DICTIONARY *of the* NEW TESTAMENT Use *of the* OLD TESTAMENT

EDITED BY

G. K. Beale, D. A. Carson, Benjamin L. Gladd, *and* Andrew David Naselli

DICTIONARY *of the* NEW TESTAMENT Use *of the* OLD TESTAMENT

EDITED BY

G. K. Beale, D. A. Carson, Benjamin L. Gladd, *and* Andrew David Naselli

Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Contents

Articles

Articles by Topic

Inner-Biblical Exegesis

Systematic Theology

Contributors

Andrew T. Abernethy *(Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)*
Wheaton College
Divine Warrior

T. Desmond Alexander *(Queen's University of Belfast)*
Union Theological College
Exodus, Book of; Holiness; Jerusalem

Christopher B. Ansberry *(Wheaton College)*
Grove City College
Proverbs, Book of

Richard E. Averbeck *(Annenberg Research Institute, Dropsie College)*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (emeritus)
Sacrifices and Offerings

S. M. Baugh *(University of California, Irvine)*
Westminster Seminary California (emeritus)
Ephesians, Letter to the

G. K. Beale *(University of Cambridge)*
Reformed Theological Seminary
Apostolic Hermeneutics: Description and Presuppositions; Colossians and Philemon, Letters to the; Method; Temple

Christopher A. Beetham *(Wheaton College)*
Zondervan
Quotation, Allusion, and Echo

Richard P. Belcher Jr. *(Westminster Theological Seminary)*
Reformed Theological Seminary
Ecclesiastes, Book of; Job, Book of

Craig Blaising *(ThD, Dallas Theological Seminary; PhD, University of Aberdeen)*
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
History of Interpretation: 300 to 1800

Craig L. Blomberg *(University of Aberdeen)*
Denver Seminary (emeritus)
Jesus's Use of the Old Testament; Matthew, Gospel of

Chris Bruno *(Wheaton College)*
Training Leaders International
Ecclesiology

C. Hassell Bullock *(Hebrew Union College)*
Wheaton College (emeritus)
Psalms, Book of

Constantine R. Campbell *(Macquarie University)*
Sydney College of Divinity
Corporate Solidarity

Robert J. Cara *(Westminster Theological Seminary)*
Reformed Theological Seminary
Thessalonians, First and Second Letters to the

D. A. Carson *(University of Cambridge)*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (emeritus)
Apostolic Hermeneutics: Present-Day Imitation; John, Letters of

Mitchell Chase *(Southern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Daniