encomion demonstrate that the structure and content of the writings are following specific guidelines that were explicated in a manual like Theon's and, to a lesser degree, Aristotle's. Theon's instructional section, labeled ΠΕΡΙ ΕΓΚΩΜΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΨΟΓΟΥ (Concerning Praise and Blame), lists a host of details for what an aspiring writer should include in their praise of a figure. As one reads through Philo's *Mos.*, it is unmistakable that he is following, maybe not Theon's manual, but the rules that were common for composing an encomion.

Structural Comparison of Mos. With Theon's Encomion Rules

Having considered the genre of *Mos.*, it is reasonable to ask, in what observable ways does the text demonstrate adherence to Theon's rules for writing an encomion? When Philo took up his reed pen to write on papyrus or parchment, what sorts of mental guidelines helped him to arrange the text? Similar to the modern age, trained writers had some idea of the writing conventions for their time and culture. The question here is whether *Mos.* reflects Theon's pattern for learning how to compose an encomion. Examining a sectional breakdown of *Mos*. in comparison with Theon's handbook will yield the clearest example of whether Philo is following its rules or not. We will follow the rules Theon sets out in their order and then compare them with what is found in Philo's text. If Philo's text agrees with Theon's rules, then one could surmise that Philo was aware of these rules and governed his writing accordingly.

Theon's progymnasmata are divided into sections, each discussing a topic of writing, for example, chreia, myth, and ekphrasis.[490] Theon's section on what should be included in an encomion describes three types of "good things (τὰ ἀγαθὰ)" that should be mentioned about the central figure (Theon 109.30). The first type of good that should be described is what Theon refers to as "external (ἔξωθεν)." External goods refer to the praiseworthiness of the character's birth (εὐγένεια ἀγαθόν), education (παιδεία), and ancestry (Theon 109.30, 110.1). The second kind of good that Theon suggests mentioning is called the "goods of the body (τὰ [ἀγαθὰ] δὲ περὶ σῶμα)," which refers to the figure's physical constitution, such as beauty, strength, and health (Theon 109.30, 110.6). The third and final category, Theon calls "goods of the mind (ψυχικὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ)," which he explains as having good character (ἦθος) as one demonstrates virtuous actions through thought and behavior (Theon 109.30, 110.7). We will now consider each of the three categories that Theon describes and how Philo implements them into his work.

Elements of an Encomion: Prooimion

Although Theon begins by explaining what the content of an encomion ought to include, we will begin first with his organizational instructions. Theon instructs his pupils that their written encomion should follow a specific structural order. For Theon, the encomion should proceed first with the introduction (προοίμιον) and then followed by descriptions of the character's external, bodily, and mental goods:

> μετὰ τὸ προοίμιον εὐθὺς περὶ εὐγενείας ἐροῦμεν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τε ἐκτὸς καὶ περὶ σῶμα ἀγαθῶν … μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰ κατορθώματα παραληψόμεθα …

[490] The order of Theon's sections is debated. Kennedy mentions that his text was edited and rearranged at a later time to conform to other works of progymnasmata. George Kennedy, *Progymnasmata Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric,* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 2.

> Immediately after the prooimion we speak about good birth and other external things and about bodily goods … and after these things we shall take up the actions and the successes … (Theon 11.12–14, 112.1)

In Philo's first book of Moses—which he refers to as the "first composition (προτέρα σύνταξίς)" and not a "book (βιβλίον)"—he follows the exact organizational structure that Theon suggests for his students. Philo begins his work with a prooimion as Theon recommends (Theon 111.12).[491] In Philo's prooimion, he describes his desire to write on the life of Moses to inform those who were unaware of his unsurpassed greatness, and subsequently to fill in his omission by Greek historians (*Mos.* 1.1–5).[492]

The prooimion in *Mos.* 1.1–5 is further evidence of how a text followed well-known literary patterns. The inclusion of a prooimion at the start of a writing was common not only for an encomion but also for other narrative works, particularly the genre of history (ἱστορία).[493] There are copious examples of prooimia in the periods preceding and contemporary with Philo from historiographers such as Thucydides (fifth century BCE), Polybius (200–118 BCE), and down to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ca 60–ca 7 BCE). From as early as Thucydides, historiographers were including prooimia in their writings as a means of introducing their subject matter, rationale for writing, accusing opponents, and even addressing their audiences. Although Theon's writing

---

[491] The prooimion (Προοιμιον) is the "introduction" to a writing (e.g., epic and history) or speech (e.g., epideictic) that explains the subject matter and prepares the listener for what follows. Aristotle explains the function of the prooimion and how closely it relates to the prologue (προλογος) of tragedy, comedy, and poetry (*Rhet.* 3.14.1-6).

[492] In addition to the setup of the praise for Moses's life, Philo's prooimion also addresses, in a scathing manner, the literary shortcomings of these same writers for not using their literary education to praise virtuous men such as Moses; instead, they waste their abilities writing comedies and composing "licentious Sybarian works (συβαριτικὰς ἀσελγείας συνθέντες)" (*Mos.* 1.3).

[493] For a collection of ancient Prologues see, Paul Edward Dutton and Justin Lake, *Prologues to Ancient and Medieval History: A Reader*, Readings in Medieval Civilizations and Cultures Series 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013). Lake refers to the introductions as "prologues", but several of the works include introductions that use προλογος as well as Προοιμιον as their term for introduction. Lake's collection includes ancient historiographers, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Thucydides, and Polybius.

exercises do not detail how to write a prooimion, his wording that "Immediately after the prooimion… (μετὰ τὸ προοίμιον εὐθὺς)" (Theon 111.12), suggests that this was a section of a writing (whether an encomion or historical writing) that was common to authors. Therefore, to think that writers of Philo's time learned the proper form and content for writing a prooimion, just as they would have for the encomion, is not presumptuous. As already mentioned, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* provides us with a clear example of rules and expectations for the content and function of the prooimion in an oral presentation (*Rhet.* 3.14.1-6), while later historiographers implemented the oral instructions into a written form. A brief comparison of what was included in prooimia across time periods and locations indicates several patterns common to each of them. From a positional standpoint, prooimia occur at the beginning of a speech and written texts. Philo's work also begins with a prooimion but without calling it as such. Instead, we can infer Philo learned to write a prooimion, as his contemporaries did, due to the continuity in instructional elements.

Another aspect of the prooimion, as found in other ancient writers, is the explanation for how the author arrived at their version of the account and how they procured their information. Philo, before the start of his narration, explains how he has used two sources for his research of the life of Moses. His first source, he says, are the "sacred books (βίβλων τῶν ἱερῶν)" and his second source is the "elders of the nation (τοῦ ἔθνους πρεσβυτέρων)" (*Mos.* 1.4). Of course, relying on books they considered authoritative or consulting contemporary people about events that supposedly transpired centuries ago was not unusual. Historiographers also employed similar tactics to produce their volumes, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus who said some of his material was from "the things heard by chance (ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων ἀκουσμάτων)" (*Ant. rom.*

1.1.4). Two interesting questions regarding Philo's research methods are, which sacred books was he referring to and why would he trust or accept what certain elders had to say? Philo's accounts of Moses's life make it evident that he possessed alternative traditions about him other than what would be preserved in the Masoretic text of the Bible.[494] What is most intriguing from the combination of these two types of sources is that Philo believes he is giving an "accurate (ἀκριβῶσαι)" account of Moses's life despite the apparent discrepancies between traditions (*Mos.* 1.4). Philo's research method demonstrates a compositional factor that is not included in Theon's instructions but indicates that Philo is familiar with conventional norms of research. The contents of *Mos.* 1.1–5 shows that Philo composed a compelling prooimion based on the common conventions and expectations of his era that led his readers into the next sections of his work. These next sections, much like his prooimion, follow the compositional structure suggested by Theon's encomion instructions.

Elements of an Encomion: External and Bodily Goods

The purpose of the prooimion section of Philo's work is to prepare the reader for the following three main sections (external, bodily, and mental goods) of what Theon suggests will make a good encomion. Theon advises in his exercises that immediately following the prooimion, the writer should begin describing the external goods of the main character.

> μετὰ τὸ προοίμιον εὐθὺς περὶ εὐγενείας ἐροῦμεν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τε ἐκτὸς καὶ περὶ σῶμα ἀγαθῶν …
>
> Immediately after the prooimion we speak about good birth and other external things and about bodily good … (Theon 111.12)

[494] Philo's parallel accounts of Moses's birth (cf. *Mos.* 1.5–29 and Exod 2.1–10) and his encounter at the burning bush (cf. *Mos.* 1.65–86 and Exod 3:1–12) are two examples of variant oral or written traditions that he learned.

This is precisely what Philo adheres to in his own writing, even demonstrating he is aware of the division between his prooimion and the next section. Philo indicates he shall begin his writing, after the prooimion, with “what is necessary to begin [with] (ἄρξομαι δ᾽ ἀφ᾽ οὗπερ ἀναγκαῖον ἄρξασθαι)” (*Mos*. 1.5). The οὗπερ ἀναγκαῖον ἄρξασθαι emphasizes that Philo understands there are specific things that should come in order after the prooimion of an encomion. The “what” Philo refers to are the three elements Theon suggests, namely, external, body, and mental goods. Looking at the structure of Philo’s work, specifically *Mos.* 1, he does indeed begin with the external good relating to the character of Moses that he has selected. Theon gives specific designations for what should be included in each of the three categories. In the first one, external good, Theon instructs his pupils to describe details about the main figure regarding his birth, ancestry, and education, among other things: (Theon 110.2-6).

> ἔστι δὲ τῶν ἔξωθεν πρῶτον μὲν εὐγένεια ἀγαθόν, διττὴ δὲ ἡ μὲν πόλεως καὶ ἔθνους καὶ πολιτείας ἀγαθῆς, ἡ δὲ γονέων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἰκείων. ἔπειτα δὲ παιδεία, φιλία, δόξα, ἀρχή, πλοῦτος, εὐτεκνία, εὐθανασία.
>
> Now the external good are first, good birth, both the city and nation and good citizenship, and offspring and other inhabitants. Then education, friendship, glory, leadership, wealth, good children, and a good death. (Theon 110.2–6)

Philo closely follows a set of directives that are enticingly similar to what was transmitted to Theon. Philo, however, follows the convention of what constitutes an encomion, while Theon’s later instructions reflect what was known from a previous time. Philo’s “external good” section mentions several of the main elements included in Theon’s instructions. Philo’s section on external good mixes elements of bodily goods as well; however, this is not a departure from Theon’s instructions. Theon also suggests that the student should incorporate the two elements

together, as already mentioned, when he writes that good birth, external good, and bodily good should immediately follow the prooimion (Theon 111.12).

After Philo's prooimion, he describes Moses's ancestral heritage, birth, and education. Following the example transmitted to Theon, which says that one should describe the good birth of the person being praised, Philo narrates Moses's birth account, albeit with an alternative rendering than what is now found in the Masoretic text (*Mos.* 1.5–50, cf. Exod 2:110). Philo describes Moses as being both well-born (εὐγενῆ), using the adjectival form, whereas Theon uses the noun form (εὐγένεια), and attractive (ἀστεῖον) (*Mos.* 1.18). Moses is also described as being more handsome (ἀστειοτέραν) than a common man (ἰδιώτην) (*Mos.* 1.9). Theon also instructs his students to describe the family background and education of the main character in praiseworthy terms. Philo does no less when introducing the reader to Moses's parents who are described as being among the best people (ἀρίστων) and his direct relation to the first leader (ἀρχηγέτης) of the Judean nation (*Mos.* 1.7). By mentioning Moses's connection with the founder (Abraham) of "all the Judean nation (τοῦ σύμπαντος Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους)" this serves as praise for what Theon says is having a good city, nation, and constitution (πόλεως καὶ ἔθνους καὶ πολιτείας ἀγαθῆς) (Theon, 110.1-5).

Although Theon mentions that an encomion should praise the education (παιδεία) of the main character, along with several other aspects, Philo devotes a lengthy section to this single attribute, more than the others, describing in detail just how exceptional Moses was.[495] In

[495] Koskenniemi offers a concise treatment of the traditions of Moses's education before the Mishnah in the works of Ezekiel the Tragedian, Artapanus, Philo, Josephus, Jubilees, and *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, Erkki Koskenniemi, "Moses-a Well-Educated Man: A Look at the Educational Idea in Early Judaism," *JSP* 17 (2008): 281–96. Philo gives the lengthiest treatment on Moses's education focusing on Greek and other Gentile subjects. The works do not

praising Moses's educational prowess, Philo describes how he was taught by some of the most learned teachers available, particularly from Egypt and Greece (*Mos.* 1.21). Moses is praised for how quickly he learns and for surpassing his own instructor's capacity (ἐν οὐ μακρῷ χρόνῳ τὰς δυνάμεις ὑπερέβαλεν) (*Mos.* 1.23). For Philo, what appears to be most praiseworthy about Moses's education is the impressive all-encompassing range of topics he was supposedly able to master (*Mos.* 1.23–24).[496] Philo's list of Moses's educational acumen would have certainly been extraordinary to Philo's contemporary readers. What is interesting to know is whether Philo *believed* Moses actually learned all of these subjects. Philo concedes that his research is based on literary texts that have some similarities with known biblical writings and testimony from elders he has interviewed. The trustworthiness of his sources for their accuracy, however, is impossible to determine. Philo's goal of praising Moses's education is aptly fulfilled by describing Moses as having received training in an exhaustive range of erudite thought.

Elements of an Encomion: Mental Goods

Following the sections describing external and bodily goods, Theon next advises his students to progress to the goods of the mind/soul (ψυχικὰ ἀγαθὰ) that are embodied in the main character's correct morals (σπουδαῖα ἠθικὰ) and result in actions (πράξεις), which are later called virtue (ἀρετήν): "The goods of the soul are correct morals and the actions leading to these … (ψυχικὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ τὰ σπουδαῖα ἠθικὰ καὶ αἱ τούτοις ἀκολουθοῦσαι πράξεις)" (Theon 110.7–10). The

all agree in the content or dissemination of education as Artapanus even reverses the process making Moses the discoverer instead of the receiver of philosophy (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.27.4).

[496] Philo lists Moses's educational training as including: Arithmetic (ἀριθμοὺς), geometry (γεωμετρίαν), rhythm (ῥυθμικὴν), harmony (ἁρμονικὴν), theories of meter (μετρικὴν θεωρίαν), all kinds of music through the use of instruments (μουσικὴν τὴν σύμπασαν διά τε χρήσεως ὀργάνων), sayings about the arts (λόγων τῶν ἐν ταῖς τέχναις), Egyptian philosophy of symbols (συμβόλων φιλοσοφίαν), Greek encyclical education (ἐγκύκλιον παιδείαν Ἕλληνες), Assyrian writings (Ἀσσύρια γράμματα), and Chaldean knowledge of the heavens (τὴν τῶν οὐρανίων Χαλδαϊκὴν ἐπιστήμην).

virtuous actions the central figure exhibits are laudable traits such as being prudent (φρόνιμος), courageous (ἀνδρεῖος), pious (ὅσιος), and just (δίκαιος) among others (Theon 110.7–10). Theon suggests his students should arrange this section of the encomion by listing the virtuous action (e.g., courage) followed by the deeds (ἔργα) during the figure's lifetime that demonstrate the virtue:

> … μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰ κατορθώματα παραληψόμεθα οὐκ ἐφεξῆς διηγούμενοι· λέγοντες γὰρ ἄλλα προστίθεμεν κατὰ μίαν ἑκάστην ἀρετήν, ἔπειτα τὰ ἔργα διεξιόντες …
>
> … after these things [the external and bodily goods] we shall receive the actions and the successes, not narrating [them] in order, but we shall set up the sayings according to each virtue, then go through the works … (Theon 112.2–5)

Philo follows a similar pattern when presenting Moses's praiseworthy deeds. Although Philo does not name his section "Goods of the Mind," it is apparent from the structure of the text that he intends to include the type of arrangement Theon instructs for his students. Structurally, Philo has already covered Moses's birth, education, family background, and physical attributes in the order Theon advises. Philo leads into this next section by centering on Moses's sublime mind and intellect before launching into a series of narratives that support his claims.

Beginning at *Mos.* 1.25–27, Philo explains how Moses uses his intellect (φρόνησιν) and even has a mind (νοῦς) that is thought to be "human or divine or mixed from both (ἀνθρώπειος ἢ θεῖος ἢ μικτὸς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν)." While the word used for "mind" is different from what Theon uses, it still shows the emphasis on the inward mental capacity to affect the outer actions of the figure. Moses's mind, according to Philo, has in fact been trained by reason (λογισμὸν) in the "contest of virtue (τοὺς ἀρετῆς ἄθλους)" so that all his actions (πράξεις) would already be praiseworthy (ἐπαινετὰς) (*Mos.* 1.48). Philo is using the same concepts Theon does regarding the central figure

being praised for the connection between their mind and virtuous actions, while also employing similar wording. The similarities continue when considering the virtues both Philo and Theon use. Theon lists being prudent, temperate, courageous, and just as examples of virtues that might be used to describe the central figure (Theon 110.7-10). Philo applies each of the four main virtues Theon uses to Moses—except for courage (ἀνδρεῖος)—which he substitutes with "fortitude (καρτερίᾳ)." This close connection of listed virtues between the authors is not a chance occurrence but demonstrates their shared awareness of the virtues discussed by famous philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle.[497]

Philo, applying his knowledge of the Greek virtues and the structural outline for this section of an encomion, describes Moses's virtues of temperance, justice, and self-control and follows them with descriptive narratives that reflect how they were enacted. While Theon instructs his readers that they should list the virtue and then give examples of how that virtue was carried out in the figure's life, Philo does the same but on a larger scale. Philo mentions Moses's virtues but his narratives that reflect how he lived them are long and include additional compositional elements. Philo's narratives occasionally venture away from Moses and introduce allegory and expanded versions of traditional biblical accounts. To understand how Philo is using all this mixed material, while still writing an encomion, we should consider the goal of the composition which he gives at the end of the first work. Philo explains that this first work was meant to describe what Moses did according to his "kingly" authority (*Mos.* 1.334). The virtues that are

[497] Philo, and later Theon, were aware of the specific virtues that should be applied to central characters. Between Plato and Aristotle, they address wisdom, courage, self-mastery, and justice as virtues that a great person possesses (Plato, *Resp.* 4.427e, 6.504a; Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 3.vi.1, 3.x.1, 4.i.1, 5.i.1). Aristotle even adds generosity (among others) and Theon follows suit by adding it to his list (*Eth. nic.* 4.i.1; Theon 110.9). Philo lists Moses's virtues in different places throughout the text, but taken together, he possesses all four of the main virtues (again substituting fortitude for courage) as well as others (*Mos.* 1.25, 154).

described (external, bodily, and of the mind), initially and throughout the text, are demonstrated by Moses's actions in the narratives as he operates as a good ruler. Therefore, all of *Mos.* 1 is devoted to describing Moses's external, bodily, and mental goods, but restricts his actions to those related to his kingly authority. This is all still in line with what Theon promotes as an orderly outline of an encomion. The difference is its presentation in two works instead of one.

Philo continues his description of Moses's "goods of the mind" by describing three other actions that reflect his virtue. At the end of his first work, Philo explains that his next composition will discuss all the things Moses did correctly (κατώρθωσε) concerning his deeds as a High Priest (ἀρχιερωσύνης) and Lawgiver (νομοθετικῆς) (*Mos.* 1.334). He will later add his role as a preeminent prophet as the third evidence of his virtue. Philo communicates exactly this in the prooimion of his second work. He reiterates the purpose of the first composition and how Moses's actions were praised:

> ἡ μὲν προτέρα σύνταξίς ἐστι περὶ γενέσεως τῆς Μωυσέως καὶ τροφῆς, ἔτι δὲ παιδείας καὶ ἀρχῆς, ἣν οὐ μόνον ἀνεπιλήπτως ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα ἐπαινετῶς ἦρξε …
>
> The first composition was about the birth of Moses and his upbringing, education, and rule, which was not only blameless, but he ruled in an exceedingly praiseworthy manner … (*Mos*. 2.1)

The continuation of Moses's virtues in the second work will now focus on his actions as a high priest, lawgiver, and prophet through divine appointment:

> For he was by the providence of God, king and lawgiver and high priest and prophet, and he showed the first things in each … (*Mos.* 2.3)
>
> ἐγένετο γὰρ προνοίᾳ θεοῦ βασιλεύς τε καὶ νομοθέτης καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ προφήτης καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῳ τὰ πρωτεῖα ἠνέγκατο …

The "first things (τὰ πρωτεῖα)" here refers to the cardinal virtues (wisdom, courage, temperance, and self-control) as taught by Plato and Aristotle. The entire second work of Philo praises Moses

by taking each of the three actions and showing how he lived them in an exceptional manner. Philo's arrangement of the section follows what Theon has received, which is to start with the virtuous action followed by descriptions of the deeds that exhibit the virtue.

For Philo, Moses's virtuous actions are the four powers (δυνάμεις) that he operates in as king, lawgiver, high priest, and prophet. Since Philo has already covered Moses's kingly action in his first work, he now takes the remaining three and follows each with specific deeds from Moses's life. Here, we will use Philo's introduction of Moses as a lawgiver as an example of the structure of each of the virtues. The formulaic arrangement Philo follows is to first introduce the virtuous action: "Now first [we shall] mention the things regarding his skill as a lawgiver" (*Mos.* 2.8). Second, Philo makes an assertion that Moses was the best or the only one that ever operated at such a high level in the capacity as lawgiver: "And that he [was] the best (ἄριστος) of all the lawgivers everywhere, as many as were from the Greeks and Barbarians" (*Mos.* 2.12). This declaration of Moses as the best lawgiver also agrees with what Theon advises his students. Theon explains that the author should praise the figure for acting at the right time, for being the only one to have done the action, or for being the first to have done it (Theon 110.21-25).[498] Third, after Philo has given ample narration to support his case for the virtue of Moses and his skill in operating as a lawgiver, he offers a summary and transition into his next virtuous action: "We have already gone through two parts of the life of Moses concerning his position as king and lawgiver, and now adding the third concerning his priesthood" (*Mos.* 2.66).

[498] Philo's description of Moses as being the "most pious" ever also agrees with Theon's inclusion of piety (ὅσιος) on his list of virtues (Theon 110.7-10). Philo also lauds Moses in other parts of this section for being the only person who has embodied all four virtuous powers (*Mos.* 2.10), for being the most pious (ὁσιώτατον) of anyone who ever lived (*Mos.* 2.192), and for being the most esteemed (δοκιμώτατος) of the prophets (*Mos.* 2.187).

This example of Philo's description of Moses as a virtuous lawgiver is the structural outline he also follows for presenting his actions as a high priest (*Mos.* 2.66–187) and prophet (*Mos.* 2.187–291). The prophetic description of Moses is considerably longer because it covers different types of prophecy and narrates Moses's death, or better, transition from his earthly existence. Philo's narration of Moses's death also aligns with Theon's instructions about a praiseworthy figure's death. Theon explains that the celebrated figure should have a "good death (εὐθανασία)" along with the other external goods (Theon 110.2-6). Philo accommodates this requirement by expanding well beyond the death of Moses tradition found in Deuteronomy 34:5–6. In the biblical narrative, Moses is denied entry into the Promised Land. He dies and is buried in a valley in the land of Moab according to the mouth of YHWH, yet his actual burial place remains a mystery. Philo's narrative of Moses's death is far more exalted. There is certainly no mention of his punishment of being denied entry into the Promised Land. This is probably due to another expectation of writing an encomion. Theon explains that none of the failures or faults of the figure should be mentioned because it would be unbecoming of an encomion: "But surely it is not necessary to speak of the slanders (διαβολὰς), for it is a remembrance of the [his] faults (ἁμαρτημάτων), or [things done] secretly or by stealth, [then] we would be making an apology instead of an encomion" (Theon 112.8–11). Philo, instead, focuses on the mysterious aspect of Moses's death—not knowing where he was buried—by describing his burial and transition from Earth to heaven (*Mos.* 2.288–291). Moses is characterized as having a good death because he is departing from Earth to go to an estate in heaven (ἀποικίαν ἔμελλεν εἰς οὐρανὸν στέλλεσθαι), he changes from a life subject to death and becomes immortal (τὸν θνητὸν ἀπολιπὼν βίον ἀπαθανατίζεσθαι), he is buried by immortal powers and not by mortal hands (χερσὶν οὐ θνηταῖς ἀλλ᾽ ἀθανάτοις δυνάμεσιν), and the entire nation (σύμπαν τὸ

ἔθνος … ὅλον) mourns for him. For Philo, Moses's "good death" is essentially an apotheosis since he becomes immortal and ascends into the heavens to live with the gods.

General Compositional Education: Variant Traditions

In addition to the compositional exercises Philo learned for composing an encomion for Moses, there were also other lessons that were not as explicitly explained in a writing handbook. Although we can understand the format that Philo employed to compose the encomion, questions remain about how he arrived at the textual content (particularly, variant narrative traditions and nuances, such as the use of philosophy, allegory, and etymologies), his motivation for writing, and where compositional education might have taken place.

The variant traditions of Moses's life that Philo uses can be explained in three ways. The first two are found in his prooimion where a description of his research methods includes utilizing "sacred books" and testimony from elders of the nation (*Mos.* 1.4). Both methods can obviously lead to discrepancies between literary accounts due to the lack of cohesive oral transmission and less stringent rules of producing exact copies of texts. Although we do not know which books Philo used for reference, consulting other books to compose a new text was certainly a long-held practice.[499] The research method of interviewing and using testimony as source material in a new work was also a lesson authors practiced. Authors, such as Dionysius, attest to the controversial

[499] Polybius, in his Histories, explains how writers composing histories often rely on libraries that have memoirs and other documents readily available for consultation (Polyb. 12.25e.4; 12.27.4–5).

practice of using word of mouth testimony as an accurate source for reporting historical details—depending on one's perspective.[500]

A third possibility to explain the variant details of Moses's life is through the compositional practice known as paraphrase (παράφρασις). Theon encourages his readers (through numerous examples including Homer and Thucydides) to use this practice when retelling past events which have been recorded. He argues that it was a practice that the ancient writers used in the best manner, changing (μεταπλάσσοντες) not only the writings of other authors but also their own (Theon 62.10–24). From Theon's perspective, changing how something was written can be viewed as an improvement on the text. The compositional practice of paraphrasing then, can help explain some of the word differences and expansions found in Philo's versions of Moses's life. It should also be noted, however, that during this same period there was not a consensus about changing the details of accounts.[501]

General Compositional Education: Motivation and Function

There were certainly other Jews who lived in Alexandria and had fine educations but did not choose to write an encomion of Moses. What was the impetus for Philo to compose one? We can look again at Philo's prooimion for insight into why one would take the time to write a praise of an ancient figure's life. Along with Philo's comments, we also find that other writers in antiquity

---

[500] Dionysius mentions using word of mouth testimony as a means of accurate source material for his histories (*Ant. rom.* 1.7.3). He does, however, mention that he condemns other historians for the same practice because of the unreliability of oral details (*Ant. rom.* 1.1.4).

[501] There were claims of falsifying reports and even inventing accounts when it came to writing histories. Josephus even claims in the prooimion of his *Jewish Antiquities* that he will not add (προσθεὶς) or take away (παραλιπών) from the actual events (*A.J.* 1.17). The coexistence of approval and disapproval regarding manipulation of texts shows that compositional practices were apparently not uniform. However, understanding positive and negative comments about the practice can help the reader identify yet another process operating in antiquity that may have led to textual variation.

shared a similar conviction for creating literature that recalled figures from a distant past. The motivation and reasoning for why a writer chose to take on a laborious task such as composing an encomion or a history is usually found in the introduction section of the writing.[502] There were three recurring motivations for why authors embarked on their task: to teach the reader some aspect of virtue, to correct erroneous information, or to preserve the memory of an important figure or event. Philo explains that his motivations are twofold: to correct the omission of Moses's life by Greek historiographers and to preserve his virtuous actions for a wider audience (*Mos.* 1.1–3).[503]

Connected to the author's motivation for writing is the intended function of the text. Both history and encomion focus on events and characters from the past. There was an interest in past actions because one of the common beliefs was that the lives and events of the past could provide insight and lessons for those living in the present and future. This concept goes back even to the time of Aristotle, who emphasized that the things that occurred in the past should be remembered because of their benefit for those living in the future (*Rhet.* 3.16.11).[504] Josephus is similar to Philo in that he uses the scared writings (ἱερῶν γραμμάτων) of the Jewish tradition of his time—which included some form of the writings attributed to Moses—and considered them as history. According to Josephus, the accounts given in these histories are also beneficial for

[502] Polybius and Josephus describe the hardships of research and writing history. Polybius mentions that research for writing history can be dangerous and is hard work and expensive (*Hist.* 12.27.4–7). Josephus explains how writing his history was such a great task that he procrastinated and even needed encouragement from those who wanted to read it to finally complete the work (*A.J.* 1.7–8).
[503] Josephus and Dionysius share similar rationales for composing their histories. Both writers feel compelled to preserve the virtuous actions of prominent figures while also desiring that their reading audience learns from their presentation of history (Josephus, *B.J.* 1.15, *A.J.* 1.8, 12; Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 1.5.3, 1.6.3–4).
[504] Likewise, Polybius also echoes this sentiment explaining how the knowledge of past actions shows the correct way to live (Polyb. 1–2).

those who want to learn from it.[505] These few examples indicate that along with the orthodox preservation and praise of past actions was the function of the text as an exemplar for the audience to learn and imitate. While Philo does not explicitly express this point, the implicit understanding of history during his time shows that this was part of the function of his encomion for Moses.

General Compositional Education: Locations

Philo's *Mos.* 1, 2 provides insight not only into how he learned to write an encomion, but also provides clues as to *where* Philo received his compositional education. Although Philo does not plainly state where he learned to compose his encomion, he does describe locations where education took place. The question of where Philo received his training is important because it offers explanations as to how he acquired writing skills and literary acumen that included a breath of knowledge ranging from Hebrew narrative traditions to complex interpretations (including etymologies and allegory) and familiarity with philosophical writers and maxims. Did Philo learn each of these subjects at a Jewish location, a Greco-Roman institution, or a combination of both?

Philo mentions synagogues, "houses of prayer," and gymnasiums as all being locations that offered some type of educational activity.[506] Philo describes the House of Prayer as a place

---

[505] The letter of the Apostle Paul to the church in Rome also reflects the belief that the written records of the past are exemplars for present and future behavior: "For what was written before (προεγράφη) was written for our instruction (διδασκαλίαν), so that through the perseverance and comfort of the scriptures we might have hope" (Rom 15:4).

[506] Levine provides a detailed discussion on the various names applied to the meeting place of Jews in Jerusalem and the Diaspora, Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2005). 138–139, 238. Levine suggests that the differences between synagogue and "house of prayer" may be due to institutional emphasis.

where Jews of his own time gathered on the Sabbath day for all types of learning (*Mos.* 2.216).[507] The questions of how and where Philo learned both Hebrew and Greek traditions may be answered from this description. Philo describes the house (or place) of prayer (προσευκτήρια) as being a "place of instruction" (διδασκαλεῖα) that offered teaching in the main virtues among other subjects related to the divine and humankind (*Mos.* 2.216). The inclusion of the major Greek virtues is interesting because they include the ones mentioned by Plato, Aristotle, and Theon: prudence, courage, self-control, justice, and piety (φρονήσεως καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης εὐσεβείας τε καὶ ὁσιότητος καὶ συμπάσης ἀρετῆς).[508]

Philo's description of the Therapeutae reveals further fluidity between groups as they are described as having sacred rooms (οἴκημα ἱερόν) that were called holy (σεμνεῖον) and monastery (μοναστήριον) where they studied the laws, piety, divine oracles, musical texts, and the mysteries (*Contempl.* 25). They also met on the Sabbath day as a divided community (between male and female) for Torah instruction (*Contempl.* 30-34). Their shared interest in literary types and reading practices with other groups, especially Greek education, is also significant. Just as Greek education teaches myths, famous figures, poetry, philosophy, and methods of allegorical interpretation, the Therapeutae apparently shared a similar curriculum. Philo describes how the Therapeutae study and "philosophize" (φιλοσοφοῦσι) through the sacred writings (*Contempl.* 28). They also have writings of ancient men (συγγράμματα παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν) which contained

[507] See Levine's discussion on the various forms of educational activity took place in the synagogue. Levine notes that study on the Sabbath may have expanded beyond Torah reading into more advances topics but also cautions that these studies and practices may not have been uniform across locations. Ibid., 144–145, 155–157. For additional discussion on educational locations, meeting times, and curriculums available during Philo's time, see, David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*, (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 244–245.
[508] The point here is Philo explains that there were several synagogues in and around Alexandria that groups, such as the Essenes, used as places to learn halakhic ideals concerning piety, justice, knowledge, citizenship, and distinguishing good from bad (*Legat.* 132–134; *Prob.* 81–83).

ideas for allegory and were used as exemplar texts (*Contempl.* 29). Along with their study of these texts and methods of interpretation, Philo also explains that they made songs and hymns to God (ποιοῦσιν ᾄσματα καὶ ὕμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν) possibly demonstrating the practice of composition (*Contempl.* 29). The Therapeutae then provide another example of a community that practices education which even includes an explanation of how they learned their method of allegory. It would certainly not be unprecedented then to have Jews learning methods of allegory in their own communities. This would help to explain how Philo would know how to construct his symbolic comparison concerning the burning bush if he learned the technique through similar methods (*Mos.* 65–86).

Some of the writings of ancient men may have also included Greek authors who practiced allegory and poetry in addition to Jewish ones.[509] Unfortunately, because both the writings of ancient men and the sacred writings are unnamed, we can only conjecture about their authors and contents. Still, it shows that some communities employed these practices and were apparently not exclusively studied in Greek educational institutions. Philo also appears to be familiar with the activities of the gymnasium even mentioning its benefit to the body and soul (*Spec.* 2.229).[510]

---

[509] Certainly, Philo's knowledge and use of Greek poets throughout his corpus of writings lends itself to his being trained in Greek education. Koskenniemi offers a detailed study of Philo's use of Greek poets and concludes that he initially learned the words of the poets (e.g., Homer, Hesiod, and Solon) during his training at the Alexandrian gymnasium, Erkki Koskenniemi, "Philo and Greek Poets," *JSJ* 41 (2010): 301–22.

[510] It is undoubted that some Jews participated in Hellenistic educational institutions, such as the gymnasium, and embraced Greek education and culture while others were resistant to its inclusion. Discussions of these various responses of Jews to Hellenistic culture, and particularly education, have been well researched and elucidated by scholars such as Hengel, Lieberman, and Mendelson. See, Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, (London: SCM Press, 1974), 103–106, 310–314; Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine; Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E.-IV Century C.E*, Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, V. L8 (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), 100–114; Alan Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*, Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 7 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982), 81–84. Narrative attestations of the response of Jews to a gymnasium in Jerusalem are recounted in Josephus, *Antiquities* 12.240–241 and 2 Maccabees 4:7–15.

This would make it feasible that Jews of the time could learn compositional education in Jewish settings such as the synagogue/House of Prayer, other special locations, as well as in the gymnasium.[511]

Conclusions

Philo's *De vita Mosis* serves as an exemplar of how a Jewish author living during the Second Temple Period learned to incorporate Greek education into an otherwise Jewish text. The combination of Philo's text agreeing with Theon's exercises and other ancient authors' comments about literary practices provides more insight into what some Jews learned to produce their texts. The reconstruction of Philo's compositional education helps to provide a framework during a period of Hellenistic influx at a time when social and cultural boundaries were merging. It is certain that Jewish writers made use of Greek culture and education, but this approach allows more clarity into the process of how they gained and applied their knowledge while also retaining their Jewish heritage. By beginning with the author's compositional education and writing expectations it helps to explain not only why certain things were written but also the way they were written. In other words, some expressions may have been a matter of compositional norms more than sectarian theology or even political bias. Additional recognition of the nuances of compositional education should lead to improved ways of reading and interpreting the varied Jewish texts that characterize the literary evolution of the era.

[511] The notion that Jews participated in Greek institutions, such as the gymnasium, is further supported by the so-called "Rescript of Claudius" otherwise known as the *Letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians* (41 CE) wherein the Emperor restricts the use of the gymnasium from Jews living in Alexandria, Egypt. The letter is found in the Loeb series. Arthur S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri*, Loeb Classical Library [Greek Authors] (London, New York: W. Heinemann, G. P. Putnam's, 1932), 86–87. The word for "gymnasium" here is γυμνασιαρχικοῖς. The letter indicates that the Jews still have other privileges, but they are not to force their way into the gymnasium.

CHAPTER 8

Rules for Writing Narrative: Explaining the Variant Accounts of the LXX Translation

Introduction

The Letter of Aristeas—a third or second-century BCE narrative (διήγησις), which describes the encounters between Jewish scholars sent from Jerusalem to their host Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BCE) in Alexandria, Egypt—retells the circumstances surrounding the translation of the Septuagint (more appropriately, the Jewish Torah or Law) from the Hebrew language to Greek.[512] Later Jewish authors, such as Aristobulus of Paneas, Philo of Alexandria, and Flavius Josephus, recount the same event. The occasion of the translation of the sacred Hebrew writings is well-known and significant to each writer for different reasons, but how they retell the details of the event differ from Aristeas and one another in interesting ways. The question that interests us here is, what led to the narrative differences in the later author's retellings? I propose that some of the differences between the later authors' and Aristeas's account were intentional and can be explained by the authors' employment of specific writing techniques learned during the process of compositional education. By "compositional education," I mean how the authors learned to write using practical guidelines for composing a coherent narrative and not merely the

[512] In addition to its narrative about the translation of the Hebrew law into Greek, Aristeas is also studied as for its unique Jewish perspective on Torah traditions and Hellenistic interaction, in response to those found in Sirach, for example. Boccaccini discusses how one of the main focuses of Aristeas, aside from the much shorter sections describing the translation, is its demonstration of a different attitude, or system of thought towards Hellenistic culture. He explains how Aristeas has polemical and apologetic features for understanding a new alternative form of Judaism. Boccaccini explains "Dialogic Judaism" as a way that Jews encountered and interacted with Greek education and culture, in a tolerant fashion, while not abandoning their Judaic traditions altogether. Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E to 200 C.E.*, (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991), 163–165, 184–185.

details of learning grammar or syntax. These guidelines for writing narrative may have been what governed the literary decisions that the authors made in deciding what information to add, omit, or revise. Additionally, this examination aides our understanding of how some Second Temple Jewish narratives were written, as well as practical explanations for the multiplicity of variant versions.

Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus serve as comparative partners for the Letter of Aristeas, arguably the earliest among the accounts, because they represent the closest, in terms of chronology, and most detailed parallels to its narrative. The evaluation will progress chronologically through each of the three comparative texts (Aristobulus, Philo, then Josephus) juxtaposing selections from these to Aristeas. The selected differences between Aristeas and the authors will be explained by writing techniques or expectations the authors learned to produce their text. The instructions and expectations for composing their texts come from writing guidelines described by Theon, a first-century CE rhetor, and other writers, such as Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (often found in their introductions). We will also consider how Jewish authors could have gained access to learn Greek rhetorical writing techniques.

Rationale for Research

Interest in the origin of the so-called Septuagint generally focuses on issues such as the veracity of the narrative account, its reception by the Judean community, the method of translation, and whether or not the text is representative of a Septuagint *Vorlage*.[513] In addition to these

[513] How one should refer to the “Letter of Aristeas” remains debatable. Scholars are divided on the most useful designation for the text. Designations such as Book of Aristeas, Pseudo-Aristeas, and Letter of Aristeas all have their supporters and detractors. I tend to lean in the direction of Book of Aristeas because of its more ancient use and the fact that it is not a letter in form but represents more of a narrative; however, in this study I will continue to use

significant inquiries, comparative studies have also been done by Septuagint scholars, such as Swete and Jellicoe, that examine the correlations between the different accounts of how the Hebrew text was translated into Greek.[514] Comparative approaches are useful because they focus on differences between the accounts in a detailed manner but the explanation of the details—in terms of how or why they were made—is often lacking. I have not come across a study that comparatively evaluates the differences from a compositional vantage point or resolves how those differences correspond with writing practices of the time.[515] This does not mean scholars have not offered any comments about compositional factors regarding the differences between the texts. Sylvie Honigman examines the translation of the Septuagint account in Aristeas (which she refers to as the Book of Aristeas) by contrasting its content and structure with compositional practices familiar to Hellenistic society of the time—in her words, "Hellenistic Historiographical standards." She argues that fundamental questions of genre, function, and historical validity cannot be appropriately answered without first situating the text in its historical compositional context, which includes understanding the author's literary training. While, Honigman's approach is done on a larger scale using the entire work of Aristeas, this study focuses on the

---

either Aristeas or the *Letter of Aristeas* and its abbreviation when referring to the ancient text for sake of wider familiarity and convenience.

[514] Swete, for example, is concise with his comments about the relationships between Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus to Aristeas. Concerning Aristobulus, he expresses uncertainty about whether he used Aristeas as the source behind his summary report. Swete describes Philo's narrative as being an independent Alexandrian tradition that is hardly consistent with Aristeas's version; while Josephus is explained as being reliant upon Aristeas's text to the point of being nearly identical. Henry Barclay Swete, H. St J. Thackeray, and Richard Rusden Ottley, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1914).12–13.

[515] Janowitz compares the translation accounts of Aristeas, Aristobulus, and Philo from an exegetical perspective. She argues that parts of the story's plot are embellishments, and that each author creates historical details around the translation account that agree with their exegetical interests to support their self-presentation as an authoritative exegete. The explanation of the differences between the accounts is explained from a motivational standpoint of the author in terms of their exegetical aims. The relationship between the text, author, and exegete is the primary model. Philo, for example, needs the original Hebrew and Greek texts, the translators, and even his own mind to be understood as divinely inspired for him to have exegetical authority. Naomi Janowitz, "The Rhetoric of Translation: Three Early Perspectives on Translating Torah," *The Harvard Theological Review* 84, no. 2 (1991). 129, 138–139. My approach differs in that I am interested in understanding the changes in the narratives from the author's compositional learning; however, they are similar in trying to understand the author's motivations for altering (if that is truly the case) the received narrative.

literary decisions that Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus made which led to their rendition of the translation account.[516] This approach takes us closer to answering which compositional techniques contributed to the differences between their narratives.

Aristeas is typically considered the oldest of the four versions and comments range from the other three having direct dependence to having no knowledge of or influence from it.[517] Scholars also suspect there is a high degree of embellishment added to the narrative, but there is hardly any explanation for how a writer learned to include this or what they thought about the practice. In other words, why would a writer who knew the story of the translation of the Septuagint in Aristeas—or even another version of it—want to change or add details to the narrative that were not a part of the received tradition? More importantly, what can their compositional education and writing expectations (particularly for narrative) tell us about how these variants came to

---

[516] Honigman situates Aristeas as a Jewish work that represents Alexandrian elite education and fits the genre category of Hellenistic Historiography with authorial creativeness. The function of Aristeas is as a Charter Myth that gives the Septuagint divine status for an educated Jewish elite readership (7-8, 145). Regarding the relationship between the three texts, Honigman acknowledges that scholarly debate concerning the order of priority and dependence between Aristobulus and Aristeas are contentious and that both may reflect a shared earlier oral tradition (90). Philo is mentioned as possibly knowing the Aristeas textual tradition, while his testimony in *De vita Mosis* is viewed as apologetic with regard to the Septuagint's translation (3, 124). Josephus is noted as certainly knowing the work of Aristeas and paraphrasing sections of it in his *Antiquitates Judaicae* (3). Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London ; New York: Routledge, 2003).

[517] Jellicoe, like most, sees *The Letter of Aristeas* as being the central text for the origin of the Septuagint. Jellicoe's discussion of the transmission history of the Septuagint covers ancient authors such as Philo and Josephus's reports of the translation narrative. For Jellicoe, Philo's awareness of Aristeas's version (as a learned Alexandrian Jew) was probable, though not certain. He does mention that while scholarship is divided on the matter, most will allow an explanation that the two authors at least shared a common tradition. Jellicoe addresses the embellishments or differences between Philo and Aristeas as being either Philo's inventions or his understanding of a tradition that was circulating during his own time. These changes to the narrative are thought of as "improvements" on the text—a customary practice for narratives about famous events. The discussion on Josephus is shorter, only noting that he certainly knew Aristeas (due to direct mentioning) and paraphrased much of the text while keeping the vocabulary (p. 30). Aristobulus is mentioned, as it relates to the early dating of Aristeas (ca. 170 BCE) by Orlinsky and Hadas, as being more likely to have cited Aristeas as his source than the opposite. Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993). 30, 38–40, 49.

be?[518] The aims of this study are twofold: first, to find out which compositional rules or expectations (learned by Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus) led to divergences from Aristeas's narrative, and second, how this knowledge informs our understanding about the process of writing narratives and its impact on interpreting variant accounts.

Texts for Comparison

The author of the Letter of Aristeas likely received an education that included Greek writing techniques, based on the content and structure of the narrative. The three authors that are compared to Aristeas's account show elite compositional skills and offer a convincing case for receiving training in Greek rhetoric. These texts were selected, however, not only because they show the writers' education and familiarity with the translation narrative, but because of how they report divergent details in the account. We will proceed by introducing each of the authors with the context for how and why they describe the translation event found in Aristeas's account. Aristobulus of Paneas (second century BCE), the earliest of our three authors, is often considered the father of Jewish allegorical philosophy and is allegedly associated with the Aristotelian peripatetic school. Aristobulus, whose fragmentary works are preserved by later Christian authors, such as Clement of Alexandrian and Eusebius, is known for his allegorical interpretations of the Torah and as a precursor to the later Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria. Aristobulus briefly mentions the translation of the Hebrew writings into Greek, as

[518] I must credit Paul Veyne's excellent book and intriguing research approach of addressing the question of whether or not the Greeks believed their own myths from the ancient authors' (generally historians) vantage point. His vast and detailed compilation of what ancient writers communicated about Greek myth made me want to pursue comparable questions about not only belief but also what they learned to produce their compositions. I am taking a similar approach by trying to gain insight from the ancient writers themselves on what they said or thought about producing narratives or compiling data for writing histories in particular, to explain why variants occur in the literary traditions. Paul Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths?*: An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination, Grecs Ont-Ils Cru À Leurs Mythes? English (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

preserved in Eusebius's (fourth-century CE Christian historian) *Praeparatio evangelica* (Preparation for the Gospel) and has the least amount of details common with the Letter of Aristeas. He recollects the translation event tangentially, while focusing on the primacy of the Torah and its incorporation by famous Greek philosophers such as Plato and Pythagoras. Aristobulus's work is valuable because it represents one of the earliest mentions of the event that can be contrasted with Aristeas's more detailed version. Philo of Alexandria (20-50 BCE), a Jewish-Hellenistic aristocrat trained in philosophy, offers a unique retelling of the translation event. He mentions his version of the account in the treatise entitled *De vita Mosis* (Concerning the Life of Moses), which retells the legendary life of Moses and argues for his supremacy as a lawgiver, prophet, High Priest, and king. The narrative begins with Moses's birth and upbringing and continues by recalling many of his miraculous moments (both biblical and extra-biblical), often with extended explanations and additional details. Including the translation of the Hebrew Torah into Greek in this account mainly serves as support to his claim that Moses is the greatest lawgiver due to the preeminence of the Torah and other renowned leaders being interested in it. Philo describes the events leading up to and after the translation account but often includes details that are not found in Aristeas's version. Philo's narrative provides a distinct variant account; it preserves details found only in his version that are not mentioned in any other account. The third author, the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus (37–100 CE), presents a version of the Septuagint translation that agrees the most with Aristeas's account. Josephus is acquainted with Aristeas's version of the translation account and even mentions him by name. Josephus's *Antiquitates judaicae* (Antiquities of the Jews) retells many of the famous events and characters found in the Hebrew bible and includes expanded traditions from Jewish historical and literary traditions. He aims to provide a true and accurate history of the Jews from the earliest period to

his own contemporary time because he believes that previous historians have perverted their history (*Ant.* 11.4). Josephus's narrative about the translation of the Septuagint fits within his overall goal of demonstrating that the Jews had received positive interest and respect from famous foreign rulers, such as Ptolemy II Philadelphus and Alexander the Great, regarding their nation's laws and traditions.[519] His version of the Septuagint translation follows Aristeas's narrative closely, while introducing some interesting adjustments to the details.

Each author's presentation of the translation of the Septuagint will be considered respectively in chronological order. The examination is not meant to be exhaustive but rather to serve as a starting point for investigating whether their divergences from Aristeas's version can be explained by specific compositional factors.

Comparative Methodology

For most scholars, including Jobes, Silva, and Hengel, the earliest accounts of the origin and translation of the Septuagint are found in Aristeas, Aristobulus (preserved in Eusebius's *Praeparatio evangelica*), Philo's *De vita Mosis*, and Josephus's *Antiquitates judaicae*.[520] Other accounts provide additional details about the occasion (both in later Rabbinic and Christian traditions) but these four will be the subject of comparison because of their relative chronological proximity and succession as well as their lengthy narrative style (except for the brevity of

[519] On Josephus's report that Alexander the Great met with Jewish leadership in Jerusalem, see *Ant.* 11.325-331. However, most scholars view his report as an embellishment or fiction.

[520] Jobes and Silva mention Aristeas as the earliest of the witnesses to the Septuagint translation—although most of the narrative is viewed as unhistorical by scholarship. The value of later writers is minimized as adding "little information of substance." Philo is mentioned specifically as being embellished and relying on a separate earlier tradition from Aristeas. Karen H. Jobes and Silva Moises, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000). 36. Hengel explains that Aristeas is the oldest witness for the translation of the Septuagint but only the dating can be trusted as historically accurate. Josephus's report is said to be dependent on Aristeas's account, while Philo is mentioned with regard to his divergence from Aristeas by emphasizing the miraculous nature of the translation. Martin Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon, Old Testament Studies* (Edinburgh; New York: T & T Clark, 2002). 25–26.

Aristobulus).[521] Additionally, part of the goal is to demonstrate Jewish writing practices and what these writers learned to produce their texts, since there is a lack of information about what instruction they received for writing. Using these three authors provides explicit evidence of Jewish knowledge and training in specific Greek writing techniques. The comparison itself will be restricted to analyzing the descriptive details of the Septuagint and its translation rather than the entire narrative in Aristeas. The focus will not necessarily be on details such as the prologue, the presentation of gifts, or the banquet scene; instead, only the elements relevant to the description and translation of the Jewish Law itself will be considered.[522] This allows the focus to remain on examining the similarities and differences between the four accounts without getting mired in peripheral details. The evaluation will progress chronologically through each of the three comparative texts (Aristobulus, Philo, then Josephus) juxtaposing selections from them to Aristeas. Each of the selected differences found between Aristeas and one of the authors will be explained by a plausible contemporary writing technique or expectation that the authors learned to produce the text. The instructions and expectations for composing their texts will come from actual writing guidelines described by Theon (a first-century CE rhetor) and from descriptions of writing expectations from ancient writers, such as Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

[521] For example, *b. Meg.* 9A and Justin, *1 Apol.* 31.

[522] For the clarity and ease of this discussion I will use the traditional anachronistic term "Septuagint" to refer to the collection of writings, understanding that there is debate as to what it should be called as well as which writings were translated. Clearly, the Septuagint that has been transmitted is not the same product as described in the narrative. Additionally, I will use "translation" when speaking broadly about the work of the seventy-two elders, despite the ambiguity that is raised by the different Greek terms used to describe it. In the section on Josephus's version of the account, there will be a brief discussion of alternative ways to differentiate the terms.

The goal of this approach is to reverse engineer the narratives to show the compositional decisions from the author's perspective, and how they might have learned these mostly Greek rhetorical writing techniques.

Aristobulus of Paneas

In comparison to Philo and Josephus's versions of Aristeas's translation narrative, Aristobulus is certainly the least detailed of the three but still bears a connection to our main text. Aristobulus's account generally holds the distinctive primary position of the three in terms of traditional transmission history, despite its brevity.[523] Although, we must rely upon the fourth-century CE historian Eusebius to provide us with Aristobulus's words about the translation of the Septuagint, he could preserve a tradition that is older than Philo's and Josephus's respective accounts.[524]

---

[523] Herbert T. Andrews, in his introduction to the *Letter of Aristeas* § 3, discusses the view of Schürer, who argues that Aristobulus is dependent on Aristeas because he includes the anachronism of Demetrius being head of the library as Aristeas does. Robert Henry Charles, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. Robert Henry Charles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913). 85. Swete expresses uncertainty about whether or not Aristobulus borrowed his wording from Aristeas but he does believe that his words (if the fragments are authentic) represent beliefs that were held by literate Alexandrian Jews and were valuable because they agree with some of the main points of Aristeas's narrative. Henry Barclay Swete, H. St J. Thackeray, and Richard Rusden Ottley, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1914). 13. Borchardt is cautious about Aristobulus being earlier than Aristeas and dismisses it as being too fragmentary to be of any use for discussion. Francis Borchardt, "The Lxx Myth and the Rise of Textual Fixity," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 43, no. 1 (2012). 9. Rajak also shares Borchardt's uncertainty about who was the first to write down the translation account or which text influenced the other. She mentions how the Aristobulus may be independent of Aristeas as well as the "Evolution of the story", how the narrative of the Septuagint translation developed over time. Tessa Rajak, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009). 34-35.

[524] For an alternative view, Wasserstein notes that Aristobulus's status as primary and historical is "dubious" at best. He cites problems with the veracity of the fragments and testimonia that describe Aristobulus and his supposed comments about the Septuagint translation. Wasserstein's doubts arise from the relatively late dates of the authors (Clement and Eusebius) and the common propensity of writers to either invent or alter evidence to fit their literary aims. The reference, in letter-form, to Aristobulus in 2 Maccabees 1:10 is viewed as a forgery. Due to the lack of pre-Christian references to Aristobulus's knowledge of or connection to the Septuagint tradition, Aristobulus's brief version of the event is viewed as dependent on Aristeas instead of vice versa. Abraham Wasserstein and David Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 29–34.

Eusebius uses Aristobulus to support his belief that Greek philosophers learned their philosophy from the Hebrews.[525] According to Eusebius, Aristobulus—a member of the Peripatetic school of thought—explained how famous Greek philosophers, such as Plato (ca. 429–347 BCE) and Pythagoras (ca. 580–500 BCE), employed philosophy from Judean writings to form their philosophical treatises (*Praep. ev.* 13.12.1). The main point in Aristobulus and Eusebius is that the Judean law is the basis and source of Greek Philosophy. The central concern related to their proclamation is, how did the Greeks gain access to Jewish legal and narrative texts? The problem was that their writings were traditionally known to be written with Hebrew characters (although, Philo suggests Chaldean letters), a language that the Greeks were not known for using, and this linguistic barrier led to Eusebius introducing the Septuagint translation narrative—found in his copy of Aristeas—to explain the anomaly.

> But before coming to this point, I think it necessary to set plainly before my readers, how the oracles of the Jews passed to the Greeks, and what was the method settled for the interpretation (ἑρμηνείας) of the sacred writings entrusted to them; showing also the number and character of the interpreters, and the great zeal of the king, whereby those oracles came to be translated (μεταβολῆς) into the Greek language … (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8.1.5 [Gifford]).

Aristobulus's descriptive summary merely serves as an auxiliary to his to his central thesis that the Greeks had access to a translated version of the Judean law *before* and after the famous account with Ptolemy Philadelphus; the latter was presumably a more complete collection of the Torah that included the prophetic, historical, and wisdom literature.

> It is evident that Plato closely followed our legislation and has carefully studied the several precepts contained in it. For others before Demetrius Phalereus, and prior to the supremacy of Alexander and the Persians, have translated (διηρμήνευται) both the narrative of the exodus of the Hebrews our fellow countrymen from Egypt, and the fame of all that had happened to them, and the conquest of the land, and the exposition of the whole Law; so that it is manifest that many things have been borrowed by the aforesaid philosopher, for he is very learned: as also Pythagoras transferred many of our precepts and inserted them in his own system of doctrines. But the entire translation (ἑρμηνεία) of all the contents of our law was made in the time of the king surnamed Philadelphus, thy ancestor, who

[525] That Greek philosophers "learned" or "began" (from the Greek word ὁρμάω), their philosophy from the Hebrews.

brought greater zeal to the work, which was managed by Demetrius Phalereus. (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.1 [Gifford]).

Aristobulus's description presents his readers with an explanation for how the Judean law came into the possession of the Greeks by recounting a summary of the tradition that later becomes so well-known. His summary agrees with some of the fundamental elements of the translation narrative found in Aristeas, Josephus, and Philo. For example, Ptolemy Philadelphus was a primary proponent of the translation initiative, the work of the seventy-two elders was referred to as an "interpretation" (ἑρμηνεία), and Demetrius of Phalerus was in charge of the library.[526] Aristobulus was clearly not attempting to provide a comprehensive historical narration of the events leading up to the translation as Aristeas, Philo, and Josephus were closer to doing; instead, he selected specific details that were relevant to evidencing his point. Aristobulus (a Hebrew) interestingly credits Ptolemy and Demetrius for bringing about the production of the Septuagint but omits any mention of his fellow countrymen—Eleazar and the seventy-two elders—who were traditionally credited with producing the translation in Aristeas's version. This omission is undoubtedly due to the emphasis placed on the reception of the Jewish law by foreign leaders of esteem. Aristobulus's version of the translation account also differs from Aristeas by focusing on a prior translation of the Hebrew scriptures. Although both accounts mention a prior translation, Aristobulus offers more details about its contents and origination before the Persians and Alexander the Great. The differences between the accounts can be explained by understanding the purpose of Aristobulus's narrative and which rules for writing governed his composition. When Aristeas mentions the previous translations, he includes them as smaller details within the larger narrative but not as the main point of focus.

---

[526] Of course, Aristeas, Philo, and Josephus also incorporate additional terms such as μεταγραφή and μεταβάλλω, suggesting that the work of the elders was twofold and might have incorporated an interpretation and a translation.

> Scrolls of the Law of the Jews, together with a few others, are missing (from the library), for these (works) are written in Hebrew characters and language. But they have been transcribed (σεσήμανται) somewhat carelessly (ἀμελέστερον) and not as they should be, according to the report of the experts, because they have not received royal patronage. (Let. Aris. 30 [Shutt, *OTP*])

> He [Ptolemy] said to Demetrius, "How is it that after such great works were (originally) completed, none of the historians or poets took it upon himself to refer to them? "He said, "Because the legislation was holy and had come from God, and indeed, some of those who made the attempt were smitten by God, and refrained from their design." Moreover, he said that he had heard Theopompus declare that, just when he was about to quote in a misleading way some of the previously translated (προηρμηνευμένων) passages from the Law, he had a mental upset for more than thirty days. (Let. Aris. 312–314 [Shutt, *OTP*])

Aristeas first mentions the previous translation through Demetrius, who negatively describes it as being carelessly translated. The point of Demetrius describing an inferior edition was to emphasize the need for a superior one. Furnishing further details about the previous edition was unnecessary because it was already considered lackluster and replaceable. Mentioning a previously translated edition of the Law that was used by Theopompus was also beside the point, because the emphasis was not on the translated Law but rather on how Theopompus intended to use its contents.[527] Further comments by Aristeas about the previous edition's translation process, when it was completed, or its contents, were irrelevant to the narrative because the new translation was meant to supersede it. For Aristobulus, the prior translation was not maligned in the same way. Although he mentions that the translation of the Hebrew writings completed under Ptolemy and Demetrius was done with more zeal (μείζονα φιλοτιμίαν), the prior translation is not considered defective; instead, it serves as the positive linchpin for his argument that Greek philosophers studied and utilized the Hebrew writings to build their philosophical arguments. Understanding Aristobulus's purpose for mentioning the previous translation and the writing rules he followed to express his point, helps explain why his account differs from Aristeas's. He

[527] The earlier translation is described by two different words σεσήμανται and προηρμηνευμένων, with προηρμηνευμένων being closer to what is used (often a form of ἑρμανεύω) to describe the new translation edition in Aristeas and Aristobulus, as well as Philo and Josephus. There is difficulty with understanding the sense of σεσήμανται and what it implies for the previous edition.

mentions the translations to show the antiquity of the Jewish laws and to prove that famous philosophers, such as Plato and Pythagoras, consulted them for their philosophical value; however, the narrative framework he uses to communicate his ideas leads to the differences. Aristobulus's narrative form and content has similarities to Theon and Aristotle's instructions for writing and suggests an implicit connection. Aristobulus does not narrate the entire endeavor of how the Hebrew scriptures were translated into Greek, instead, he offers what Theon refers to as a 'straightforward statement' about it. Theon suggests different ways to construct a narrative: presenting facts as a "statement" is one possibility that helps explain what Aristobulus was doing.

> Since we are accustomed to setting out the facts (πράγματα) sometimes as making a straightforward statement (ἀποφαινόμενοι) and sometimes as doing something more than making a factual statement, and sometimes in the form of questions, and sometimes as things we seek to learn about, and sometimes as things about which we are in doubt, and sometimes as a making a command, sometimes expressing a wish, and sometimes swearing to something, sometimes addressing the participants, sometimes advancing suppositions, sometimes using dialogue, it is possible to produce varied narrations in all these ways. (Theon 87 [Kennedy])

Aristobulus's statement of facts is meant to communicate how Plato and others studied and appropriated the Jewish laws from a prior translation to their philosophies. These facts also help to determine the genre of Aristobulus's narrative as historical because it aligns with Theon and Aristotle's descriptions that narratives ought to relate things from the past.

> In historical writing (ἱστορίᾳ) it is perhaps appropriate to spin things out and to begin far back and to explain some of the things that seem incidental … (Theon 83.24–25 [Kennedy])

> In deliberative oratory narrative is very rare, because no one can narrate things to come; but if there is narrative (διήγησις), it will be of things past (τῶν γενομένων ἔσται), in order that, being reminded of them, the hearers may take better counsel about the future. (Aristotle *Rhet.* 16.11 [Freese, LCL])

Aristobulus crafts his historical narrative by relaying the actions of past figures (Plato, Pythagoras, Ptolemy, and Demetrius) as well as significant moments, such as the translation and

appropriation of the Jewish law books. As he presents the historical details, he also follows Theon's instructions for a narrative to be concise and to have a chief point.

> In the same way, the narration is concise (σύντομος ἡ διήγησις) from what is said and how it is said. Conciseness (ἡ συντομία λόγος) is language signifying the most important of the facts, not adding what is not necessary nor omitting what is necessary to the subject and the style. Conciseness arises from the contents when we do not combine many things together, do not mix them in with other things, and when we leave out what seems to be assumed; when we do not begin too far back in time and do not lavish words on incidentals, as do those who acquire the habit of narrating events subsequent to those in the case. (Theon 83.13–23 [Kennedy])

> … but in speaking a narration (διήγησιν) one ought to look to the chief point (κεφάλαιον) of the whole subject that he has set out, bringing into the narration (διηγήσει) only things that complement this. (Theon 83.26–28 [Kennedy])

Although Aristeas offers a sprawling narrative, including dialogue between characters and descriptions of the law book's grandeur, Aristobulus offers only the necessary facts of translation. His report is restricted to details that communicate his main point—that the translation was used by other great philosophers—and does not delve into peripheral matters which would make the narrative longer. Aristobulus's framework for his narrative statement of facts (i.e., conciseness, past details, and having a chief point) and purpose to show how previous philosophers used the Jewish laws helped to determine which details to include or exclude. The way he describes the prior translation differs from Aristeas because it functions as a positive reinforcement to explain how renowned philosophers used its contents as instructional sources for their teachings. His description does three things: it alludes to the prior translation's antiquity (before the Persian era) as proof for its long history of relevance and reverence, provides the prior translation's contents (exodus, conquest of Canaan, and the Mosaic Torah), and identifies Plato, Pythagoras, Ptolemy, and Demetrius as famous figures who transferred the precepts of the law into their own teachings. Aristeas does not make the same claims as Aristobulus; therefore, he can describe the prior translation as inferior because the new one under Ptolemy is intended to

be its successor. Aristobulus's description of a zealous translation of the entire law made under Ptolemy does not differ substantially from Aristeas's report.

Aristobulus's written remains, reputation as a peripatetic philosopher, and teacher of Ptolemy (whether true or not) suggest that he possessed an advanced degree of education.[528] Attestations to Aristobulus's acumen are difficult to substantiate because they are made by later second-hand writers. References to Aristobulus as a teacher, philosopher, and author make it plausible that he had access to and compiled information about how the Jewish law was translated—whether through oral tradition, a copy of Aristeas's text, or another variant version (perhaps an Ur-Text)—to produce his narrative statement.

Philo of Alexandria

A primary source of comparison for understanding the differences between Philo's account of the Septuagint translation and Aristeas's is the *progymnasmata* (preliminary exercises) traditionally attributed to Theon.[529] Not much is known about Theon as a historical figure, aside from what is reported about him in the *Suda*, a tenth-century Greek Byzantine encyclopedia. The

---

[528] 2 Maccabees 1:10 mentions that he was Ptolemy's (probably Philometor) teacher. Wasserstein sees difficulties with the validity of the letter in 2 Macc 1:10 as well as the later reputation of Aristobulus preserved by later Christian authors. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, 31. We also have another example of Aristobulus's skill in scholarly writing through Eusebius who mentions that he wrote to King Ptolemy concerning matters of interpretation of the Jewish books, "But it is time to hear what Aristobulus, who had partaken of Aristotle's philosophy in addition to that of his own country, declared concerning the passages in the Sacred Books which are currently understood to refer to limbs of God's body. This is that very man who is mentioned in the beginning of the Second Book of Maccabees: and in his writing addressed to King Ptolemy he too explains this principle.", *Praep. ev.* 8.9.38 (Gifford).

[529] Theon is described in the tenth-century Byzantine encyclopedia called the *Suda* (referenced as Θ 206) as a sophist from Alexandria, Egypt. For Theon being in the first century CE as well as other introductory details see, George A. Kennedy and Societies American Council of Learned, *Progymnasmata Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric, Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003). xii. However, Theon is not the first or the only writer to provide instructions for narrative compositions. Aristotle, Hermogenes of Tarsus (second century CE), Aphthonius (fourth century CE), and Nicholaus of Myrna (sixth century CE) have also made similar contributions to compositional guidelines. Heath offers an alternative argument, against the scholarly consensus, that Theon should not be dated to the first century but rather to the fifth century CE. Malcolm Heath, "Theon and the History of the Progymnasmata," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 43, no. 2 (2002). 141–158.

Suda describes him as a first-century CE Sophist from Alexandria and as the author of various literary works, which include: on *progymnasmata*, commentaries on writers such as Xenophon and Isocrates, as well as other scholarly works that attest to his teachings and familiarity with rhetorical training. His alleged instructions on the *progymnasmata*, however, are a primary interest. Theon's instructions on the "first exercises" in writing are significant because they align with later instructors' teachings about the same subject in their educational handbooks. Theon's instructions demonstrate the continuation and development of compositional instructions taught by earlier teachers such as Aristotle, as well as their transmission to other teachers as late as the fifth century CE. Theon is significant for this study because he operates in the same location (Alexandria) and time (first century CE) as Philo. Their overlapping time periods show which contemporary writing practices were available to Philo as he composed his works.

Philo's version of the translation of the Septuagint is retold in a more unique manner than the other three texts under consideration; his narrative is neither an excerpted summary of the event (as Aristobulus is) nor is it directly dependent on Aristeas's report (as we will see with Josephus).[530] Instead, Philo represents an independent tradition of how the events surrounding the Septuagint took place, albeit with a different function than the other three. Aristeas, Aristobulus, and Josephus primarily report the events to improve the knowledge of their

[530] This point is not undisputed. Jellicoe and others have observed that Philo's narrative may indeed be reliant on Aristeas's account because of some similarities—albeit in summary form—such as the elders' reception by Ptolemy and the feast and philosophical conversation (*Mos.* 2.33). Additionally, some see the miraculous translation section as being an elaborate expansion of the brief but cryptic passage about the length and nature of the translation being completed in seventy-two days "by some set purpose" in Let. Aris. 307. If Philo's account is not dependent on Aristeas directly, then they both might share a common oral or literary tradition. Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 39. See also, Abraham Wasserstein and David Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today,* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 35-45.

readers.[531] They emphasize accurately reporting the events that led to the Septuagint's translation and celebration. Philo reports the events as he understands them but the *reason why* he explains the details differs from the other three writers. Aristeas, for example, offers his report to satisfy Philocrates's thirst for learning (Let. Aris. 1–2), but Philo shares his narrative to support his claim that Moses is the preeminent and prototypical king and lawgiver, and only secondarily tries to improve the reader's knowledge of the events.[532] Philo's account, in other words, is different due to its purpose in the whole of *De vita Mosis*, whereas the other versions essentially function the same as Aristeas does for Philocrates. Next, we will explore two differences between Aristeas's and Philo's Septuagint translation narrative as examples of how literary education and compositional practices led to their divergences.[533]

We must consider Philo's education and his narrative's literary function to identify the compositional reasons that underlie divergences from the other writers. Philo's educational background is widely known both from his personal attestations and from what later commentators throughout antiquity thought of him.[534] He describes his educational training as

---

[531] This is evidenced by Aristeas addressing his book to Philocrates (Let. Aris. 1.1), Aristobulus to King Ptolemy (*Praep. ev.* 13.12.1 = Fragment 3), and Josephus to Epaphroditus (*Ant.* 1:8). Each author writes with the purpose of providing their reader with information to meet their interests. Philo, of course, does not specify an addressee.

[532] Benjamin Wright's chapter on 'Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo' offers an alternative view and considers the issues of the translation narrative in Aristeas and Philo as it relates to the origin and function of the Septuagint, as well as its status. Wright focuses primarily on the textual-linguistic features of the two narratives in connection to a view that the Septuagint originally served as an interlinear tool for Greek readers who needed access to the Hebrew text. According to Wright, the function of the narrative translation in Aristeas was to provide a new origin myth of the Septuagint as an independent and divine translation of the Hebrew original (as opposed to a historical reconstruction of its origins). The translation narrative in Philo, instead, supported the view that the Greek form of the Septuagint was the same as or equivalent to the Hebrew and therefore should be authoritative on its own. Benjamin G. Wright, *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism,1384-2161; V. 131 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 297–314.

[533] For a listing of additional differences between Philo's account and Aristeas see, Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 39-40.

[534] Philo alludes to his own innate desire for learning and in-depth education (*Congr.* 74). Josephus describes Philo as being skilled in philosophy and honored in all things (*Ant.* 18.259). Eusebius Pamphilus is profuse with praise for

including the main areas of encyclical paideia that were common during his day (e.g., mathematics, geometry, grammar, and music).[535] His educational background coupled with familial connections to his brother Alexander, who served as an Alabarch for the Roman administration, demonstrates that he was not only a recipient of a fine education but also someone with political connections and financial means.[536] Philo's literary production alone is enough to surmise that he received an advanced education in Greek grammar. His writings frequently include signs of advanced educational training and writing techniques, such as allegorical interpretation, symbolic language, etymologies, and maxims. Philo's *De vita Mosis* itself testifies to his training in Greek grammar and rhetoric through its substance and structure.

The genre of Philo's *Mos.* 1, 2 is a principal component for understanding the narrative differences between the accounts. Based on its content and structure, Philo's *Mos.* 1, 2 is an *encomion* (ἐγκώμιον).[537] An encomion is a category of literary composition that ancient philosophers and sophists such as Aristotle and Theon describe and teach. An encomion was meant to celebrate a famous figure from the past or current time. It employed a specific outline for communicating a character's praiseworthy deeds that were accomplished during their

---

Philo. He notes his renown in and outside the Church, his vast literary production, and his broad studies particularly in the philosophy of Plato and Pythagoras (*Hist. eccl.* 2.4.2, 18.3–8).

[535] *Spec.* 3.1–6. For a discussion and summary of the encyclical paideia and how they are presented in Philo, see Alan Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*, Monographs of the Hebrew Union College. 0190-5627; No. 7 (Cincinnati: New York, N.Y.: Hebrew Union College Press; Distributed by Ktav Pub. House, 1982), 4–5.

[536] Regarding Philo's brother Alexander serving as an Alabarch, see Josephus's *Ant.* 18.259.

[537] Martin, while not focusing solely on Philo, also presents *De vita Mosis* as an encomion ("praise" of a figure) demonstrating the broad similarities it has with other progymnastic authors such as Josephus and the author of the Gospel of Luke. His presentation examines the encomion as a topical template that ancient authors followed to compose their narrative portrayal of famous figures. His comparison includes Theon and other teachers' instructions for preliminary education and charts their similarities and differences. Michael W. Martin, "Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other Bioi?," *New Testament Studies* 54 (2008). 21–23. I agree with his details but differ in his use of "bios" as a genre for which encomion falls under. I prefer using encomion instead of bios as a genre category that ancient authors themselves referred to and employed.

lifetime.[538] The encomion was made up of several facets that served as evidence of the central character's virtuous actions. According to Theon, the main sections of the encomion consisted of an introduction (προοίμιον), external goods, physical goods, and mental goods (Theon 111.12–14, 112.1). These goods that had been demonstrated over a lifetime of actions were understood as evidence of the figure's virtuous nature. *Mos.* 2 continues the descriptive praise of Moses—this time as a virtuous lawgiver—and proceeds to explain why he was such an exemplary figure (*Mos.* 2.8).[539] Theon teaches how to express praise for a figure through explicitly arranged presentations. For each virtue that Philo wants to praise Moses for having, Theon suggests that the writer should support the claim with an example (some practical deed in their life) of how they exhibited the virtue:

> … after these things [the external and bodily goods] we shall receive the actions (πράξεις) and the successes … not narrating [them] in order, but we shall set up the sayings according to each virtue (ἀρετήν), then go through the works (ἔργα) … (Theon 112.2–5)[540]

Philo, following the guidelines for an encomion, leads into his narrative of the Septuagint's translation by linking Moses—whom he claims is the greatest lawgiver—with YHWH's divine law.

> But that he himself is the most admirable of all the lawgivers (νομοθετῶν ἄριστος) who have ever lived in any country either among the Greeks or among the barbarians, and that his are the most admirable of all laws (νόμοι κάλλιστοι), and truly divine (ἀληθῶς θεῖοι) … (Philo, *Mos.* 2.12 [Colson, LCL])

Coupling Moses as the lawgiver with the law's divine nature serves as evidence for his virtuous character and for being the "most admirable of all the lawgivers who have ever lived." Philo must now explain why this is the case (according to the rules of writing an encomion) by

---

[538] Aristotle describes elements of an encomion in his *Rhetorica* 1.9.33ff and Theon devotes an entire section to it in his *progymnasmata* (Theon 109–115).

[539] *Mos.* 1 describes Moses in his kingly function—including his superior physical attributes and education—while *Mos.* 2 continues the narrative demonstration of his virtuous actions as a prophet, lawgiver, and High Priest (*Mos.* 1.334, 2.3).

[540] My translation.

detailing Moses's actions to support his claims. The claim that Moses was a virtuous figure is addressed in *Mos.* 1 and focuses on his noble birth, education, physical and mental excellence, and regnal readiness. Philo makes the case in *Mos.* 2 that Moses is an exemplar lawgiver because of the divine nature and universal usefulness of the law not only for Judeans but for all nations.

> But this is not the case with our laws which Moses has given to us; for they lead after them and influence all nations, barbarians, and Greeks, the inhabitants of continents and islands, the eastern nations and the western, Europe and Asia; in short, the whole habitable world from one extremity to the other. (Philo, *Mos.* 2.20 [Colson, LCL])

Philo begins his narrative on the Septuagint by claiming that Moses is a virtuous king and lawgiver. He demonstrates advanced compositional education and identifies the genre of *De vita Mosis* as an encomion, which helps to explain why differences between his and Aristeas's accounts occur.

Two major differences between Philo and Aristeas can be explained through Theon's compositional instructions for an encomion. The first is the excessive praise of Ptolemy Philadelphus which begins Philo's narrative (*Mos*. 2.28–30). Theon's compositional instructions for an encomion can explain two differences between Philo and Aristeas. First, is the excessive praise of Ptolemy which begins Philo's narrative (*Mos.* 2.28–30). In Aristeas, Ptolemy, as a central character, sets up the impetus (via epistles) for the Jewish law to be translated into Greek (Let. Aris. 9–11), is a mouthpiece for its grandeur (Let. Aris. 176–177, 317), and serves as an interlocutor for the Judean elders' wisdom (Let. Aris. 187–300).[541] Philo's introduction and

[541] Philo's account and Aristeas have several other differences between them, which are not the focus of this comparison, but this one related to Ptolemy and the epistles warrants a brief mention. Aristeas's version includes the prominent back and forth correspondence between Demetrius, Ptolemy, and Eleazar, while Philo makes no mention of it. Either Philo is aware of the correspondence but has chosen to omit it or he is unaware of it. Considering that Philo is only including the narrative of the Septuagint as a means of supporting his point that Moses is a good lawgiver and that he has collected his material based on research that was at least partially based on personal inquiry, he probably did not know of or have access to the correspondence letters. From a compositional standpoint, Philo

description of Ptolemy, however, functions as comparative evidence for Moses being the greatest lawgiver. Part of Theon's instructions for writing an encomion suggests that a writer should use comparisons of the central figure's works—in this case, Moses and his legislation—with the deeds of other famous figures of past lore.[542]

> It is not useless to mention the comparison (ἀντιπαραβάλλοντα) of the deeds of those who have been honored to the works of those who are being praised. (Theon 111.1–3)[543]

Moses and Ptolemy are compared because they are virtuous figures and are interested in making the law universally available. Theon's encomion instructions teach that the figure who receives praise should be described in the superlative.

> Actions are praised on the basis of the occasion and whether someone did them alone or was the first or when no one else acted, or did more than others or with few helpers or beyond what was characteristic of his age … (Theon 111.21–25)[544]

Following this practice, Philo's encomion describes Moses as the greatest lawgiver and the "the holiest (ὁσιώτατον) of men ever yet born" (Philo, *Mos.* 2.192 [Colson, LCL]).

> That Moses himself was the best of all lawgivers in all countries, better in fact than any that have ever arisen among either the Greeks or the barbarians, and that his laws are most excellent and truly come from God, since they omit nothing that is needful … (Philo, *Mos.* 2.12 [Colson, LCL])

Philo applies similar accolades to Ptolemy, even describing him as the 'most approved of kings' (Philo, *Mos.* 2.28 [Colson, LCL]). The most striking parallels Ptolemy shares with Moses are his renowned virtuous actions and leadership qualities.

> Ptolemy, surnamed Philadelphus, was the third in succession to Alexander, the conqueror of Egypt. In all the qualities which make a good ruler, he excelled not only his contemporaries, but all who have arisen in the past; and even till to-day, after so many generations, his praises are sung for the many evidences and monuments of his greatness of mind which he left behind him in different cities and countries, so that, even now, acts of more than ordinary munificence or buildings on a specially great scale are proverbially called Philadelphian after him. To put it shortly, as the house of the Ptolemies was highly distinguished, compared with other dynasties, so was Philadelphus among the Ptolemies.

---

certainly would not need to include the written correspondence because it was not integral to the purpose for including the translation narrative, which was to praise Moses as a lawgiver and king.

[542] Aristotle also instructs his readers to make comparisons to the figure being praised using a similar Greek word ἀντιπαραβάλλειν (*Rhet.*1.9.38).

[543] My translation.

[544] My translation.

> The creditable achievements of this one man almost outnumbered those of all the others put together, and, as the head takes the highest place in the living body, so he may be said to head the kings. (Philo, *Mos.* 2.29–30 [Colson, LCL])

In addition to Ptolemy's virtuous leadership abilities, Philo also highlights his interest in the Jewish law and desire to distribute it to the Greeks and wider world.

> Then it was that some people, thinking it a shame that the laws should be found in one half only of the human race, the barbarians, and denied altogether to the Greeks, took steps to have them translated. In view of the importance and public utility of the task, it was referred not to private persons or magistrates, who were very numerous, but to kings, and amongst them to the king of highest repute. Ptolemy, surnamed Philadelphus, was the third in succession to Alexander, the conqueror of Egypt. (Philo, *Mos.* 2.27–29 [Colson, LCL])

> This great man, having conceived an ardent affection for our laws, determined to have the Chaldean translated into Greek, and at once dispatched envoys to the high priest and king of Judaea … explaining his wishes and urging him to choose by merit persons to make a full rendering of the Law into Greek. (Philo, *Mos.* 2.31 [Colson, LCL])

Philo portrays Moses and Ptolemy as having the same virtues and concerns. Both are virtuous kings who want the Jewish law to be available to the Greeks and other nations. Philo's details about Moses and Ptolemy demonstrate his awareness of the rules for writing an encomion and help to explain why certain specifics are present in his narrative but absent in other accounts.

The second difference between Philo and Aristeas is found in the narration of the translation sequence (*Mos.* 2.37–39). In Aristeas's account, the translation from Hebrew to Greek is completed in seventy-two days 'according to some set purpose' (Let. Aris. 307). Aristeas's narrative, however, does not elaborate on the actual *process* of translation. The closest we get to a description of what the translators did is when they began to read and attempt an initial "translation" of the text. The term for translation (διασάφησιν), which means "clarity", is distinct from the other descriptions of the translator's work. Another passage explains that they made a comparison (ἀντιβολαῖς) of their completed work to make an agreeable and suitable copy.

> Following the custom of all the Jews, they washed their hands in the sea in the course of their prayers to God, and then proceeded to the reading and explication (διασάφησιν) of each point. (Let. Aris. 305 [Shutt, *OTP*])

> They set to completing their several tasks, reaching agreement among themselves on each by comparing versions. The result of their agreement thus was made into a fair copy by Demetrius. (Let. Aris. 302 [Shutt, *OTP*])

Neither description reveals information about the process for making the text clearer. Whereas Aristeas's narrative provides little information about the translation process, Philo offers more details which implies his narrative's independence. For instance, Philo describes the translator's divine inspiration as prophetic, which resulted in their translated words agreeing as if they had an invisible prompter—details that are not repeated in any of the other three versions.[545]

> [T]hey became as it were possessed, and, under inspiration, wrote, not each several scribe something different, but the same word for word, as though dictated to each by an invisible prompter. (Philo, *Mos.* 2.37 [Colson, LCL])

Although Philo may not have used Aristeas as a source for his narrative, two questions remain: how did he learn about the translation and why does he include it? The beginning of *Mos.* 2 offers insight —from a compositional perspective—into how and why Philo included his version of the translation narrative. The methods that a writer uses to research and report their subject matter are also part of the narrative composition process—which includes the genre of historical narrative. Some methods for collecting information, especially events from the distant past, were common. In addition to following composition rules that were similar to Theon's, Historiographers—such as Polybius (ca. 200–ca.118 BCE); Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ca. 60–7 BCE); and Josephus (37–ca. 100 CE)—provide insight into the research methods Philo likely employed when composing his encomion. Historiographers generally collected their data in three ways: experiencing an event as an eyewitness and reporting first-hand knowledge, conducting

[545] As already mentioned, some see Let. Aris. 307 as a brief or ambiguous precursor to the lengthier miraculous detail presented in Philo's version.

library research by accessing memoirs and other documents, and through "hearsay."[546] Polybius, as he critiques the history writing of Timaeus (ca. 350–260 BCE), shares some outlooks on writing history, including how details were collected and presented. He does not trust word-of-mouth hearing (ἀκοῆς)—agreeing with the much earlier philosopher Heraclitus (ca. 540–480 BCE)— as much as he does first-hand experience; what is seen with the eyes (ὁράσεως) is more trustworthy and less prone to inaccuracy or lies than oral learning.

> Nature has given us two instruments, as it were, by the aid of which we inform ourselves and inquire about everything. These are hearing and sight, and of the two sight is much more veracious according to Heracleitus. "The eyes are more accurate witnesses than the ears," he says. Now, Timaeus enters on his inquiries by the pleasanter of the two roads, but the inferior one. For he entirely avoids employing his eyes and prefers to employ his ears. (Polybius, *Hist.* 12.27.1–2 [Walbank and Habicht, LCL])

Although Polybius prefers factual reporting based on experience, he believes that inquiries made from books or memoirs—decidedly less expensive and encumbering—are also acceptable if one has an accessible library (βυβλιοθήκην) in their city.

> Inquiries from books may be made without any danger or hardship, provided only that one takes care to have access to a town rich in documents or to have a library near at hand. After that one has only to pursue one's researches in perfect repose and compare the accounts of different writers without exposing oneself to any hardship. Personal inquiry, on the contrary, requires severe labor and great expense, but is exceedingly valuable and is the most important part of history. (Polybius, *Hist.* 12.27.4–7 [Walbank and Habicht, LCL])

Although Polybius is averse to employing hearsay, it is nonetheless an appropriate research method for writing histories.

---

[546] The age-old practice and commonality of using "hearsay" as a method of collecting and reporting data can also be found in the explanations of fifth century BCE. authorities such as Herodotus (*Histories* 2.3) and Thucydides (*Histories* 1.22). Gray offers an insightful compilation and categorization of the uses of "It is/was said" as a narrative device in Thucydides' *Historiae* and identifies the several Greek verbs that express this phrasing, including two instances of φημί. Gray explains that the use of this formula in Thucydides—as well as some instances in Herodotus and Xenophon—can be divided into five categories: "Near Miss", "Superlative Reputations for Savagery", "Mythical Proofs", "Large Numbers", and "Base Motives." Each category (along with a few subcategories) is related to a type of content, such as causes of battles, and numbers of fatalities, in Thucydides and demonstrates how he utilizes the formula to make his report with either certainty or uncertainty. The category of "Mythical Proofs" (pp. 84–85) is the closest to how Philo uses φημί to report the events of the Septuagint translation. Gray explains that this category demonstrates Thucydides' common usage of the phrase with long ago or legendary events as a means of confirming their veracity. She also discusses how, for Thucydides, the phrase "It is/was said" primarily functions in general to affirm his claims especially when the details appear to be sketchy or unbelievable. Vivienne Gray, "Thucydides' Source Citations: 'It Is Said'," *The Classical Quarterly* (New Series) 61, no. 01 (2011). 75-90.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, another historiographer, also shares his approach to data collection. His research methods imply the type of hearsay that Polybius cautions. Dionysius receives his historical information through what he has learned: from the wisest men, his associations with others, and what he was taught.

> Some information I received orally from men of the greatest learning, with whom I associated; and the rest I gathered from histories written by the approved Roman authors—Porcius Cato, Fabius Maximus, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, the Aelii, Gellii and Calpurnii, and many others of note; with these works, which are like the Greek annalistic accounts, as a basis, I set about the writing of my history. (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 1.7.3 [Cary, LCL])

Dionysius's reporting methods imply that his information was not from first-hand experience but from second-hand knowledge—what he heard from others. Josephus shares Polybius's distrust of research methods that are not based on eyewitness accounts; he condemns writers who randomly collect data from what they have heard (ἀκοῇ) and sophistically compose conflicting stories.[547]

> Of these, however, some, having taken no part in the action, have collected from hearsay casual and contradictory stories which they have then edited in a rhetorical style; while others, who witnessed the events, have, either from flattery of the Romans or from hatred of the Jews, misrepresented the facts, their writings exhibiting alternatively invective and encomium, but nowhere historical accuracy. (Josephus, *B.J.* 1.1–3 [Thackeray, LCL])

Although collecting data through hearsay was not unanimously accepted, it was still a common research practice that could account for why Philo's narrative of the Septuagint translation differed from Aristeas's version; in fact, Philo explicitly points to the research method behind his account. He informs his readers that his source for how the translation took place was based on testimony from others. Philo explains that the translators began their work with the book that contained the creation (alluding to Genesis?); that the men were inspired (ἐνθουσιῶντες); and that the Chaldean words corresponded accurately to Greek.

[547] Ironically, Josephus also mentions those who were present for the Jewish war against the Romans but still presented false accounts *B.J.* 1.2.

… [F]or the laws begin with the story of the world's creation, they [the translators] became as it were possessed, and, under inspiration, wrote, not each several scribe something different, but the same word for word, as though dictated to each by an invisible prompter. Yet who does not know that every language, and Greek especially, abounds in terms, and that the same thought can be put in many shapes by changing single words and whole phrases and suiting the expression to the occasion? This was not the case, we are told (φασι), with this law of ours, but the Greek words used corresponded literally with the Chaldean, exactly suited to the things they indicated. (Philo, *Mos.* 2.37–38 [Colson, LCL])

Following his description of the translation, Philo's asserts what 'they say' (φασι) about how the event transpired (*Mos.* 2.38). He also explains how he combined hearsay research with what he read to formulate his accounts of Moses.

> … [A]nd tell the story of Moses as I have learned (μαθὼν) it, both from the sacred books, the wonderful monuments of his wisdom which he has left behind him, and from some of the elders of the nation; for I always interwove what I was told with what I read (λεγόμενα τοῖς ἀναγινωσκομένοις), and thus believed myself to have a closer knowledge than others of his life's history. (Philo, *Mos.* 1.4 [Colson, LCL])

Philo's account of the translation is based on hearsay and is not a first-hand retelling. He collated what he learned from others and fashioned his story into a coherent supportive section, which demonstrates how Moses and Ptolemy mirror each other as great kings and lawgivers. Philo's reliance on hearsay research rather than Aristeas's written account of the translation helps to explain why his version has details that Aristeas lacks.

Flavius Josephus

Josephus's account of the translation of the Jewish law code (*Ant.* 12.11–118) closely follows the narrative events told in Aristeas's version. The relationship between the two accounts is established when Josephus directs his readers to consult the "book of Aristeas" (Ἀρισταίου βιβλίον) for two things: to learn about the philosophical banquet between Ptolemy and the seventy-two elders and to learn the names of the seventy translators at the end of the letter sent from Eleazar to Ptolemy contained in his narrative.

> But I have not thought it necessary to report the names of the seventy elders who were sent by Eleazar and brought the Law, their names being set down at the end of the letter. (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.57 [Marcus, LCL])[548]

> … so that anyone who wishes to find out the details of the questions discussed at the banquet can learn them by reading the book which Aristaeus composed on this account. (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.100 [Marcus, LCL])

The direct reference to Aristeas's book demonstrates that Josephus knew of and had access to the narrative or at least a version of it. For instance, Aristeas and Josephus have parallels in content and terminology. Most of the similarities, at the content level, follow Aristeas's order of events. Josephus recounts the circumstances of how the Jewish law was added to the Alexandrian library (Let. Aris. 9–11 // *Ant.* 12.12–16); the correspondence between Demetrius, Ptolemy, and Eleazar (Let. Aris. 28–46 // *Ant.* 12.35–57); the reception of the elders (Let. Aris. 172–175 // *Ant.* 12.86–88); and their successful translation of the law. Despite his apparent use of Aristeas, the shared material is not always a word-for-word rendering; some of Josephus's details are not found in Aristeas. Josephus acknowledges using Aristeas, but what rationale would lead him to amend his source's words instead of replicating them. Although Josephus does not stray altogether from Aristeas's report, some differences exist between them, for example, in terminology; the Let. Aris. 10–11 and *Ant.* 12.13–16 demonstrate one instance of this difference. Both sections narrate the interaction between Demetrius, the overseer of the Alexandrian library, and Ptolemy regarding the purpose of adding the Judean law books to the library's collection. Josephus includes the discussion about how many books are currently in the library collection (Let. Aris. 10 // *Ant.* 12.13); the desire for and worthiness of procuring the Judean law books (Let. Aris. 10 // *Ant.* 12.14); and the necessity of some sort of "translation" (Let. Aris. 11 // *Ant.* 12.15), which parallel Aristeas's account. The similarities also include agreement in detail such as having

[548] The names of the translators are listed in Let. Aris. 47–50.

twenty-thousand books currently housed in the library and the goal of accruing fifty-thousand (Let. Aris. 10 // *Ant.* 12.13). Although Josephus utilizes the order and much of the detail that Aristeas reports, he does not provide an exact copy (ἀντίγραφος); instead, he uses it as the basis for his version of the history—but for what reason? What was the motivation and precedent for using another author's historical report and then retelling it with one's own editorial license (especially details that were not originally mentioned)—that is to say, how can we explain Josephus's divergences from Aristeas when he claims to use his report?

Theon's instructions on paraphrase (παράφρασις) help to explain Josephus's compositional practice and expectations. Theon and Quintilian, a first-century Latin orator (ca. 35–90 CE), provide modern historians with an ancient vantage point for what paraphrase entailed and how it was used. Theon offers the most in-depth description of paraphrase between the two authors; he describes the practice of paraphrase as taking what has been said or written and recasting it in creative ways.

> Despite what some say or have thought, *paraphrasis* (paraphrase) is not without utility. The argument of opponents is that once something has been well said it cannot be done a second time, but those who say this are far from hitting on what is right … and, in brief, all ancient writers seem to have used paraphrase in the best possible way, rephrasing not only their own writings but those of each other. (Theon 62.10–20 [Kennedy])

Theon gives several examples from Homer's *Iliad*, Demosthenes, and Thucydides for how ancient writers reworded and expanded their material when reporting the same events (Theon 63–64). Theon explains that what was previously said or written was not the only or best way to say it; a writer could make alterations to what was said before without being charged with plagiarism or some other flagrant violation of another writer's work. Paraphrase or making modifications to another writer's words was not entirely condemned—for Theon it was

commendable. Quintilian shares a similar positive attitude towards the compositional practice of paraphrase:

> Let them learn then to tell Aesop's fables, which follow on directly from their nurses' stories, in pure and unpretentious language; then let them achieve the same slender elegance in a written version. Verse they should first breakup, then interpret in different words, then make a bolder paraphrase, in which they are allowed to abbreviate and embellish some parts, so long as the poet's meaning is preserved. This task is difficult even for fully trained teachers; any pupil who handles it well will be capable of learning anything. (Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.9.2–3 [Russell, LCL])

Paraphrase was learned early on before a student reached the age for training with a rhetor. Quintilian teaches that a student should begin with Aesop's *Fables* and learn how to breakdown verses, change words, and make interpretations. A student who was trained in paraphrase (*paraphrasis*) learned to shorten (*breviare*) and embellish (*exornare*) verses, while preserving a writer's original meaning. The way Josephus renders Aristeas's version of the events suggests that he used paraphrase: restating what Aristeas wrote by making changes that were distinct but did not affect the meaning of the original report. We will consider four instances of changes to terminology that demonstrate Josephus's application of paraphrase to Aristeas 10–11. The first is a change in narration from Aristeas's first-person telling (Let. Aris. 10) to Josephus's third-person (*Ant.* 12.13). The narration voice shifts because Josephus presents Aristeas's details as part of his own historical narrative and not as a copy. This requires shifting the personal tone of a report for Philocrates to a third-person retelling of a historical event by an outsider. Although minor, this is an immediate sign that Josephus does not intend to follow Aristeas exactly.

Josephus's description of the Judean law books is the second, and more intriguing, instance of paraphrase. Aristeas presents Demetrius as making some general descriptive statements about the Judean law, which Josephus paraphrases in different ways. In the first instance, Demetrius says that the Jewish laws are 'worthy of translation' (τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμιμα μεταγραφῆς ἄξια) and

ought to have a place in the King's library (Let. Aris. 10). Josephus modifies the statement by calling the laws 'legal compositions' (νομίμων συγγράμματα) and that are worthy of esteem and should be housed in the King's library (*Ant*. 12.14). Josephus curiously changes the 'books being worthy of translation' to 'being worthy of esteem' before returning to Aristeas's comments about their language. The wider context for why Josephus wrote his *Antiquities* helps us to understand the literary rationale for his paraphrastic action. Josephus wants to counter the inaccurate and negative portrayal of Jews by other historians, particularly their war against the Romans, by providing an accurate history of their existence and laws. The change from 'worthy of translation' to 'worthy of esteem' shows a shift in emphasis—from the work of translation—to what the non-Jewish characters (Ptolemy and Demetrius) thought about the status of the Hebrew writings. The change to 'worthy of esteem' emphasizes that the Hebrew writings (and the nation it represents) are intrinsically laudable, which necessitates the translation. Demetrius's comment that the Jewish law was worthy of esteem was a textual improvement because it communicated that he and Ptolemy thought the law was honorable; this resolved Josephus's lament in his introduction to *Contra Apionem*, that some Greek historians considered the Jewish law unworthy of mention.[549]

The third example involves understanding the work of the seventy-two Jewish elders; what were they invited to Alexandria to do? On one hand the law books were written in a foreign

[549] Josephus comments on his reasons for writing his previous history and *Contra Apionem*, due to the inaccurate portrayal of the Jews by other historians, "Since, however, I observe that a considerable number of persons, influenced by the malicious calumnies of certain individuals, discredit the statements in my history concerning our antiquity, and adduce as proof of the comparative modernity of our race the fact that it has not been thought worthy of mention by the best known Greek historians, I consider it my duty to devote a brief treatise to all these points; in order at once to convict our detractors of malignity and deliberate falsehood, to correct the ignorance of others, and to instruct all who desire to know the truth concerning the antiquity of our race." Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.2–4 (Thackeray, LCL).

language, but why different words were used to describe the process for making the law readable it is not immediately clear. Aristeas uses three different Greek words (μεταγράφω, ἑρμηνεία, and διασάφησις) to describe the Jewish elders' work with the law, but how were his readers supposed to understand these terms? [550] The comparison focuses on Let. Aris. 11 and *Ant.* 12.14–15 to explain how the elders' work should be understood and Josephus's use of paraphrase to improve Aristeas's narrative. In Aristeas's account, Demetrius first states that the Jewish laws are worthy of "translation."

> Information has reached me that the lawbooks of the Jews are worth translation (μεταγραφῆς) and inclusion in your royal library. (Let. Aris. 10 [Shutt, *OTP*])

When Demetrius says that the lawbooks are worthy of "translation" using μεταγραφῆς, it is best understood as a transcription or copy of the Jewish writings.[551] The work was described as a transcription because the desire was to have a copy of the Jewish law, with all of its contents, available in the Library of Alexandria. The elders were making a writing in Greek "alongside" the original Hebrew version; similar to the Latin *transcribere*—to make a copy. The next word Aristeas uses is sometimes rendered as translation or interpretation (Ἑρμηνείας).

> Demetrius replied, "Translation (Ἑρμηνείας) is needed. They use letters (χαρακτῆρσι) characteristic of the language of the Jews, just as Egyptians use the formation of their letters in accordance with their own language (φωνὴν ἰδίαν). The Jews are supposed to use Syrian language (Συριακῇ), but this is not so, for it is another form (of language)" (Let. Aris. 11 [Shutt, *OTP*])

In this instance, Demetrius does not refer to the need for a transcription or copy (μεταγραφή) but explains that a translation or interpretation is required—but which is intended? Zuntz may be

[550] The comparison between Aristeas and Josephus demonstrates that they both describe the activity of changing the Judean law books to Greek with three or four different words. Aristeas employs various noun and verbal derivatives of μεταγράφω (45, 307), ἑρμηνεία (11, 32, 120), and one use of διασάφησις (305). Likewise, Josephus in his *Antiquitates judaicae* also uses derivatives of, μεταγράφω (12.55), ἑρμηνεία (12.87, 104), διασαφέω (12.108), and μεταβάλλω (1.10, 12.14–15), as well as two passages where both terms are used in tandem to describe the work of the appointed elders (12.48, 107). Although the use of ἑρμηνεία is frequently used to describe the work of the seventy-two and as a designation for them (e.g., Let. Aris. 308, 310, 318), Josephus and Aristeas's instances of disagreement when describing the act of translation or interpretation are not surprising.
[551] The literal compound meaning of μεταγραφή is "alongside a writing".

correct in suggesting that Aristeas refers to the ambiguity of the Hebrew characters and their need to be correctly identified (interpreted) before the copying process can proceed.[552] The general use of ἑρμηνεία is to explain or interpret something: an obscure oracle from a deity or a dream whose meaning is not immediately clear. It can also be used to describe the official capacity of an interpreter (ἑρμηνεύς) or translator; someone who makes a foreign language comprehensible for the recipient.[553] Demetrius's issue is that the foreign letters of the Jewish language are hard to distinguish from Syriac and need a team of scholars to interpret (i.e., read or identify) them. Interpretation in this instance is equivalent to making a translation, that is to say, to bring the Hebrew language across into Greek.

The third instance in Aristeas that describes the work of scholars occurs during translation process itself.

> Following the custom of all the Jews, they washed their hands in the sea in the course of their prayers to God, and then proceeded to the reading and explication (διασάφησιν) of each point. (Let. Aris. 305 [Shutt, *OTP*])

The scholars were in the midst of carrying out their assigned work to make the Jewish texts available in Greek. Aristeas uses διασάφησις—a combination of the preposition διά and σαφής (clear or plain) that means clarity or an explanation—to describe this process.

---

552 Zuntz provides a very detailed and interesting discussion about the difficulties inherent in the different Greek words used to refer to the work of the seventy-two elders in Aristeas's narrative of the Septuagint. He attempts to resolve the meaning and use of ἑρμηνεία ("interpretation") and μεταγραφή ("translation" or "transcribing") by explaining that the former refers to the difficulty of identifying the strange Hebrew letters and therefore needing a way to interpret what they are first to make an acceptable Greek copy. The latter refers to the practice of reading aloud and instead of meaning a translation or change of letters, it means changing the *sound* from their peculiar Hebrew into Greek sounds. Here Zuntz equates γράμμα with what he calls "articulate sound" (φωνή) because of the practice of reading aloud and needing to shift the sounds/letters in one's head which would be a form of μεταγραφή i.e., translation or even transcription. While making a compelling argument, Zuntz also acknowledges that his explanation helps with understanding some of the word difficulties but does not resolve them all. For his full argument on the different Greek terms used for "translation" in Aristeas see, G. Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies II: Aristeas on the Translation of the Torah," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 4, no. 2 (1959), 111–114.

553 The understanding of the translator in Latin comes from translation, which is a compound that means "to bring across", *trans* = across + *latio* = carry or bring.

The Jewish writings, in this context, are written in a foreign language and need to be made clear in Greek. This process can also be understood as a translation because the translators take the Hebrew words and make them clearer for their readers. All three words, μεταγραφή, ἑρμηνεία, and διασάφησις describe an aspect of what it meant to bring the Hebrew law into Greek. Each word could be rendered as a "translation" but for different reasons: to make a copy or transcription, to interpret the foreign letters, or to make the meaning of the Hebrew clearer in Greek.[554]

Although Aristeas explained the work of the Jewish elders in our focal passage (Let. Aris. 11) with ἑρμηνεία, Josephus employs a different word: one that is not used in any Aristeas's descriptions of the translation. He gives his version of the same exchange between Ptolemy and Demetrius but with some modifications.

> He added that he had been informed that among the Jews also there were many works on their law, which were worthy of study and of a place in the king's library, but, being written in the script (χαρακτῆρσιν) and language (διαλέκτῳ) of this people, they would be no small trouble to have translated (μεταβαλλόμενα) into the Greek tongue. For, he said, though their script seemed to be similar (ἐμφερὴς ὁ χαρακτὴρ) to the peculiar Syrian (Aramaic) writing (Συρίων γραμμάτων), and their language (φωνὴν ὁμοίαν) to sound (ἀπηχεῖν) like the other, it was, as it happened, of a distinct type (ἰδιότροπον). (*Ant.* 12.14-15 [Marcus, LCL])

The immediate difference between their versions is that Josephus uses μεταβάλλω instead of ἑρμηνεία; but why does Josephus deviate from the descriptive word that Aristeas uses in the same section to describe the translation? In Aristeas's version, Demetrius comments on the need for an "interpretation" of the foreign Hebrew letters by someone who recognizes them and can make a readable copy in Greek. Josephus's word choice can be understood by examining how he refers to the translation in other instances. He uses two other words to help the reader understand

---

[554] Wright understands the use of the Greek terms rendered as transcription, translation, and interpretation as "rough equivalents". He suggests that Aristeas intentionally uses these terms to indicate that the Greek translation is equivalent to and can take the place of the Hebrew version. For his full discussion, see, Benjamin G. Wright, *The Letter of Aristeas: 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'on the Translation of the Law of the Jews'*, Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature (Berlin De Gruyter, 2015), 119–120.

his description of the translation: μεταγράφω to describe the completed translation (*Ant.* 12.55) and ἑρμηνεία to refer to the task that the Jewish elders engage in (*Ant.* 12.87, 104). The elders are called "interpreters" or "explainers" (διασαφήσαντας) because they make the obscure Hebrew characters (sometimes mistaken for Syriac) understandable for Greek readers (*Ant.* 12.108).[555] Josephus uses μεταβάλλω to refer to the *physical and practical* aspect of translating the Hebrew letters—carrying them over and changing them—to the Greek language (*Ant.* 12.14). He chooses to use μεταβάλλω instead of ἑρμηνεία, as Aristeas does, because it makes the description of the elders' work clearer for his readers. He also uses the same word when he initially describes Ptolemy's desire to have the Jewish laws translated (μεταβαλεῖν) into the Greek tongue (*Ant.* 1.10). Josephus's word choice makes it clear that the process involved changing the words of the law and was not just an interpretation of its contents.

The fourth example shows how Josephus used paraphrase to clarify Aristeas's comment that Hebrew characters (script) were sometimes confused with Syrian.

> They use letters (χαρακτῆρσι) characteristic of the language of the Jews, just as Egyptians use the formation of their letters in accordance with their own language (φωνὴν ἰδίαν). The Jews are supposed to use Syrian language (Συριακῇ), but this is not so, for it is another form (of language). (Let. Aris. 11 [Shutt, *OTP*])

> … being written in the script (χαρακτῆρσιν) and language (διαλέκτῳ) of this people, they would be no small trouble to have translated (μεταβαλλόμενα) into the Greek tongue. For, he said, though their script seemed to be similar (ἐμφερὴς ὁ χαρακτὴρ) to the peculiar Syrian (Aramaic) writing (Συρίων γραμμάτων), and their language (φωνὴν ὁμοίαν) to sound (ἀπηχεῖν) like the other, it was, as it happened, of a distinct type (ἰδιότροπον). (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.15 [Marcus, LCL])

Aristeas mentions this dilemma in passing because the need for a translation of the Jewish law was his main point; however, he does not explain *how or why* their idiomatic script could be confused with Syrian letters. Although these details appear minute and unrelated to the need for translation, they are relevant to Theon and Quintilian's instructions for improving what was

[555] From διασαφέω "to make clear" or "to show plainly."

previously said or written. Josephus may have read Aristeas's comment and decided to use paraphrase to clarify how distinctive Jewish script became confused with Syriac letters. Josephus addresses the problem by using paraphrase to adjust Aristeas's original comment. He identifies to the Jewish script with χαρακτῆρσιν but substitutes Aristeas use of φωνὴν ἰδίαν to refer to the Jews own "specific language" with διαλέκτῳ. Josephus's choice of διαλέκτῳ precisely emphasized the idiomatic style and sound of the Jewish language more than φωνὴν ἰδίαν implied. Josephus clarifies Aristeas's problem of the, apparently, common confusion between the Jewish and Syrian scripts. Aristeas briefly mentions the problem without any explanation, whereas Josephus specifically address how and why the confusion occurred. Josephus explains that although the writing and spoken language of the Jews were distinctive (ἰδιότροπον), they could still be confused with Syriac; confusion occurred because the written characters are visually similar (ἐμφερὴς ὁ χαρακτὴρ) and the verbalized scripts sounded alike (φωνὴν ὁμοίαν) making it difficult for the listener to distinguish. Aristeas's observation that Hebrew and Syriac were sometimes confused lacked clarification; however, Josephus made improvements to the text by providing his readers details for how confusion occurred at the verbal and written levels.

Josephus maintains the order and structure of Aristeas's account in each of the three selections but employs the literary technique of paraphrase—which was similar to Theon and Quintilian's instructions—to fit his presentation. Josephus made improvements on Aristeas's narrative for his readers in all three instances of paraphrase (narration change, descriptions of the

law books, and the confusion between Hebrew and Syriac) by using more elaboration and precise terminology.[556]

Although it appears that Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus used writing techniques that were similar to Theon and Quintilian's instructions, two questions remain: where and how did they learn to write this way? A presentation of Jewish education during the Hellenistic period would be too much for this discussion, but a few possibilities of how our authors could have learned to write using Greek language and compositional rules will be mentioned.[557] Each author is presumed to have had the requisite advanced levels of education to produce their respective narratives. Later authors describe Aristobulus as subscribing to the Aristotelian philosophical school of Peripatetics and being a teacher to Ptolemy. If any of these descriptions are historical, then he would have probably leaned the introductory Greek lessons (including grammar and the progymnasmata) that preceded philosophy—which could be learned through private or public education. The problem with his accolades is that they are from later second-hand reports. Philo mentions his Greek education directly. He describes how, at an early stage, he became acquainted with the branches of Greek encyclical education, which included learning grammar, the writings of famous historians and poets, and the study of philosophy.[558] Since Philo spent time in Alexandria, Egypt and participated in other Hellenistic activities such as the theater, he probably had access to and was taught at one of the local gymnasiums or even at one of the many

[556] Aristeas and Josephus have other similarities between them, but some modifications amount to nothing more than terminological preferences. For example, the change in the number of translators from seventy-two to seventy can be understood as the author merely shortening or rounding a number, which reflected a literary convention of the time. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, 47.

[557] For a detailed discussion of ancient sources describing Jewish education and writing, see Catherine Hezser's chapter on Education in *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism; 81(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 39–109.

[558] *Congr*. 74–76. Philo's reputation as scholar and literary corpus are well-known by even later authors such as Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 2.4.2).

synagogues there.[559] Josephus also alludes directly to his educational experience; however, like Philo, Josephus does not indicate where or how he received his education.[560] He has learned Greek grammar and writing but unfortunately, does not offer any details about the circumstances of how he was educated.[561]

All three authors used some elements of learning to write that were included in Theon and Quintilian's progymnasmata. These exercises were generally taught to young men (νέος) during the secondary stage of education by a Grammarian or Sophist.[562] These instructors typically taught at "schools" which could be found on the grounds of the gymnasium, palaestra, or at an alternate location such as a home or whatever open space was convenient. Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus could have obtained a Greek education in composition at a local gymnasium where Grammarians served as teachers. Gymnasiums were available in Alexandria, Egypt and in Jerusalem (if the Maccabean report is trustworthy). 2 Maccabees describes the inclusion of Jews in the activities of the gymnasium built under Antiochus Epiphanes (175–164 BCE) at the behest of Jason the High Priest.[563] In addition to the Maccabean report of Jews participating in the education and culture offered at the Gymnasium, there was also the Edict of Claudius (41 CE) which restricted the attendance of Alexandrian Jews who patronized the gymnasium.[564] The

---

[559] *Ebr*. 177; *Prob*. 141.
[560] Josephus describes his great learning (μεγάλην παιδείας), royal Hasmonean lineage, and membership in the sect of the Pharisees, which he says is similar (παραπλήσιός) to the philosophy of the Stoics (*Vita* 8–12).
[561] Josephus, *Ant*. 20.263.
[562] The Grammarian and the Sophist could teach at the gymnasium or they could be hired as tutors or private instructors for children and young men.
[563] 2 Macc 4:9, 12 describes Jews who frequented the gymnasium in Jerusalem that was requested by the High Priest Jason and his constituents. The Jews who were interested and supported its presence are said to have participated in the Greek education of youth (called the ἐφηβεία) and even donned their distinctive head covering.
[564] No. 153. "The Letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians" in Victor Tcherikover, Alexander Fuks, and Menahem Stern, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Published for the Magnes Press, Hebrew University [by] Harvard University Press, 1957), 36–55.

necessity of the edict proves that some Jews evidently participated in the events held at the gymnasium, which would have included educational and physical activities. Both examples, despite referring to different time periods, support the notion that some Jews were interested in learning Greek language, customs, and education, which apparently included literary composition.[565] The literary production and location of all three authors makes it plausible that they could have received an education in Greek literary composition through any of the existing institutions (private or public) that were available in their Hellenistic and later Roman cities.

Conclusions

Comparing the narratives of Aristeas, Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus showed that the variants could be explained by the authors' use of common writing techniques. Textual variants were compared to specific writing instructions taught by Theon and others to account for differences in terminology and content. Examining Aristeas's account and how the other authors used writing techniques that led to their own versions helps to understand the processes involved to compose a narrative. The authors' variant versions demonstrate their awareness of specific writing conventions to produce their texts. Their unique accounts of the translation confirm that *if they were aware* of Aristeas's version, they did not have to adhere to it word-for-word; they could, instead, make modifications by choosing which details to include or exclude to fit the parameters of their presentation. Research methods for composing narratives were also varied but each author saw their own version of the narrative as legitimate. Knowledge of which writing techniques governed the divergences between Aristeas and the other authors also changes how

[565] According to Josephus, at least some Jews were apparently interested in learning Greek ideas. He includes an account through a peripatetic philosopher named Clearchus, who tells of an encounter that his famous teacher Aristotle had with an unnamed Jew from Celesyria. The anonymous Jewish man is described by Aristotle as knowing Greek language and philosophy as well as having a "Greek soul" (*Ag. Ap.* 1.176–182).

we view variant accounts. the dissimilarities between the accounts—in addition to misremembering events or competing theological viewpoints—can also be the result of intentional alterations that meet the requirements of a new narrative genre or function. Familiarity with the rules for writing a narrative also offers insight into how the authors thought about the structure and content of their compositions. For some authors, to make changes to another writer's words if it made them clearer or to embellish a character's deeds in a narrative was acceptable. Writers' comments about their sources also provides insight into their research methods and what they considered accurate reporting. Consideration for what was learned to write a narrative provides an alternative for interpreting why variants of the same account exist. Awareness of compositional education also provides explanations for disparities in texts that are based more on strategic writing decisions and less on happenstance occurrences.

CHAPTER 9

Narrative Authority

I. Introduction

The initial question of what Jewish authors, who wrote in Greek, learned to compose narrative helped to provide a response for how their literature functioned. The Greek compositional curriculum, along with commentary about narrative expectations, led to the understanding that narrative had a didactic function for its recipients. These conclusions are also instructive for answering our third and final question about narrative: what status did these writings have? By status, I mean what authority did the writings hold for the readers (audience) or community that subscribed to them?[566] Did these writings, for example, have any binding power over the readers' mindset or lifestyle? Lastly, were they considered divine or above other writings in circulation? Did these writings have the kind of sacred or inspirational status that other previous collections of literature possessed? These questions are difficult to answer because some of the texts under consideration are not mentioned directly with regard to their literary status until later periods by Patristic and Rabbinic writers.[567] This discussion will demonstrate how knowledge of

---

[566] The understanding of a text's "authority" is sometimes also described as "scripturalization." Schniedewind discusses scripturalization as a means of endowing sacred authority to a written text by focusing on precursors to how scripture became authoritative in ancient Israel. He describes three ways that a written text could become sacred and have authority by comparing them to ancient Near Eastern textual practices and parallels. A text could become sacred and authoritative through what he calls the "revelation paradigm," "messenger formula," and use as a magical text. For his detailed presentation, see, William Schniedewind, "Scripturalization in Ancient Judah," in *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*, ed. Brian Schmidt (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2015), 305–319.

[567] Rabbinic comments in the Talmud, some of which are said to go back to Tannaitic times (30 BCE–200 CE), name the biblical texts and discuss their proper order, who wrote them, and the disputed status of some texts (b. B. Bat. 14b–15a; b. Meg. 7a). Patristic authors, such as Eusebius, also discuss which texts were included for reading

compositional education informs our understanding of the authoritative status of Jewish narratives written in Greek. These texts were considered authoritative (i.e., sacred or inspired) based on their intended function, how their authors were reputed, and religious conceptions about divine mediation and writing.

The question of status or authority is inextricably intertwined with questions of canonicity. The listing of preferred or approved texts for reading was already underway in the first and second century CE, but the selection process itself was not clear or universal.[568] Early on, allusions to authoritative works were made but the titles of the works were lacking. Working in reverse, we can postulate which writings were intended based on descriptions of contents, but there is still a degree of conjecture involved. Sirach, for instance, mentions divisions of the law, prophets and ancestral books; 2 Maccabees points out the law and the prophets; the Gospel Luke mentions the law of Moses, prophets, and psalms; and Josephus, who gives the lengthiest and most descriptive listing, mentions twenty-two books which include five from Moses, thirteen written by prophets, and four that contain hymns and precepts for living.[569] Josephus' list of twenty-two works agrees most with the number that was later transmitted. The titles, and more importantly, the process for determining why those specific divisions of writings were selected

and which were disputed. His list is especially helpful for identifying which writings the Christian Church would accept (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.25.1–7). Additionally, he preserves two of the earliest lists that name the writings of the Hebrew Bible from Melito Bishop of Sardis (second century CE) and Origen (185–254 CE) (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl*. 4.26.13–14, 6.25.1–2). For a detailed discussion of the early testimonies to the collection of the Hebrew scriptures, see, F.F. Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture*, (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 69–77.

[568] Cross also discusses the complex issues related to the fixation of the Hebrew canon and its arrangement. He explains the evidence for a fluid canon between various Jewish sects (e.g., Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Samaritans) and the role that House of Hillel played in the eventual formation and acceptance of the twenty-two-book canon. Special attention is given to Josephus' list, rabbinic sources, and Qumran. Frank Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*, (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 205–229.

[569] Sirach Prologue; 2 Macc 15.9; Luke 24:44; Josephus, *Contr.* 1.39-40.

as special, however, is not explained. Philo specifically mentions divisions of writings, such as the laws (or laws of Moses), psalms, and prophetic writings.[570] He also says that Moses wrote five books, which Josephus will later claim, and even gives the name of the first of the five as Genesis.[571] He also mentions Kings as a writing and quotes from a variety of biblical texts, which demonstrates his familiarity with specific books although he does not name them all.[572] Josephus, in addition to describing the collection of writings, either mentions or alludes to the names of some biblical texts. He mentions Kings, Isaiah, the twelve prophets, and Daniel, specifically, as books.[573] He alludes to Joshua, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah as books that are written but does not provide their names.[574] Likewise, texts, such as the Gospel of Luke, also mention the names of some books in the divisions, such as Isaiah and Psalms.[575]

Partial quotations of books mentioned by other writers helps to identify works, even if they have variant traditions or readings in them. Philo quotes parts of various books from the Hebrew Bible without directly naming the source, but his reader, presumably knew which text he was referring to.[576] Even allusions to specific stories (written or oral) by writers provides some idea of which text was intended. When the Gospel of Matthew, for example, has Jesus mention the

---

[570] Five books of the law or law of Moses (*Abr.* 1; *Post.* 1; *Virt.* 201). For Philo's mentioning of the psalms and prophetic writings, see, *Gig.* 17 and *Plant.* 117. For a discussion of the sources and evidence for the different divisions of the Jewish canon, see, Roger Beckwith, "Formation of the Hebrew Bible," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 51–58.
[571] Philo, *Abr.* 1; *Aet.* 19.
[572] Philo, *Conf.* 149.
[573] Josephus, *Ant.* 9.28, 10.35, 210, 11.4–6.
[574] Josephus, *Ant.* 5.61, 10.78–80.
[575] Luke 3:4, 4:17, 20:42. For an excellent discussion and listing of books that are quoted, named, or alluded to, see, Roger Beckwith, "Formation of the Hebrew Bible," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 45–51.
[576] For instance, Philo quotes passages from the book of Exodus without naming it (*Sacr.* 133).

story of Jonah being in the belly of the fish for three days and three nights, he is undoubtedly referencing either the literary text or oral tradition of Jonah.[577] Introductory formulas, such as, "As it is written," also offer insight into the identification and authoritative status of a text, but again, why a specific passage or saying in a text is considered especially significant is unexplained.[578] In addition to a lack of clarity regarding which writings held authority, different Jewish sects also apparently read a wider range of writings as well. The Qumran community read traditional and a host of non-traditional literature, such as the Rule of the Congregation (1Q28a). This document mentions how a young Israelite should be instructed in the laws of the covenant as well as in the book of Meditation (בספר ההגי), whose content is unknown to us.[579] Additionally, Josephus mentions the Essenes as another sect that studied (unnamed) writings of the ancients (παλαιῶν συντάγματα) and sacred books (βίβλοις ἱεραῖς), which might have included traditional readings as well as a wider collection.[580] Philo describes the Therapeutae and their practice of studying the laws, prophetic oracles, hymns, psalms and other unnamed books that were profitable for knowledge and piety.[581] Another, slightly more esoteric, example of other books that may have had authority, comes from 2 Esdras.[582] In 2 Esdras, ninety-four books are written by dictation from Ezra's ecstatic experience. Twenty-four of the books are declared to be made public and used by the worthy and unworthy alike, while the remaining seventy books are to be reserved for the wise. The twenty-four books could very well be the traditional writings of the Hebrew Bible, depending on how the works are divided.[583] The seventy books for

[577] Matt 12:39; Jonah 1:17.
[578] For example, Mark 1:2–3 is a quotation of two biblical passages found in Isaiah 40:3 and Malachi 3:1.
[579] 1Qsa I, 7.
[580] Josephus, *B.J.* 2.136, 158–159.
[581] Philo, *Contempl.* 25.
[582] Also known as the Apocalypse of Ezra and 4 Ezra.
[583] The collection of writings could be twenty-four or twenty-two depending on which texts are combined (e.g., Ezra and Nehemiah). Josephus arrives at twenty-two books in his division of the Hebrew writings, which also aligns with the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. For a discussion of the symbolic meanings of the numbers 22 and 24

the wise could include writings, which are now preserved in the modern collections of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, or some other lost or unknown works. Each of these issues of understanding a writing's authority demonstrates the diversity of reading practices and preferences that different groups had during the Hellenistic and Roman eras.

The main challenge to answering what status or authority a specific narrative, or narratives in general, had is that our evidence for their acceptance or rejection is typically a later judgement. When a narrative was first written it had a primary audience and purpose but as the years transpired, the novelty and use for the text undoubtedly changed. The formation of the Christian canon is an example of how some writings, that at one time held a wide readership, lost their standing due to later political circumstances and tastes. Popular texts, such as the Shepherd of Hermas, were relegated to a disputed or rejected status after initially holding an authoritative position in the life of some Church communities.[584] Earlier Jewish literature, such as 1 Enoch and Jubilees, also held an audience but was later omitted from official lists of approved readings.[585] Unfortunately, the reasons for the approval or disapproval of certain texts was not always explicated. Looking at later judgements of the status or authority of texts then, would be anachronistic for trying to understand their initial status or function for their recipients. Instead,

in Josephus and 4 Ezra, instead of them referring to exact canonical boundaries, see, Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016), 161–171.

[584] The authoritative status of the Shepherd of Hermas fluctuated, depending on the opinion of Patristic writers. Irenaeus, Clement, and Origen, for instance, thought that the writing was inspired, should be included with the other holy writings, and quoted liberally from it (Irenaeus, *Haer*. 4.20.2; Clement, *Strom*. 1.29; Origen, *Princ*. 2.1.5). Tertullian, on the other hand, explained that the "Shepherd" was deemed apocryphal and false by various councils (Tertullian, *Pud.* 10).

[585] The book of 1 Enoch, for instance, is even quoted in the New Testament letter of Jude 14–15. Tertullian (third century CE), for instance, mentions that Jubilees is not accepted by some, but he acknowledges its validity and inspiration (*Cult. fem.* 1.3).

to ascertain the likely authority a narrative text had, we must revisit some of the groundwork that has already been laid concerning its production.

II. Scholarly Viewpoints

The study of the authority of biblical books is generally associated with the subject of canonicity. Of course, this study could be divided into the canons of the Hebrew Bible and New Testament; however, in the case of this discussion, we are interested in the authority of texts that predate the writing of the New Testament, so the focus will be on texts that are now collected in the Hebrew Bible, or in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Canonicity mainly deals with three areas, including, (1) how to define the term canon, (2) the origin of the biblical canon, and (3) the development of its structure and content. Issues of authority and inspiration are also discussed, mostly in connection with how to define canon and why certain texts were selected. The relationship between textual authority and canon is related to how the definition of "canon" is understood.[586] Scholars generally explain the use of the word canon either based on its etymological meaning (e.g., rule, list, measure) or as an ideological construct that embodies a given or perceived significance. Canon, in a more literal sense, could entail the *actual list* of books that were considered approved by a community.[587] Canon could also be used adjectively as a synonym for "authority" when describing a book as "canonical." Some scholars, such as Popović, think that "canon" as a designation for describing biblical books during the ancient

[586] Chapman discusses additional problems with defining "canon," especially its relationship to "textual fixity," authority, and scripture. For these and summaries of other prominent terminological issues and approaches for canonical studies, see, Stephen Chapman, "How the Biblical Canon Began: Working Models and Open Questions," in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*, ed. Margalit Finkelberg and Guy Stroumsa (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 34–48.

[587] Sanders understands the canon as taking shape due to the need of the people to identify and distinguish themselves because of the exilic catastrophe. The community selects writings that reflect their cultural history, which become authoritative texts and are later unchangeable. James Sanders, Torah and Canon, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 91.

Israelite and Second Temple periods, should be excised and replaced by "authoritative writings."[588]

Canonical Origins

The origin of the canon is also connected to textual authority and inspiration. The canon's inception is often explained through four views that postulate when it (the first division) was initially recognized as an authoritative document or collection. The first view argues that the Torah of Moses—perhaps the Decalogue or some combination of a proto-Deuteronomy or Leviticus text—was venerated early on by the Israelite community and became the first part of the canon.[589] The second view holds that Josiah's reform and the discovery of the book of the Torah was the watershed moment when the text was considered authoritative (canonical).[590]

---

[588] Whereas previous authors have sought to delineate a more tenable meaning for "canon" as well as its use regarding ancient Jewish literature, Popović dismisses the term altogether. Popović calls many of the common terms into question, such as canonical, biblical, and non-biblical. His point, which agrees with other scholars as well, is that many of these terms are acutely anachronistic, particularly for the Second Temple Period. Popović, instead, offers "authoritative writings" as a replacement term and imbues the phrase with characteristics that other scholars use to define canon, e.g., the antiquity of the writing, its inspiration, authorship, and even its political cachet. Mladen Popović, *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 1–2. Timothy Lim criticizes Popović for engaging in the very thing he so aptly precludes. He argues that while Popović warns against applying terms that are not indicative of what ancient Jewish communities were familiar with, he uses "Authoritative Writings" as if it was a term that would be immediately recognizable to them. Lim's accusation of Popović includes a thorough listing of all the designations used, in the "Hebrew Bible", Dead Sea Scrolls, Jewish texts of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods including the New Testament, and Rabbinic Literature that refer to texts, e.g., Book of Moses, Books of the Prophets, the Law, Oracles of God, among others. Lim's point of course, is to demonstrate that in such an exhaustive list, Authoritative Writings is not a designation that the Jewish writers or communities used to refer to their writings themselves. According to Lim, terminology for the Canon, while imprecise, becomes a moot point because the concept of a recognized collection was embedded in textual phrases such as "Torah of Moses." Timothy Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, in The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 3–4.

[589] Leiman suggests that the early version of the Torah was comprised of portions of Deuteronomy, Leviticus, and Exodus as well as other writings. Shnayer Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence,* Transactions - the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences (Hamden, Conn: Published for the Academy by Archon Books, 1976), 21. Sanders asserts that by the first destruction of the Temple, "the Torah became the rather truncated affair it now is." *Torah and Canon*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 6.

[590] One of the earliest suggestions for the emergence of the Canon, offered by Ryle, centers on the account of Josiah's reform found in 2 Kgs 22:8–23:3. The account describes the happenstance discovery of the Book of the Torah which had apparently been lost for some time within the Temple precinct. Herbert Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament; an Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture*, (London: Macmillan and co., limited, 1895), 47.

Here, the Book of the Torah is thought to be synonymous with the Sinai Covenant and given authority by the community.[591] The third view argues that there was "canonical activity" during the time of Moses, Solomon, and Hezekiah, before the time of Josiah.[592] The difference from the first view, is that this one asserts that the laws of Moses were already composed and canonical as early as the fifteenth century BCE.[593] The authority of the texts came through the community's acceptance and reverence for them, while their inspired status was supported by the commands being attributed to God as the "Book of the Law of the Lord (סֵ֥פֶר תּֽוֹרַת־יְהוָ֖ה)."[594] The third approach, places the origin of the canon in the Post Exilic period under the leadership of Ezra the Priest-Scribe.[595] This view understands the Torah of Moses, alternatively called the Torah of YHWH and the Commandments of YHWH, as containing the eventual books of the Pentateuch. The inspiration of the books is connected to their designation as the Torah or Commandments of YHWH, giving them a divine authorship, while their authority is ratified by the community's acceptance of them. A variation of the third approach places the origin of the canon in the second century BCE based on the Prologue of Sirach. Beckwith, for instance, argues that the Torah was not alone, and that other texts were also circulating, and only needed to be divided.[596] The fourth view asserts that there was no concept of canon in ancient Israel at all; instead, there was a

---

[591] Ryle takes the 2 Kgs 22:8–23:3 narrative as the initial occurrence of the Canon stating, "It is not till the year 681 B.C., the eighteenth year of the reign of King Josiah, that the history of Israel presents us with the first instance of 'a book,' which was regarded by all, kings, priests, prophets, and people alike, as invested not only with sanctity, but also with supreme authority in all matters of religion and conduct." Ibid., 47.

[592] Shnayer Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence,* Transactions - the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences (Hamden, Conn: Published for the Academy by Archon Books, 1976), 24.

[593] Ibid., 16.

[594] 2 Chr 34:14.

[595] Herbert Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament; an Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture*, (London: Macmillan and co., limited, 1895), 74.

[596] Beckwith, rather than searching for when the canon first originated, elects to argue that there was a settled canon beginning in the second century BCE and that, "The Law was never the whole of the canon, and the other two sections were formed not so much by canonizing fresh material as by subdividing material already canonical." Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism*, (London: SPCK, 1985), 165.

collection of literature, such as the Pentateuch and Prophets, that was in circulation.[597] Barton, a supporter of this view, distinguishes between scripture and canon, explaining that scripture refers to authoritative writings, while canon has to do with the closed collection of authoritative texts.[598]

The Process of Canonization

The process of canonization is usually discussed from two vantage points; one approach, the Three-Stage Theory, is an older model that held wide acceptance during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Now, variations of the three-stage model are accepted by most scholars.[599] The Three-Stage Model explains the canonical process as developing sequentially and resulting in a tripartite division. This model understands the biblical canon as closing in sections, beginning first with the Torah as it was recognized during the time of Josiah. The Torah is thought to be a proto-Torah that included legal, priestly, and cultural literature.[600] This early version of the Pentateuch was then closed under the leadership of Ezra and contained the books that presently make up the Pentateuch today. The argument for why this early Torah collection is considered to reflect the Pentateuch that has been transmitted is based on Ezra recalling events

---

[597] John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 57.
[598] Ibid., 147.
[599] According to Toorn, this three-stage model for the development of the Canon was first introduced by Heinrich Graetz and continued in the works of Frants Buhl, Gerrit Wildeboer, and Herbert Ryle. Their works respectively: Heinrich Graetz, Kohélet = [Ḳohelet]: *Oder Der Salomonische Prediger: Übersetzt Und Kritisch Erläutert* (Leipzig: C.F. Winter, 1871); Frants Buhl, *Kanon Und Text Des Alten Testamentes* (Leipzig: Akademische buchhandlung (W. Faber, 1891); Gerrit Wildeboer, *Die Entstehung Des Alttestamentlichen Kanons: Historich-Kritische Untersuchung* (Gotha: Perthes, 1891); and Ryle, Herbert Edward. *The Canon of the Old Testament; an Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture*. London: Macmillan and co., limited, 1895. See Toorn's discussion in, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2007), 234–235.
[600] Herbert Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament; an Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture*, (London: Macmillan and co., limited, 1895), 47.

that are found in different books of the Torah.[601] The authority for this collection of texts comes from both the community's acceptance as well as the Persian Edict.[602] The second stage in the three-stage canonical process, asserts that the prophetic literature was next to close during (at the earliest) the third century BCE. The prophetic closure dates are based on references to the prophetic division in 2 Maccabees and the prologue to Sirach.[603] In both cases, the prophets are mentioned as a collection of writings. In 2 Maccabees, the books of kings are mentioned along with the prophets and David's writings (as well as some additional letters). One difficulty with this view is that the titles of the works are not given in either circumstance, which makes it difficult to identify the texts that were part of the collection. The third canonical stage of development involves the close of the final division known as the Hagiographa. The Hagiographa are referred to by a variety of non-descript designations, such as, the "other writings", the psalms, hymns, and "the writings of David" among others.[604] The old model associated the closing of this division of writings, and consequently the end of the entire Hebrew canon, with another major event, famously called the Council of Jabneh (or Jamnia) in 90 or 100 CE.[605] The council held at Jabneh was thought to be a Rabbinic meeting, something akin to the Council of Nicaea for Christianity, that was intended to solidify the canon by including and

---

[601] Ibid., 113. Ryle, and other proponents of this theory, support the assertion that the Torah that Ezra presented included the books of the Pentateuch, with evidence from Nehemiah 9:6–25. In this section of the passage, Ezra is retelling many of the significant historical moments and accounts of figures in Israelite history, e.g., Abraham, the crossing of the Red Sea, the giving of the Decalogue, and their possession of Canaan. The passage actually references more events than what is traditionally found in the Pentateuch. It may be more evidence for a Hexateuch, considering that it goes into the possession of Canaan from the book of Joshua. Additionally, the passage goes even further than a Hexateuch by mentioning Israel's disobedience and rejection of the Prophets, which is found in later writings (Neh 9:26).
[602] Timothy Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, in The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 54–73.
[603] Sirach, Prologue; 2 Macc 2:13.
[604] Philo, *Contempl*. 25.
[605] According to Lewis, this notion is first attributed to H. Graetz (1871), Jack Lewis, "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 32 (1964): 125.

excluding specific writings as authoritative and inspired.[606] The concept of the council of Jabneh is pieced together by connecting, what are now deemed, unrelated rabbinic accounts from the Mishnah and Tosefta. The meeting to determine the authority, acceptance, and rejection of texts is built on passages from Mishnah Yadayim 3:5, Mishnah Ketubot 4:6, and Tosefta Yadayim 2:13–14. These passages discuss the dispute of the place of Song of Songs and Qohelet and whether they "defile the hands" as holy or inspired books. The location of the meeting is not mentioned directly in Mishnah or Tosefta Yadayim, so it has to be inferred from another separate passage in Mishnah Ketubot 4:6. Additionally, some also try to connect the listing of the order of the biblical books in the Babylonian Talmud's tractate Baba Batra 14b, as part of what transpired during the meeting. This stitching together of passages to create a rabbinic meeting that centered on settling the Hebrew canon has been rejected by modern scholarship mainly on the grounds of eisegesis. None of the passages, read alone, offer any indication of a meeting about the canon of writings. One of the main arguments against the view—regarding Mishnah Yadayim 3:5—is that other Hebrew writings that were included in the canon are not mentioned, aside from Song of Songs and Qohelet. Ultimately, the three-stage model of canon development was undone after the discovery of the Qumran scrolls in 1946.[607] Scholars began advocating for a more nuanced

[606] Jack Lewis challenges this conception and argues that the rabbinic texts used as evidence to support the theory are in fact not describing a meeting to close the Hebrew canon and are taken out of context in most cases. He succinctly sums up the difficulties of presenting the Council of Jabneh as evidence for the close of the Jewish Canon by stating, "[I]t would appear that the frequently made assertion that a binding decision was made at Jabneh covering all scripture is conjectural at best. The current certainty on the matter appears to be one of those things that has come to be true due to frequent repetition of the assertion rather than to its being actually supported by the evidence. In the absence of evidence, it would be sounder scholarship to admit ignorance and to allow the question to remain as vague as the sources are" (132). For Lewis' full discussion of the sources and problems with the theory, see, Ibid., 125–132.

[607] For a detailed discussion on the Dead Sea Scrolls and their significance for understanding canonical issues within the Qumran community and on biblical texts, see the chapter "Canons and the Dead Sea Scrolls" in Philip R. Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 152–168. Cross sees the Dead Sea Scrolls as the first unambiguous witness to an ancient stage of the Hebrew text and provides evidence for earlier textual traditions. Frank Moore Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University press, 1998), 210.

understanding of the canon and how it developed because the Dead Sea Scrolls had "canonical" as well as "extracanonical" literature.[608] This led to scholars advocating for a rethinking of the sequential and tripartite canon development. Instead of a singular and linear canonical process, the canon was being viewed as pluralistic and nonsequential. Some of the most significant challenges to the three-stage theory included an understanding of a "majority canon" which was less rigid, more fluid, and diverse across groups and time periods; whereas another view, held that there was no canon in antiquity at all.[609] The understanding of the canon, authority, and inspiration, then became a matter of sectarian preferences and allowed for the existence of multiple canons simultaneously. Scholars, such as Lim and Collins, attribute the later fixation of the Hebrew canon to the cessation of sectarianism and the rise of the Pharisaic party and its influence.[610]

---

[608] Barton considers 4 Ezra 14:45–46 as evidence for additional authoritative books being separated out into public and private literature. For Barton, the twenty-four books are the eventual Canon, while the reference to the other seventy books shows that not all additional books were necessarily rejected as t. Yad. 3:3 seems to suggest; rather they were intended for the advanced learner who had wisdom and knowledge. John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 65. The difficulty with Barton's approach to the extra-canonical materials and using 4 Ezra, is that he has to make a large leap to equate the seventy private books with any one of the extant Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha, or even the bipartite canon for that matter, since the text provides no titles.

[609] For scholars, such as Lim, "Majority Canon" means a canon that is representative of the sect in power; in this case the Pharisees whom he believes influence the formation of the eventual Rabbinic Canon. This view, however, leaves open the reality that there were other canons in existence and that every group did not have to share in the decisions and selections of others. Timothy Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, in The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 179. Barton approaches canonization differently than the Three Stage Theory by proposing that there was no canon in antiquity, based on his definition of canon as a closed collection of books. He distinguishes canon (as a list) from scripture (writings of religious authority) and asserts that there were many texts of scripture in existence without a closed list. Barton sees no exclusiveness between texts in the early periods and therefore rejects passages that are generally interpreted as evidence for canonical collections of texts, e.g., 2 Macc 2:13–14 and Philo, *Contempl*. 25. Since Barton does not define Canon is the tradition way, he understands that there are multiple authoritative scriptures in existence and belonging to different groups such as the Essenes, Pharisees, and Sadducees. John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 57, 64.

[610] Lim proposes that the Pharisaic Canon became the fixed Rabbinic Canon by the end of the first century CE. He follows the route of modern scholarship in rejecting the Council of Jabneh theory in favor of concluding that ancient Judaism did not have councils to decide inclusion or exclusion of books as later Churches did. Timothy Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, in The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 25. Lim, however, does follow John Collins' argument that the Pharisees eventually became the majority and their collection of 22 or 24 books won out. Later decisions by the Rabbis also impacted the larger communities as sectarianism ceased along with debates over competing canons. John J. Collins, "Before the Canon: Scriptures in

The development of the Hebrew canon is linked to authority and inspiration primarily by terminology for understanding canonicity and the criteria used for determining texts that were at some point or eventually approved. The authority that texts held is at times synonymous with how scholars use and define canonical status. Some scholars, as we have seen, explain authority as the communal approval that is given to a text or collection of writings. They are authoritative because the community views them this way. Inspiration on the other hand, is more of a theological issue, but is associated with the names applied to the Torah (Pentateuch). When it is referred to as the Torah or Commandments of YHWH, they are understood as products of the divine which were communicated through Moses. The limitation of authority and inspiration is essentially related to later Rabbinic proclamations about writings that defile the hands and particularly the reference to the Gospels, books of the heretics, and Ben Sira as writings that do not make the hands unclean.[611] The reference in the Tosefta to these books, and all books that come after them, is a declaration that they are not sacred or inspired by the Spirit as Song of Songs is.[612] Using Ben Sira as a line of demarcation (ca 180 BCE), the Rabbinic compiler asserts that writings that came afterwards were not to be accepted. This would also align with the Rabbinic claim that the Holy Spirit and prophecy ceased after the later prophets, such as Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, which would mean that inspired authorship would have as well.[613] This explanation, however, was obviously not a consensus view and does not explain why some groups read, copied, quoted, and included later writings in their collections.

Second Temple Judaism," in *Old Testament. Past, Present, and Future: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*, ed. D.L. Petersen J.L. Mays, and K.H. Richards (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995). 225–241.

[611] t. Yad. 2:13.

[612] t. Yad. 2:13–14.

[613] t. Soṭah 13:3.

III. Narrative Authority, Genre, Function, and Authorial Comments

One way to better understand the status or authority that Jewish narratives written in Greek had, is to consider what has previously been said about its (1) genre and (2) function, and particularly (3) comments made by Greek authors. The combination of these three issues allows us to move to a position prior to the later conclusions of official canonical lists; instead, we will evaluate what authors and their readers expected of these texts. Genre assists with understanding a narrative's authority because of the definitions given to ancient categories and what they were supposed to entail. History and myth already had definitions and expectations that precluded how they should be received by their authors and readers. History, for instance, was expected to present factual details (although some fiction or embellishment was allowed) and myth was already thought to contain invented material. In both cases, their expected content of fact and fiction, were intended to serve the reader in a didactic manner. History, in particular, was composed with an educational purpose in mind. As we have already observed, even comments by historiographers reflected their desire to produce their works for the benefit of specific individuals or general audiences.[614] Their goal was to preserve the past actions of figures or events because this information was vital and beneficial for how people could live successfully in the present and future. Here, the intended function and comments about narrative history dovetail. The didactic function, often directly expressed by the writer, compliments other comments for what motivates historiographers to engage in research and publication. Jewish and Greek narrative writers expressed their motivation for writing typically in the prologues of their work. As we have seen, authors, such as Josephus, addressed their historical works to individuals

[614] For example, Josephus addresses his historical works to Epaphroditus because of his interest in learning (*Ant.* 1.8; *Vita* 1.430; *C. Ap.* 1.1).

or groups to fulfill their recipient's desire for learning.[615] What about mythical narratives? Just as history was a genre that was meant to inform its audience about the past, myth was also used as educational literature (that also dealt with the past), similar to how children's stories are in modern times.[616] The modern children's story is mostly fictional but still functions to teach a moral lesson that shapes a child's value system.

Although the genre, function, and comments made by authors about their works are significant, how a writer's work is thought of and received also contributes to its authoritative status. While subjective, the reputation of a historian can positively or negatively affect its authoritative reception. Polybius, for example, criticizes Timaeus and his historical work, but apparently not everyone felt this way.[617] Josephus later points out how historians routinely criticized and disagreed with one another, even naming Timaeus as one of the historians who was criticized and criticized others.

> I should spend my time to little purpose if I should pretend to teach the Greeks that which they know better than I already, what a great disagreement there is between Hellanicus and Acusilaus about their genealogies; in how many cases Acusilaus corrects Hesiod; or after what manner Ephorus demonstrates Hellanicus to have told lies in the greatest part of his history; as does Timeus in like manner as to Ephorus, and the succeeding writers do to Timeus, and all the later writers do to Herodotus nor could Timeus agree with Antiochus and Philistius, or with Callias, about the Sicilian History, no more than do the various writers of the Atthidae follow one another about the Athenian affairs; nor do the historians the like that wrote the Argolics about the affairs of the Argives. (Josephus, *Contr.* 1.16–17 [Whiston])

Subjective accusations about myth or history affected the authoritative status of a literary work, but this was distinct from an author's intention. How a work was received was different depending on the time and location. An author's work may have been accepted and authoritative

[615] Josephus, *Ant.* 1.8–9.
[616] Plato, *Resp.* 2.378e.
[617] Polyb. 12.25.6–7; 12.25a.4–5.

at one point and criticized or rejected at another.[618] Since one's work was subject to the one reading it or writing against it, authority may have been better understood in terms of its usefulness or the respect it had. Authority in this sense could refer to how much the author's reputation and work could be trusted for presenting an accurate report. As previously discussed, the antiquity of a text also contributed to its authoritative status. The authority of myth or historical fiction would be judged somewhat differently. The antiquity of the work, such as the writings of Homer, Hesiod, or Moses, and the traditions associated with it (e.g., how the creation or Torah originated), contributed to its authoritative status. The practice of attributing a pseudonym to a narrative, usually a legendary or mysterious figure from the distant past, would have also added more weight to its authority, due to interest in and reverence for antiquity. This was certainly the case with later Jewish and Christian literature that was attributed to famous past figures, such as Enoch or Melchizedek, that claimed to have special insight into the future or contained mysterious secretive teachings. Determining a text's status was complex because it depended on the recipient or collective community's attitude and opinion about a text's worth. This was also the situation with later attributions of authority to collections of literature; however, another nuance would be added—the sacredness or inspiration of an author or text.

Narrative: Authoritative, Sacred, or Inspired

In some cases, the authority of narrative was expressed in terms of its sacredness or inspired

[618] Cancik, for example, describes parts of the process that led to the eventual "canonization" of some Greek texts. He explains how before texts came to be understood as part of an official or standardized list, they went through several stages which began with annual festal contests. Cancik explains how during festivals and contests, such as the Pananthenaia, literary works (e.g., Homer's epics and tragedies) were performed. The works that were performed had to meet certain criteria or rules (κανών) for the contests to be fair. This resulted in the need for standardized versions of the texts for competition, as well as which author's texts would be used. Hubert Cancik, "Standardization and Ranking of Texts in Greek and Roman Institutions," in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*, ed. Margalit Finkelberg and Guy Stroumsa (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 117–119.

status. This was, at times, something beyond the sense of "authority" as it relates to respect or trust. The former understanding of authority, generally rested on the author's reputation, the quality of the product, and perhaps its antiquity. These were all observable features, although somewhat opinionated. A reader could accept or reject a writer's literary skill or presentation of certain details. The antiquity of a work could be judged by its being quoted or in circulation for a long period of time. Each is an external feature that allowed a writing to achieve some authority or reverence by its reader. Authority based on sacredness or inspiration, however, was an entirely subjective endeavor. There was no material or objectively measurable difference between an inspired text or an uninspired one, nor a sacred or secular one; both were written on physical mediums using intelligible characters (for the most part).[619] The understanding of the status of Jewish narrative literature, as sacred, inspired, or something else, can be evaluated from the author's perspective.

Greek Narrative: Authoritative and Inspired

Greek and Jewish authors, at times, communicated their understanding of how some texts had an authority that was based on otherworldly attributes. For these texts, the author's physical, mental, and spiritual state was intertwined with the content or message of their literary work. This combination of divine effect and written product gave the text an authority that was different from, or perhaps, in some instances, superseded literature that was not viewed in the same way. The most distinctive aspect of texts that have sacred or inspirational qualities, which gives it

[619] Some texts resorted to "magical" scripts as a means of communication and mixed them with recognizable scripts. These are especially seen in Jewish and Christian magical texts. See, for example, Paul Mirecki, "The Coptic Hoard of Spells from the University of Michigan," in *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, ed. Marvin Meyer and Richard Smith (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), 293–310.

authority, is that its composition was somehow directly affected by an external divine entity or force. A text that met or exceeded the general parameters for a good composition, had a respectable author, and antiquity behind it, could garner a fair amount of authority on its own.[620] A text that had a divine connection, however, held authority because of its external attributes, given by a divine presence, without meeting every rigorous compositional standard; the divine influencer is what gives the text its authority or reverence, not necessarily its compositional elegance. But what did it mean for a text to be inspired or sacred? Writers, such as Hesiod, Plato, and Aristotle, express ideas or experiences for how poetic works were understood as inspired. Each writer describes some part of the inspirational experience or quality of the work, but none of them explains the entire systematic process from inspiration to a text's production. Looking at the different descriptions, the process or experience of an author being inspired and producing a text or its oral contents, begins with an external entity.

The general process begins with the act of the divine entity possessing or inspiring (ἐνθουσιάζω) the human orator or author. This act of inspiring leads to the human figure becoming filled with the divine (θεῖος) and is described as the inspired (ἔνθεος) or enthusiastic state during possession.[621] The action of filling the individual can occur with the aid of an

[620] There were other ways that a text or author, such as Homer, might have gained authority as well. Finkelberg, for instance, explains how Homer's revisions of the older Epic Cycle, through speeches, were understood as an update of Greek morals and culture. Homer's Iliad and Odyssey took previous material from traditional stories about the Trojan war, for example, and reshaped them to fit his own or present societal ideals. According to Finkelberg, Homer's versions of older stories eventually superseded the previous traditions by updating and marginalizing them. Examples of this are shown by the recasting and expansion of how virtue and honor are described in Homer. The older understanding of personal honor (τιμή) is coupled with the newer (for Homer) understanding of virtue (ἀρετή) that benefits the community. Homer's texts become the foundational myths which serve as models for people to follow (replacing the other older traditional stories), particularly later in schools. Margalit Finkelberg, "Homer as a Foundational Text," in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*, ed. Margalit Finkelberg and Guy Stroumsa (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 84–90.

[621] The Greek verb ἐνθουσιάζω, which is related to ἔνθεος**,** means to be possessed by or filled with the divine, and is where the word *enthusiasm* comes from. The person who is enthusiastic is filled with the divine (θεῖος).

outside medium, such as wine or music, but also through contact with a divine breath (πνεῦμα). Hesiod, for instance, explains how he receives the ability to orally produce his poetic content because a divine voice (αὐδὴν θέσπιν) was breathed (ἐνέπνευσαν) into him by Zeus's daughters (the Muses):

> So spoke great Zeus' ready-speaking daughters, and they plucked a staff, a branch of luxuriant laurel, a marvel, and gave it to me; and they breathed a divine voice into, so that I might glorify what will be and what was before, and they commanded me to sing of the race of the blessed ones who always are, but always to sing of themselves first and last. (Hesiod, *Theog*. 31 [Most, LCL])

Additionally, Plato explains how a poet needs the inspiration of the Muses, and is unable to produce anything without first being inspired (ἔνθεός) and being out of his mind (ἔκφρων), no longer having his own mind in him (καὶ ὁ νοῦς μηκέτι ἐν αὐτῷ):[622]

> In the same manner also the Muse inspires men herself … For all the good epic poets utter all those fine poems not from art, but as inspired and possessed, and the good lyric poets likewise … For a poet is a light and winged and sacred thing, and is unable ever to indite until he has been inspired and put out of his senses, and his mind is no longer in him: every man, whilst he retains possession of that, is powerless to indite a verse or chant an oracle. (Plato, *Ion*. 533e–534b [Fowler and Lamb, LCL])

After receiving an infilling of the divine, the person is described as "inspired" or possessed by the divine (ἔνθεος), resulting in an ecstatic (ἔκστασις) experience, which means the individual is in a trance or "standing outside of themselves;" their mind (νοῦς) and actions are no longer solely their own, they are now under the power and direction of the divine. The state of ecstasy then produces an observable physical response of mania (μανία) or "frenzy" in the person.[623] Plato, for example, describes how the poet is inspired by the Muses and enters a state of mania which results in the ability to produce poetry and songs:

---

[622] Plato also expresses the notion that divination (μαντικός) is a gift from god and that truly inspired divination (μαντικῆς ἐνθέου) only occurs when one is not in their rational mind (ἔννοος), "And that God gave unto man's foolishness the gift of divination a sufficient token is this: no man achieves true and inspired divination when in his rational mind, but only when the power of his intelligence is fettered in sleep or when it is distraught by disease or by reason of some divine inspiration" (Plato, *Tim.* 71e [Bury, LCL]).

[623] Plato, in his *Phaedrus*, describes (through Socrates) mania as a good thing and a gift from the gods. He also explains that songs and poetry are produced through a (third) type of mania that comes from the Muses (*Phaed*. 244a–245a). This is where the modern sense of "mania" comes from. The person who is out of their mind, usually in a negative context, is thought of as a maniac; although, in this ancient context it is viewed as a positive mental state.

> And it is worth while to adduce also the fact that those men of old who invented names thought that madness was neither shameful nor disgraceful; otherwise they would not have connected the very word mania with the noblest of arts, that which foretells the future, by calling it the manic art. No, they gave this name thinking that mania, when it comes by gift of the gods, is a noble thing, but nowadays people call prophecy the mantic art … And a third kind of possession and madness comes from the Muses. This takes hold upon a gentle and pure soul, arouses it and inspires it to songs and other poetry, and thus by adorning countless deeds of the ancients educates later generations. (Plato, *Phaedr.* 244a–245a [Fowler and Lamb, LCL])

The content of poetry receives its authority then, not simply because of its compositional appearance or author's reputation, but because of its transmission from a divine entity through a human vessel. The Muses are the prompters who give the poet supernatural knowledge and abilities, which means, as Aristotle asserts, that the poetic product (the text) is itself inspired: "[F]or there is something inspired in poetry (ἔνθεον γὰρ ἡ ποιήσις)" (*Rhet.* 3.7.11 [Freese, LCL]). The text has a divine origin and authorship and is not merely a product of human ingenuity. These examples of inspired authors and texts points to poets and their works as being considered authoritative because of their divine connection and process of production. Non-poetic works, however, could still be considered authoritative (perhaps to a lesser degree) based on the more mundane characteristics of compositional genre, antiquity, and author's reputation. Authority based on the inspiration of the author or text was still subject to one's belief or acceptance of such occurrences. As we have seen, not every poet—including Hesiod and Homer—was considered authoritative, truthful, or beneficial for moral instruction.

Jewish Narrative: Authoritative, Sacred, Inspired

Even before later councils, whether at Jabneh or Nicaea, that would confirm or deny certain writings into a "canonical" collection, Jewish and Christian writers had their own distinct opinions about the divine or sacred authority of some texts. The understanding of the authority of

Jewish biblical, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphal literature, usually deals with their reception or rejection by later decisions surrounding their canonical status. Scholars generally agree that lists or collections of writings were in flux leading into the first century CE.[624] While divisions of the Jewish texts were emerging (e.g., Torah/Law, Prophets, Psalms) the content of each division was not altogether settled.[625] Some texts, like those that would eventually be recognized as the Pentateuch, were settled, perhaps by the time of Josephus, while other books or divisions were still open. The ambiguous status of textual collections associated with the Therapeutae, the community at Qumran, and the existence of apocryphal and pseudepigraphal texts, means that literature outside of the Pentateuch was read and positively received. The questions that canonicity tries to answer are: what characteristics made a text authoritative and how were they distinguished from other popular texts that communities read? Scholars approach these questions by examining how texts were quoted by Jewish authors, how they were described, and how rabbinic sources—such as the Babylonian Talmud—retold debates regarding the status of specific texts. How a text was quoted is used to determine its authority based on certain formulaic introductions, such as "as the Scripture says" or "as it is written." These types of quotations presume an authority that a text has as a rule or measure of behavior, ethics, legal decisions, or truth. Sometimes the text is named and other times it is alluded to by its wording.

---

[624] Cross discusses many of the issues related to the development of the Hebrew canon of scriptures. He explains the problem of the lack of evidence for a formalized canon before the time of 70 CE. Cross also explains the malleable nature of which writings were read and considered authoritative due to the various sects, such as the Essenes, Qumran sect, and Hellenistic Jews. For his full discussion, see, Frank Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*, (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 219–229. Freedman offers a different explanation for the development of the Law and Prophets portion of the Hebrew Bible. He argues, based mainly on internal textual evidence, that the selection of canonical texts was already determined soon after the return from the Babylonian exile, as early as the fifth century BCE. For his assessment, see, David Noel Freedman, "The Law and The Prophets," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1963): 250–265.

[625] Scholars often describe the canonical divisions as being tripartite, which included the Torah/law, prophets, and other writings. The third division of the other writings are generally thought to include texts such as the psalms, proverbs, and historical literature, and are sometimes referred to as the Hagiographa.

How a text is *described*, has to do with later interpretations or opinions about a text as sacred or inspired; this is the part we will focus on here. The main issue with this question is: what criteria made a writing inspired or sacred, and thereby gave it an authoritative status in the community? Scholars make considerable use of Rabbinic sources to understand the process of canonization because, although the texts are from a later period, they presumably preserve earlier traditions and debates about texts that were accepted or rejected as authoritative or inspired.[626] From these questions, a text's authority was based on how it was referred to or used by different groups. If Philo or Josephus quoted a passage from Genesis, for instance, it meant that they viewed that text as possessing some type of significance above other writings. Quoting a text may have meant that it held high significance and even authority for the writer, but how a text or its author was described provided insight into why a text was thought to be authoritative. The use of rabbinic debates about the place or status of texts also connects to how writings are described. Here, we will focus our attention on why Jewish authors viewed some texts as authoritative due to its inspired or sacred status. A text's authority based on inspiration or sacredness, as we shall see, was similar to the opinions held by Greek authors concerning the inspiration and authority of their poetic authors and texts.

Whereas Jewish narratives written in Greek held authority—like their Hellenistic counterparts—based on longevity, an author's reputation, and its compositional features, some texts were also viewed as authoritative because of the belief or opinion that they were the

[626] Beckwith, for example, discusses the status of Jewish books, mainly through rabbinic sources, as it relates to the dispute about which books defiled the hands or should be stored away. He explains the issue of their inspiration and why certain texts' status, such as Esther and Ben Sira, were disputed. Roger Beckwith, "Formation of the Hebrew Bible," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 61–68.

products of divine association. Certain books and divisions of Jewish literature were considered authoritative based on how they were described by authors who had an interest in these texts. While their comments do not prove their authoritative status, they do offer insight into how some writers and their audiences thought of these writings and their authors. The question here is not about which texts made it into the canon; instead, we will evaluate what specific authors said about their texts to understand why they thought they were inspired or sacred and held authority. As with reconstructing the educational curriculum for writing narrative, the aim is to understand—from the author's perspective—what they thought about inspired or sacred authority for those living during the Hellenistic and Roman eras. References will still be made to later testimonies, such as the Rabbinic and Patristic sources, but only to underscore certain points. We will begin with how the concept of inspiration and sacredness (including its terminology) was understood, then how some Jewish writers referred to their texts, and finally, how the status of narrative was conceived based on these findings.

When a writer said that a text was inspired or sacred what did they mean? References to biblical passages were often described as sacred, holy or inspired, but why certain texts were regarded in this manner and not others, was not always explained. The concept of inspiration or the sacredness of a text starts with its terminology. Usually, texts are assumed as authoritative because of the later traditions that were transmitted, without asking how or why these texts were considered inspired in the first place. A text's authority was a topic of debate in Rabbinic and Patristic circles because they sought to explain why certain texts were deemed authoritative for their students and communities. For writers of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, however, what was their conception of inspiration or sacredness? Was there a precedent for understanding what they meant before the later opinions and explanations of rabbis and Christian theologians? First,

simple quotation of familiar Hebrew passages does not account for why they thought those texts were inspired. Philo, Josephus, and Paul quote secular Greek authors, but it does not mean that they considered those writings on equal footing with Jewish literature. Quotation alone could mean that the writings were well-respected and even revered, but it does not immediately suggest a belief in inspiration or sacredness.

Inspiration: Concept and Terminology

The concept of the inspiration of scripture as a rationale for authority, is similar to the Greek understanding. The Greek conception of inspired texts features a godly interaction with a human speaker or author, who in turn is filled with the divine, and enters an ecstatic state prompting manic behavior, which produces the words (oral or written) of the deity. The authority of inspiration rests on the divine nature of the content of the speech or text. The speaker or author is "out of their mind" as the writer conveys the divine being's message. In some Jewish traditions, there was a belief in the inspiration of the author as well as scripture. The words used to describe the writer or the texts in this way, forms of ἔνθεος or ἐνθουσιάζω, were also the same as in the Hellenistic tradition for Jewish writings composed in Greek, in addition to others. The reason these terms were probably selected, is connected to the process for inspiration. In Greek thought, the poet was the one who received the infilling, at times, through a divine breath.[627] In Jewish tradition, the prophet was often the figure through whom God imparted his divine message;

[627] Plato also describes the association of mantics with prophets, explaining that they are not exactly the same. Prophets are known for interpreting inspired divinations (ἐνθέοις μαντείαις). "Wherefore also it is customary to set the tribe of prophets to pass judgement upon these inspired divinations; and they, indeed, themselves are named "diviners" by certain who are wholly ignorant of the truth that they are not diviners but interpreters of the mysterious voice and apparition, for whom the most fitting name would be "prophets of things divined" (Plato, *Tim.* 72a–b [Bury, LCL]).

although, other figures who were not strictly prophets also received this as well.[628] The spirit of God, in the Hebrew Bible, was depicted as coming upon a figure and enabling them to do accomplish miraculous feats, including prophesying.[629] The spirit of God is רוּחַ in Hebrew, which is often translated with πνεῦμα in the Septuagint; both of which can be translated as spirit or breath. The Greek tradition also uses πνεῦμα to refer to one of the ways that a poet received divine inspiration, as we saw with Hesiod and the Muses. In the Hebrew Bible, the prophet receives the spirit or breath of God, which results in a physical reaction as prophesy. Two figures from the Hebrew Bible, David and Moses, are analogous to the experience of the Greek poet, whose words or writings also became authoritative (for some) because of their perceived inspiration. Both figures were considered to be prophets who were endowed with the deity's breath or spirit and produced literary works under divine possession, in a manner similar to the poets. The prophets in the Hebrew Bible are described as characters to whom the spirt or breath of God (רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים) or of YHWH (רוּחַ יהוה) inhabits which induces prophecy.[630]

> Saul was told, "David is at Naioth in Ramah." Then Saul sent messengers to take David. When they saw the company of the prophets in a frenzy, with Samuel standing in charge of them, the spirit of God came upon the messengers of Saul, and they also fell into a prophetic frenzy. When Saul was told, he sent other messengers, and they also fell into a frenzy. Saul sent messengers again the third time, and they also fell into a frenzy. (1 Sam 19:19–21)

The reception of the spirit and response of prophecy are similar, as we shall see, to the state of ecstasy and mania that the poets experienced. The prophets, in addition to prophesying, also elicit a bodily reaction which often included music and instruments.[631] The spirit or breath is also

[628] The prophet Amos, for example, explains that he is not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but is commanded by YHWH to go and prophesy (Amos 7:14–15). For an instance of the spirit of YHWH (רוּחַ יהוה) coming upon Saul and inducing prophesy, see, 1 Sam 10:6.

[629] Samson, the Judge and Nazarite, has the spirit of God (רוּחַ יהוה) come upon him to accomplish his feats of strength (Judg 14:6).

[630] Another common way to describe the divine source of the prophet's words was, for example, through the formulaic expression, "The word of the Lord came to Isaiah (וַיְהִי֙ דְּבַר־יְהוָ֔ה אֶֽל־יְשַׁעְיָ֖הוּ)" (Isa 38:4).

[631] 1 Sam 10:5 and 1 Chr 25:1.

tangibly transferable; a person who is around others in a prophetic state may also contract the breath of god and begin prophesying themselves.

> Then Saul sent messengers to take David. When they saw the company of the prophets in a frenzy, with Samuel standing in charge of them, the spirit of God came upon the messengers of Saul, and they also fell into a prophetic frenzy. (1 Sam 19:20)

The spreading of the divine breath to others is also characteristic of Greek thought, as inspiration (ἔνθεος) from the Muses can also spread to or connect others.

> In the same manner also the Muse inspires (ἐνθέους) men herself, and then by means of these inspired persons (ἐνθουσιαζόντων) the inspiration (ἐνθέων) spreads to others, and holds them in a connected chain. (Plato, *Ion*. 533e [Fowler and Lamb, LCL])

David was also considered to be in the company of the prophets. The connection of his writings (the Psalms) to divine inspiration comes from the idea that he was inspired as a prophet by the breath or spirit of God. David's prophetic position is demonstrated by passages where he expresses that the spirit of God spoke through him, or when other writers acknowledge his prophetic status.

> Now these are the last words of David: The oracle of David, son of Jesse, the oracle of the man whom God exalted, the anointed of the God of Jacob, the favorite of the Strong One of Israel: The spirit of the LORD speaks through me, his word is upon my tongue. (2 Sam 23:1-2)
> Fellow Israelites, I may say to you confidently of our ancestor David that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us to this day. Since he was a prophet, he knew that God had sworn with an oath to him that he would put one of his descendants on his throne. (Acts 2:29–30)[632]

The writings of the Psalms are often attributed to David, and his contribution is sometimes described as inspired, as he spoke the words "by the Holy Spirit (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ)."[633] Jesus, for instance, in the Gospel of Mark, explains David's words—from Psalm 110:1—as being under the influence of the spirit.

> While Jesus was teaching in the temple, he said, "How can the scribes say that the Messiah is the son of David? David himself, by the Holy Spirit, declared, 'The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet."' (Mark 12:35–36)

[632] The reference is to the Apostle Peter's address to the mixed crowd on the Day of Pentecost.
[633] The authorship of the Psalms is attributed to David in the Babylonian Talmud (b. B. Bat. 14b–15a).

This could also be understood as David speaking while possessed by the holy breath (of God). David speaking by the Holy Spirit would be equivalent to the Greek poet who spoke while possessed by the Muses after receiving the divine breath. The control of the (holy) spirit or breath over David as he spoke is more clearly articulated in Acts, where the physical text is associated with David and is attributed to the breath or spirt (of God).

> In those days Peter stood up among the believers (together the crowd numbered about one hundred twenty persons) and said, "Friends, the scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit through David foretold concerning Judas, who became a guide for those who arrested Jesus-- for he was numbered among us and was allotted his share in this ministry." … "For it is written in the book of Psalms, 'Let his homestead become desolate, and let there be no one to live in it'; and 'Let another take his position of overseer.' (Acts 1:15–20)

Here, the scripture (Psalms) contains the words spoken by David, who was under inspiration or possession by the holy breath or spirit. The inspiration and authority of Psalms attributed to David then, could be considered authoritative because of his status as a prophet and his experience of being under the influence of the holy breath, which was analogous to the divine breath of the Greek poets. The content of Psalms (David's writings) were, according to their understanding, products, not of David, but of direct divine agency.

The authority of the Torah (Pentateuch) was also connected to divine inspiration, and particularly associated with the Hebrew figure of Moses. Although David was understood as a prophet whom the Holy Spirit occasionally possessed and spoke through, Moses was Israel's prophet par excellence. Traditionally, Moses was superior to any other prophet in Israel, and his relationship with God was also unlike other prophets; God spoke to them through distant methods, such as dreams or visions, while with Moses, his prophetic experience was a personal encounter, "Never since has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses, whom the LORD knew

face to face (Deut 34:10)" and "Thus the LORD used to speak to Moses face to face, just as a man speaks to his friend (Exod 33:11)."

> He said, "Hear now My words: If there is a prophet among you, I, the LORD, shall make Myself known to him in a vision. I shall speak with him in a dream. "Not so, with My servant Moses, He is faithful in all My household; With him I speak mouth to mouth, even openly, and not in dark sayings, And he beholds the form of the LORD. Why then were you not afraid to speak against My servant, against Moses?" (Num 12:6–8)

Although other prophets spoke words that were given to them under possession of the breath of God, and were subsequently captured in written form, Moses' connection to the Torah is described as a close encounter with God or an angelic mediator. Moses is not necessarily filled with the divine breath, at this juncture, because he is actually in the midst of a meeting with divine beings. The contents of the Torah are described as being given or communicated to him by heavenly beings (God or an angel), which gives the written Torah its divinely inspired status. The divine inspiration is more of an exchange between the heavenly being and human intermediator, than the inspired and divine infilling described with other prophets or poets. The law and commandments are written by the finger of God on two tablets and given to Moses for the peoples' instruction on Mount Sinai, "And when He had finished speaking with him upon Mount Sinai, He gave Moses the two tablets of the testimony, tablets of stone, written by the finger of God (Exod 31:18)." The encounter is between YHWH and Moses, and the Torah's contents are divine because they are conceptualized and written by YHWH, "Now the LORD said to Moses, "Come up to Me on the mountain and remain there, and I will give you the stone tablets with the law and the commandment which I have written for their instruction"" (Exod 24:12). Moses communicates and shares the divine words with the Israelite congregation, which is his function as a prophet.

The book of Jubilees expands on the tradition of Moses receiving the law and commandments from God on Mount Sinai by also having him write additional details about the divisions of time. Just as in the traditional account, God has written the law and commandments on tablets and given them to Moses.

> In the first year of the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt, in the third month of the sixteenth day of that month, the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, "Come up to me on the mountain, and I shall give you two stone tablets of the Law and commandment, which I have written, so that you may teach them." (Jub. 1:1 [Wintermute, *OTP*])

Additionally, God instructs Moses to write in a book what is said about the divisions of time, everything that will occur from beginning to end.

> And he said, "Set your mind on every thing which I shall tell you on this mountain, and write it in a book so that their descendants might see that I have not abandoned them on account of all the evil which they have done to instigate transgression of the covenant which I am establishing between me and you today on Mount Sinai for their descendants." (Jub. 1.5 [Wintermute, *OTP*])

> "And you write down for yourself all the matters which I shall make know to you on this mountain: what (was) in the beginning and what (will be) at the end, what will happen in all of the divisions of the days which are in the Law and testimony and throughout their weeks (of years) according to the jubilees forever, until I shall descend and dwell with them in all the ages of eternity." (Jub. 1.26 [Wintermute, *OTP*])

Although God tells the Angel of the Presence to write these things for Moses, the angel then instructs Moses to write everything beginning with the creation, which includes details and events found in the book of Genesis.[634] The attribution of the creation story's authorship to heavenly origins that were dictated to Moses and transcribed by him, gives the content of the work its inspired character. The words are divine because they are from God or the angel and are processed through the venerated figure of Moses. The experience is a more direct and intensive form of having the divine breath give the words to the prophet. The prophet (Moses) actually receives the tablets and new material directly from the divine entity, instead of through an ecstatic or manic experience.

[634] Jub. 1.27, 2.1.

Philo takes the same account with Moses but describes it using Hellenistic terms that align more with the Greek poet's experience of inspiration.[635] For Philo, Moses is a divine prophet (θείου προφήτου) whose oracles are written in sacred books (ἱεραῖς βίβλοις).[636]

> … having fully discussed the first three, and having shown that Moses was a most excellent king, and lawgiver, and high priest, I come in the last place to show that he was also the most illustrious of prophets. I am not unaware then that all the things which are written in the sacred books are oracles delivered by him; and I will set forth what more peculiarly concerns him, when I have first mentioned this one point, namely, that of the sacred oracles some are represented as delivered in the person of God by his interpreter, the divine prophet, while others are put in the form of question and answer, and others are delivered by Moses in his own character as a divinely-prompted lawgiver possessed by divine inspiration. (*Mos.* 2.187–188 [Yonge])

Moses' prophetic experience is described as inspired by God (ἔνθους), full of the divine breath or spirit (καταπνευσθεὶς), and under the spirit's (πνεύματος) guidance, which resulted in his prophesying.[637]

> Thus he spoke to them while yet standing still. But after a short time he became inspired by God, and being full of the divine spirit and under the influence of that spirit which was accustomed to enter into him, he prophesied and animated them thus … (*Mos.* 1.175 [Yonge])

Moses, like the Greek poet, is inspired by the divine using the same word (ἔνθεος), the process of becoming inspired is also described as becoming filled with the breath or spirit of the divine, and the result is a prophetic, instead of poetic utterance.[638] Moses' prophetic response is even further described using the Greek verb θεσπίζει, which is derived from θέσπις (a combination of θεός

---

[635] Philo also does the same with the figure of Abraham. He converts Abraham's experience when receiving the covenant from YHWH to terminology that reflects a prophetic reception of the divine breath or spirit. Whereas in the Genesis account (Gen 15:12), Abraham falls into a deep sleep, Philo explains that he enters a trance (ἔκστασις), is inspired (ἐνθουσιῶντος) by the deity—using similar language as what the poets experience—and is described as a prophet (*Her.* 1.258).

[636] *Mos.* 2.188.

[637] See also, *Mos.* 2.246.

[638] Philo, when discussing how the divine oracles were shared with Moses and written in sacred books, explains three ways that they were received. Some were delivered directly by God and needed a divine prophet to interpret them. A second type came during a question and answer session between God and Moses, and a third kind was received when Moses was possessed by divine inspiration (*Mos.* 2.188).

and ἔσπον), and means to speak words from god. The book of Jubilees and Philo's presentation of Moses as a prophet who receives direct communication from God, demonstrates how and why writers understood the authority of the Torah (Pentateuch) as inspired and authoritative. The Torah's contents were not only transcribed by a preeminent prophet, but they were communicated or written directly by God.[639]

The status of Jewish literature and its inspiration were associated with the prophetic tradition and experience. Philo, for instance, mentions the book of Kings as most sacred (ἱερώτατον) and inspired (ἱεροφαντηθέντων), which later rabbinic tradition corroborated by attributing its authorship to the prophet Jeremiah.[640] The concept that the writings were the products of divine speech and intellect, as opposed to strictly human ingenuity or opinion, helped to solidify their status as authoritative for later readers. This understanding can be seen from authors, such as Josephus, who naturally accepts and claims that the Jewish scriptures—according to his reckoning—were products of prophetic utterance, which meant divinely inspired. He asserts that prophets were responsible for writing the earliest accounts and that the source of their knowledge of these events was God, through inspiration or his breath (ἐπίπνοιαν).[641] This, as he states, meant that the writings themselves were divine (θεῖα) because of the source of their content.[642]

[639] Amir discusses how Philo presents the transaction of divine oracles between God and Moses as a sort of collaboration. The process of inspiration and revelation of the Torah includes aspects that are divine, but it does not exclude Moses' human ability, as a recipient, to reason. Amir shows that the oracle still has a divine source, but as Philo explains it, Moses can also apply his philosophical skills to express what was communicated to him. In this way, the Torah can be described as authored by God and Moses. For Amir's full discussion, see, "Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the Writings of Philo," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 433–439.
[640] For Philo's description of the book of Kings as sacred and inspired, see, *Deus* 1.6, *Conf.* 1.149. For the Rabbinic attribution of Jeremiah as the author of the book of Kings, see, b. B. Bat. 15a.
[641] The Apostle Paul also associates the inspiration of all scripture (πᾶσα γραφὴ) with God's divine breath using the word θεόπνευστος to describe the process and their nature (2 Tim 3:16).
[642] Josephus' comment that the scriptures are "divine (θεῖα)" is preserved in Eusebius' version of the quotation (*Hist. eccl.* 3.10).

> … everyone is not permitted of his own accord to be a writer, nor is there any disagreement in what is written; they being only prophets that have written the original and earliest accounts of things as they learned them of God himself by inspiration; and others have written what has happened in their own times, and that in a very distinct manner also. For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from, and contradicting one another, [as the Greeks have], but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times; which are justly believed to be divine … (*C. Ap.* 1.37–38 [Whiston])

Later Rabbis would also link the authorship of many of the biblical books to prophets as well, to certify their inspired and authoritative status. Figures, such as Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, and Jeremiah, were listed as authors who wrote much of the biblical collection.[643] Their authorship was already being attributed to prophetic figures from Israel's past and expressed in Hellenistic terms, before the Rabbinic period, similar to poetic inspiration by Jewish authors who wrote in Greek. What did this mean, however, for the authority of later Jewish literature, such as the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha? For narratives written in Greek, historiography proper generally did not make any declarations of divine inspiration for authority. Histories, like 2 Maccabees or those written by Josephus, were framed as Hellenistic historical works that reported past events and only claimed to give an accurate or truthful account. The authors, named or unnamed, did not claim to have a prophetic experience or receive a divine breath to assist with composing their work; instead, they relied on their compositional skills and research and reporting techniques to complete their task. The authority of their literary efforts rested on the quality of their work, reputation, and reception by their readers and critics. Texts attributed to characters, such as Enoch, however, needed to have additional authority for their texts to be accepted.[644] The practice of pseudepigraphy not only associated the writing with a figure from

[643] The Babylonian Talmud lists authors of biblical texts, some of whom are considered to be prophets, and their text therefore inspired; however, some texts are listed that do not have a prophetic connection (b. B. Bat. 14b).

[644] Mroczek discusses how attributed authorship can be done for various reasons aside from providing authority to a writing. She suggests that attribution was also practiced to further develop a character, such as David, or to position them as a general trident of a tradition instead of the actual author. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016), 52–53.

the past, it also, in some cases, positioned the text's source, content, and characters with heavenly beings who provided secret of futuristic messages; akin to what prophets would be privy to.

Since most of our understanding of the authority of accepted texts comes from later sources, it is difficult to know how the authors and their readers viewed, what we would call, inspired or authoritative texts. The writer of the New Testament letter of Jude quotes a passage from what we recognize as the book of 1 Enoch, but did the writer of the epistle consider the contents of the text or its author as inspired?[645] Additionally, did the writer of Jude or its readers view the content of 1 Enoch as sacred, historical, or both? Jude cites Enoch, seemingly as a historical figure, and says that he "prophesied (Προεφήτευσεν)" about the fate of his current opponents.

> It was also about these that Enoch, in the seventh generation from Adam, prophesied, saying, "See, the Lord is coming with ten thousands of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to convict everyone of all the deeds of ungodliness that they have committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things that ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 1:14–15)

Enoch is presented as prophesying, which presumably entails divine communication, as in other instances, and makes the message not solely Enoch's but from a divine source. Based on how prophetic utterances appear to have been received, the words (and text) of Enoch were probably considered by Jude to be inspired. Enoch's reception as an inspired and authoritative text by later Patristic writers, such as Tertullian, is not surprising then, because of its prophetic connection.[646]

---

[645] The quotation is from 1 Enoch 1.9.

[646] Tertullian, *Cult. fem*. 1.3. The Ethiopian Church tradition, for instance, includes 1 Enoch in its canonical writings.

Narrative as a Sacred Text

Closely related to the concept of literary inspiration is the sacredness of a text. Whereas inspiration deals with the process between the author, speaker, and the divine, the sacredness of the text mainly entails its material state. A text that is described as "inspired" conveys more of how the text was produced, while a text that is described as sacred or holy communicates its relative position to other texts and its human readers.[647] Writers from the Hellenistic and Roman eras, such as Philo and Josephus, describe traditional Jewish texts often as sacred or holy without significant differences between how they viewed them. Sometimes they referred to them as sacred or holy books (e.g., ἱεραῖς βίβλοις), and other times as writings (e.g., γραφαῖς ἁγίαις), among other combinations.[648] The general sense is that the books are something to have awe or reverence for because of their relationship to the divine. The writings are sacred or holy because their content and authors are inspired, results of God's divine breath. For writers of this time, to say that a text had authority because it was inspired, automatically qualified it as sacred; however, it is also possible to have a text that was sacred or holy but, perhaps, not inspired.

[647] Rabbinic debates on how the sacredness of texts affected the reader or handler are discussed in the Babylonian Talmud. Some texts, such as Esther, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes, were debated as to whether they defiled the hands of the reader or not. Defiling the hands (or making them unclean) meant that the sacredness or holiness of the text, in equal proportion to its uncleanness, could defile the hands. If a text, however, was not inspired or holy, then it did not defile the hands (b. Meg. 7a). For a discussion of the rabbinic positions regarding this argument, see, Roger Beckwith, "Formation of the Hebrew Bible," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 61–73.

[648] For sacred (ἱερός) books (βίβλος), see, Philo *Mos*. 2.188; Josephus *Ant*. 1.26, 82, 139. For sacred (ἱερός) writings (γραφή or γράμμα), see, Philo *Congr*. 175, *Somn*. 2.265; 2 Tim 3.15; Josephus *Ant.* 10.210, *C. Ap*. 1.127. For holy (ἅγιος) books (βίβλος), see, 1 Macc 12.9. For holy (ἅγιος) writings (γραφή), see, Rom 1:2. For a detailed discussion of how the scriptures were referred to using other combinations of terms, aside from holy or sacred, see, Roger Beckwith, "Formation of the Hebrew Bible," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 39–40.

IV. Conclusions

Authority, based on a text's inspired or sacred status, would still be left to the believability and approval of the audience. Whether an author viewed their text, written in the name of a revered figure from Israel's past, as inspired or authoritative is difficult to answer. I think to answer these questions, we have to review the motivations authors had for writing and how they expected their work to function. Because creating details and expanding existing stories about legendary figures was part of their writing curriculum, it seems that they would not have to believe that all the details were "true" (that is historically accurate); however, from an authoritative standpoint, they would want their work to be consulted for didactic purposes. To ensure that their literary creations would be used and remembered, presenting them as authentic prophetic works would certainly be more convincing to their audience. The issue was not intentional deception, as we have seen; instead, it was about using the literary means and techniques at their disposal to craft a persuasive product for their reader. To what extent authoritative and inspired works influenced the daily lives of their readers, probably depended on the subject matter and how persuaded they were by the narrative presentation.

CHAPTER 10

Summary and Conclusions

The initial questions of how and what Jewish writers learned to compose Greek narrative and what it could tell us about the function and status of their texts, were answered by first situating them in their proper historical setting. An important step was recognizing that the definition and parameters of "narrative" as a genre needed to be recalibrated to fit the meanings it had for writers operating during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. This prevents anachronistically applying modern genre designations that confuse the scope and means of properly identifying narrative as the centerpiece of the study. Narrative, as an ancient literary genre, constituted sub-genres and rhetorical techniques that could be identified in Jewish texts and made it possible, through comparison, to understand its function and status.

To identify the details behind what constituted narrative compositional education, a reconstruction of the curriculum was required. The reconstruction was successfully completed by combining classical Greek and Jewish literary sources, as well as exercises and comments about writing. This combination provided the framework that displayed the writing instructions and authorial attitudes and expectations for composing narrative literature. Now, instead of being restricted to only commenting that Jewish writers (probably) learned Greek education and rhetorical techniques, we can definitively articulate what they learned, at what stage they learned

it, where they likely learned it, and how it affected the structure and content of their works. Additionally, we can point to explicit comments and expectations about narrative, from Jewish and Greek authors, that express how they thought about their products, and (at long last) at least consider what authors were thinking; something that was almost sacrilegious to ask of ancient authors and texts.

The reconstruction of general and compositional education showed that Jewish students had access to Hellenistic education while continuing their traditional study of Jewish subjects, such as the Torah. In addition to the Jewish education curriculum, they also learned parts of the encyclical paideia, including grammar, mythology, and maxims at various stages of the curriculum. The early stages of learning equipped students with fundamental knowledge of Greek myth, theology, lists of names, rudimentary philosophical concepts, and moral ethics. Additionally, they were introduced to recitation of "classical" authors as practice for reading, memorization, and writing. These exercises and ideas served as outlines, which they continually expanded, for when they would eventually compose their own texts. Their educational curriculum was cumulative, as evidenced by using Aesop's *Fables* and other well-known stories or authors in the school handbooks for writing and speaking drills. What was learned at an early stage could certainly be used for literary purposes at a later one.

Training in narrative composition began in earnest during what we referred to as the "second stage" of education under a rhetor or sophist. During this period, beginning around twelve years of age, students were introduced to more advanced writing techniques, sometimes called the *progymnasmata* (preliminary exercises), and began honing their skills for inventing texts. The

definitions of narrative and the authors' comments about the intended use of their works showed that they primarily had a didactic function. The instructional nature and value of narratives, such as historiography, was further enhanced by claims, often based on tradition, that the texts were sacred or inspired. The intrinsic value of a narrative was connected, for instance, to what the receptors believed about its relationship to the divine (prophetic) or the reputation (positive or negative) of its author. The human author could be equally exalted as inspired or roundly criticized as someone who invented falsehoods. Based on authors' comments about education, the location for learning could be at several places, including the synagogue, gymnasium, or someone's home, among other places.

The rules for writing were just as diverse and fluid as the places to learn. Narrative writing styles and instructions were concurrently exact and malleable. Teachers of writing communicated their instructions with vivid reasonings and examples, but the student or veteran writer was also encouraged to blend aspects of the rules for their literary interests or to meet the desired effect on their audience more efficiently. Openness to merging rules was due to the rhetorical goal of narrative presentations as a form of persuasion. The writer's aim was the same as the orator, to convince the audience (listening or reading) of their point, regardless of its veracity.

Possessing a plausible paradigm for Jewish education and writing during the Hellenistic and Roman periods equips the modern reader with invaluable background information for interpreting ancient texts. Now, when a reader encounters challenging texts or passages, the educational setting of the author could prove to be crucial for resolving the issue or inquiry. The

writer's training, whether in paraphrase, allegory, encomiastic elements, thoughts about using superlatives, or changing established textual versions, helps to explain their use or presence in a text.

The practical case studies, involving Philo and Aristeas, demonstrated unequivocally that aspects of Hellenistic education and rules for composing narrative were employed by Jewish authors who wrote in Greek. Both studies proved that Jewish writers had access to, knowledge of, and had the ability to incorporate Greek compositional techniques by aligning the structures and contents of the Jewish texts with their Greek counterparts. The similarities between them corroborated the use of specific instructions and expectations for writing narrative. These case studies also provided a template for how to comparatively examine and apply knowledge of writing rules to ancient literature.

The reconstruction of narrative compositional education for Jewish writers and how it informs our understanding of function and status are important steps towards understanding textual production in ancient Judaism. Some additional questions for further research include, how the book trade (booksellers) factored into the creation and distribution of narrative texts, especially what was said about them. Magical texts, with their use of unintelligible (to us) symbols, and employment of angelic, celestial, or superhuman beings, is another area to understand when learning to compose texts. For now, having a construct to understand Greek education and writing is a significant move towards adding another lens for interpreting the complexities within Jewish narratives. Because of the mutual exchange between Jewish students and Greek

education, Judaism, as a religion and culture, continued to find new forms of expression through innovative conceptions for composing narratives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abegg, Martin, Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1999.

Alexandre, Manuel. *Rhetorical Argumentation in Philo of Alexandria.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1999.

Amir, Yehoshua. "Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the Writings of Philo." Pages: 421–453 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Mulder and Harry Sysling. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004.

Amir, Yehoshua. "The Transference of Greek Allegories to Biblical Motifs in Philo." Pages 15–25 in *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*, ed. Frederick Greenspahn, Earle Hilgert, and Burton Mack. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984.

Apuleius. *Metamorphoses (The Golden Ass), Volume II: Books 7-11.* Edited and translated by J. Arthur. Loeb Classical Library 453. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Aristotle. *Art of Rhetoric.* Translated by J. H. Freese. Loeb Classical Library 193. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Aristotle. *Politics.* Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 264. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Aristotle, Longinus, Demetrius. *Poetics. Longinus: On the Sublime. Demetrius: On Style.* Translated by Stephen Halliwell, W. Hamilton Fyfe, Doreen C. Innes, W. Rhys Roberts. Revised by Donald A. Russell. Loeb Classical Library 199. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Arnim, Hans Von, ed. *Chrysippi Fragmenta Logica et Physica*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, Inc., 2010.

Attridge, Harold. "Historiography," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Pages 157–183 in Vol. 2 of Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud. Edited by Michael Stone. Assen, Netherlands: Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress Press, 1984.

Aune, David, “Greco-Roman Biography.” Pages 107–125 in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*, Edited by David Aune. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1988.

Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986.

Beckwith, Roger T. *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism*. London: SPCK, 1985.

Beckwith, Roger. “Formation of the Hebrew Bible.” Pages: 39–86 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Mulder and Harry Sysling. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004.

Billings, Bradly S. "“As Some of Your Own Poets Have Said”: Secular and Non-Canonical Literature in the New Testament and Some (Post)Modern Parallels." *The Expository Times* 123, no. 10 (2012/07/01 2012): 479-85.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 BCE to 200 CE*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Borchardt, Francis. "The Lxx Myth and the Rise of Textual Fixity." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 43, no. 1 (2012): 1–21.

Borgen, Peder. “Philo of Alexandria.” Pages 233–282 in *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud*. Edited by Michael Stone Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Bowie, Ewen. “The Ancient Readers if the Greek Novels.” Pages 87–106 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Braginskaya, Nina. “Joseph and Aseneth.” Pages 79–103 in *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections*. Edited by Marília Pinherio, Judith Perkins, and Richard Pervo. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing; Groningen University Library, 2012.

Briant, Pierre. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Translated by Peter Daniels. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Bruce, F.F. *The Canon of Scripture*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1988.

Bryan, Christopher. *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Settings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus. *Hymns and Epigrams. Lycophron: Alexandra. Aratus: Phaenomena.* Translated by A. W. Mair, G. R. Mair. Loeb Classical Library 129. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

Cancik, Hubert. "Standardization and Ranking of Texts in Greek and Roman Institutions." Pages 117–130 in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*. Edited by Margalit Finkelberg and Guy Stroumsa. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.

Carr, David. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature.* Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Chapman, Stephen. "How the Biblical Canon Began: Working Models and Open Questions." Pages 29–51 in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*. Edited by Margalit Finkelberg and Guy Stroumsa. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.

Charles, Robert Henry. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. edited by Robert Henry Charles Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.

Cicero. *On the Orator: Books 1-2.* Translated by E. W. Sutton, H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 348. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Cicero. *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Translated by Harry Caplan. Loeb Classical Library 403. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Clement of Alexandria. "The Stromata, or Miscellanies." In *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria (Entire)*, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe, Vol. 2. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Company, 1885.

Cohen, Shaye. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

Collins, John J. "Before the Canon: Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 225–41 in *Old Testament. Past, Present, and Future: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*, edited by D.L. Petersen J.L. Mays, and K.H. Richards. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.

Crenshaw, James. "Education in Ancient Israel." *JBL* 104 (1985): 601–615.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996.

Cross, Frank. *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah*. Oxford: The Clarendon press, 1933.

Davies, Philip. *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.

Demsky, Aaron. "Jewish Education." *Encyclopedia Judaica* 6:162–169.

deSilva, David. "The Author of 4 Maccabees and Greco-Roman Paideia: Facets of the Formation of a Hellenistic Jewish Rhetor." Pages 205–238 in *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*. Editors Jason Zurawski and Gabriele Boccaccini. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017.

Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History, Volume I: Books 1-2.34.* Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 279. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities, Volume I: Books 1-2.* Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library 319. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, and Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1960.

Docherty, Susan. "Joseph and Aseneth: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?". *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35, no. 1 (2004): 27–48.

Drazin, Nathan. *History of Jewish Education from 515 B. C. E. To 220 C. E. (During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim).* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins press, 1940.

Dusinberre, Elspeth. *Empire, Authority, and Autonomy in Achaemenid Anatolia.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Dutton, Edward, and Justin Lake. *Prologues to Ancient and Medieval History: A Reader*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Edmonds, J. M. *The Fragments of Attic Comedy after Meineke, Bergk, and Kock, Augmented, Newly Edited with Their Contexts, Annotated, and Completely Translated into English Verse*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957.

Euripides. *Fragments: Oedipus-Chrysippus. Other Fragments.* Edited and translated by Christopher Collard, Martin Cropp. Loeb Classical Library 506. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Eusebius, and Edwin Hamilton Gifford. *Eusebiou Tou Pamphilou Euangelikēs Proparaskeuēs Logoi 15 = Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri Xv*. De Evangelica Praeparatione. English & Greek. Oxonii: Novi Eboraci: Typographeo Academico; H. Frowde, 1903.

Feldman, Louis. "How Much Hellenism in Jewish Palestine?" *HUCA* 57 (1986): 83-111.

Finkelberg, Margalit. "Homer as a Foundational Text." Pages 75–96 in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*. Edited by Margalit Finkelberg and Guy Stroumsa. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.

Fludernik, Monika and Olson, Greta. "Introduction: Assessing Current Trends in Narratology." Pages 1–23 in *Current Trends in Narratology*. Edited by Greta Olson. Vol. 27 of *Narratologia: Contributions to Narrative Theory*. Edited by Fotis Jannidis, Matías Martínez, John Pier, and Wolf Schmid. Berlin; New York City: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Freedman, David Noel. "The Law and The Prophets." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1963): 250–265.

Goodenough, Erwin R. "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De Vita Mosis." *Harvard Theological Review* 26, no. 1 (1933): 109.

Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1997.

Green, Peter. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Grethlein, Jonas, and Rengakos, Antonios, eds. *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Vol. 4 of *Trends in Classics, Supplementary Volumes*. Edited by Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos. Berlin; New York City: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Grintz, Yehoshua M. "Maccabees, First Book Of." In *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, edited by Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik, 316-17. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007.

Gruen, Erich. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998.

Harris, J. Rendel. "The Cretans are Always Liars." *Expositor* 7, no. 2 (1906): 305–317.

Harris, J. Rendel, and Margaret Dunlop Smith Gibson. *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hadatha (C. 850 A.D.) in Syriac and English*. Horae Semiticae, V-Vii, X, Xi. Cambridge: University press, 1911.

Heath, Malcolm. "Theon and the History of the Progymnasmata." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 43, no. 2 (2002): 129-60.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. London: SCM Press, 1974.

Hengel, Martin. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*. Old Testament Studies. Edinburgh; New York: T & T Clark, 2002.

Hesiod. *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia.* Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most. Loeb Classical Library 57. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Hezser, Catherine. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism; 81. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Hock, Ronald F., and Edward N. O'Neil. *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World; V. 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.

Holzberg, Niklas. “The Novel: Genres Proper and the Fringe.” Pages 11–28 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Homer. *Odyssey, Volume I: Books 1-12.* Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock. Loeb Classical Library 104. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Honigman, Sylvie. *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*. London; New York: Routledge, 2003.

Horsley, Richard. *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

Hunt, Arthur S., and C. C. Edgar. *Select Papyri*. Loeb Classical Library [Greek Authors]. London, New York: W. Heinemann, G. P. Putnam's, 1932.

Janowitz, Naomi. "The Rhetoric of Translation: Three Early Perspectives on Translating Torah." *The Harvard Theological Review* 84, no. 2 (1991): 129-40.

Jamieson-Drake, David W. *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah a Socio-Archeological Approach*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 109. Sheffield, England: Almond Press, 1991.

Jellicoe, Sidney. "Aristeas, Philo, and the Septuagint Vorlage." *The Journal of Theological Studies* XII, no. 2 (October 1, 1961 1961): 261-71.

Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993.

Jerome. "The Letters of St. Jerome." In *St. Jerome: Letters and Select Works*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, translated by W. H. Fremantle, G. Lewis, and W. G. Martley, Vol. 6. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893.

Jobes, Karen and Moises, Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.

Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume I: Books 1-3.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 242. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume V: Books 12-13.* Translated by Ralph Marcus. Loeb Classical Library 365. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943.

Josephus. *The Jewish War, Volume I: Books 1-2.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 203. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Josephus. *The Jewish War, Volume III: Books 5-7.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 210. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Josephus. *The Life. Against Apion.* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 186. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Josephus, Flavius, and William Whiston. *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.

Joyal, Mark, Iain McDougall, and John Yardley. *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*. Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2009.

Kennedy, George A. *Progymnasmata Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Kennedy, George. "Theophrastus and Stylistic Distinctions." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 62 (1957): 93–104.

Koskenniemi, Erkki. "Moses-a Well-Educated Man: A Look at the Educational Idea in Early Judaism." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 17, no. 4 (2008): 281-96.

Koskenniemi, Erkki. "Philo and Greek Poets." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 41, no. 3 (2010): 301–22.

Krueger, Roberta. “Romance.” In *The New Oxford Companion to Literature in French*. Edited by Peter France. Oxford University Press, 2005. doi:10.1093/acref/9780198661252.001.0001.

Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures: A Translation with Annotations and Introductions*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1987.

Lemaire, André. “Education (Israel).” *ABD* 2:305–312.

Lemaire, André. *Les Écoles Et La Formation De La Bible Dans L'ancien Israël*. Fribourg, Suisse: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Lieberman, Saul. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine; Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E.-IV Century C.E.* Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, V. L8. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962.

Leiman, Shnayer Z. *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence.* Transactions - the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. Hamden, Conn: Published for the Academy by Archon Books, 1976.

Levine, Lee. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2005.

Lewis, Jack P. "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" *Journal of Bible and Religion* 32 (1964): 125–32.

Lim, Timothy H. *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*. The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Mack, Burton. “Decoding the Scripture: Philo and the Rules of Rhetoric.” Pages 81–115 in *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*. Edited by Frederick Greenspahn, Earle Hilgert, and Burton Mack. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984.

Macrobius, Ambrosius Aurelius Theodosius. *Commentary On the Dream of Scipio.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Mangum, Douglas. “Ludlul Bel Nemeqi.” Edited by John D. Barry, David Bomar, Derek R. Brown, Rachel Klippenstein, Douglas Mangum, Carrie Sinclair Wolcott, Lazarus Wentz, Elliot Ritzema, and Wendy Widder. *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.

Marrou, Henri. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1956.

Martin, L. H. “Hermes.” Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden; Boston; Köln; Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge: Brill; Eerdmans, 1999.

Martin, Michael W. "Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other Bioi?". *New Testament Studies* 54 (2008): 18-41.

Menander. *The Principal Fragments*. Translated by Francis G. Allinson and Francis Greenleaf. LCL. London, W. Heinemann: New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1921.

Mendelson, Alan. *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*. Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 7. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982.

Metzger, B. M. “The Fourth Book of Ezra.” Page 519–520 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985

Mirecki, Paul. “The Coptic Hoard of Spells from the University of Michigan.” Pages 293–310 in *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*. Edited by Marvin Meyer and Richard Smith. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Mroczek, Eva. The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Neusner, Jacob. *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2011.

Nickelsburg, George. “Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Pages 33–84 in Vol. 2 of Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud. Edited by Michael Stone. Assen, Netherlands: Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress Press, 1984.

Nickelsburg, George. “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Pages 89–152 in Vol. 2 of Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud. Edited by Michael Stone. Assen, Netherlands: Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress Press, 1984.

Nicklin, T. "Epimenides' Minos." *The Classical Review* 30, no. 2 (1916): 33-37.

Niditch, Susan. *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Niehoff, Maren. *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Perry, B. E. *The Ancient Romances; a Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*. Sather Classical Lectures, V.37. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Philo. *On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses.* Translated by F. H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Philo. *On the Confusion of Tongues. On the Migration of Abraham. Who Is the Heir of Divine Things? On Mating with the Preliminary Studies.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 261. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Philo. *On the Creation. Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 2 and 3.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 226. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Pinheiro, Marília, Judith Perkins, and Richard Pervo, eds. *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections*. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing, 2012.

Plato. *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus.* Translated by Harold North Fowler. Loeb Classical Library 36. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Plato. *Laches. Protagoras. Meno. Euthydemus.* Translated by W. R. M. Lamb. Loeb Classical Library 165. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Plato. *Republic, Volume I: Books 1-5.* Edited and translated by Christopher Emlyn-Jones, William Preddy. Loeb Classical Library 237. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Plato. *Statesman. Philebus. Ion.* Translated by Harold North Fowler, W. R. M. Lamb. Loeb Classical Library 164. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Plato. *Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Epistles.* Translated by R. G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library 234. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Plutarch. *Moralia, Volume I: The Education of Children. How the Young Man Should Study Poetry. On Listening to Lectures. How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend. How a Man May Become Aware of His Progress in Virtue.* Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. Loeb Classical Library 197. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Polybius. *The Histories, Volume I: Books 1-2.* Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank, Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 128. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Polybius. *The Histories, Volume IV: Books 9-15.* Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank, Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 159. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Popović, Mladen. *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.

Porter, Stanley E., and Craig A. Evans. *Dictionary of New Testament Background: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.

Prince, Gerald. "Narratology." Pages: 110–130 in vol. 8 of *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Edited by Raman Selden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Quintilian. *The Orator's Education, Volume I: Books 1-2.* Edited and translated by Donald A. Russell. Loeb Classical Library 124. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Quintilian. *The Orator's Education, Volume V: Books 11-12.* Edited and translated by Donald A. Russell. Loeb Classical Library 494. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Rajak, Tessa. *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Renehan, Robert. "Classical Greek Quotations in the New Testament." Pages 17–46 in in *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Georges Vasilievich Florovsky on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 195. Edited by David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin. Roma: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1973.

Robinson, S. E. "4 Baruch." Page 414 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

Rollston, Christopher. "Scribal Curriculum during the First Temple Period: Epigraphic Hebrew and Biblical Evidence." Pages 71-102 in Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production. Edited by Brian Schmidt. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2015.

Ruiz-Montero, Consuelo. "The Rise if the Greek Novel." Pages 29–86 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. Leiden, Netherlands; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Ryle, Herbert Edward. *The Canon of the Old Testament; an Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture*. London: Macmillan and co., limited, 1895.

Sanders, James A. *Torah and Canon*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

Sandmel, Samuel. *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Schams, Christine. *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Schniedewind, William. “Scribal Education in Ancient Israel and Judah into the Persian World.” Pages 11–28 in Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context. Editors Jason Zurawski and Gabriele Boccaccini. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017.

Schniedewind, William. “Scripturalization in Ancient Judah.” Pages 305–319 in *Contextualizing Israel’s Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*. Editor Brian Schmidt. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2015.

Scholer, David. Foreword to *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*, Translated by C.D. Yonge. Hendrickson Publishers, 1993.

Spengel, Leonhard von. *Rhetores Graeci*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana. S.G. Lipsiae: in aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1894.

Swete, Henry Barclay, H. St J. Thackeray, and Richard Rusden Ottley. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1914.

Tcherikover, Victor, Alexander Fuks, and Menahem Stern. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Vol. 2, Cambridge: Published for the Magnes Press, Hebrew University [by] Harvard University Press, 1957.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume I: Books 1-2.* Translated by C. F. Smith. Loeb Classical Library 108. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Toorn, Karel Van Der. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible.* Cambridge, MA; London, England: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah V. 54. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

Traill, A. "Menander's "Thais" and the Roman Poets." *Phoenix* 55, no. 3/4 (2001): 284-303.

Veyne, Paul. *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths?: An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*. Grecs Ont-Ils Cru À Leurs Mythes? English. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Vos, R. L. “Thoth.” Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden; Boston; Köln; Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge: Brill; Eerdmans, 1999.

Wasserstein, Abraham, and David Wasserstein. *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Watson, D. F. “Rhetorical Criticism.” Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.

Wills, Lawrence M. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*. Myth and Poetics. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Wise, Michael Owen, Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005.

Wright, Benjamin G. *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism*,1384-2161; V. 131. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.

Wright, Benjamin G. *The Letter of Aristeas: 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'on the Translation of the Law of the Jews'*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin De Gruyter, 2015.

Wright, Benjamin. “Greek *Paideia* and the Jewish Community of Alexandria in the Letter of Aristeas.” Pages 93–112 in *Second Temple Jewish Paideia in Context*. Editors Jason Zurawski and Gabriele Boccaccini. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017.

Xenophon. *Cyropaedia, Volume I: Books 1-4.* Translated by Walter Miller. Loeb Classical Library 51. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Yonge, Charles Duke with Philo of Alexandria. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Zuntz, G. "Aristeas Studies II: Aristeas on the Translation of the Torah." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 4, no. 2 (April 1, 1959): 109-26.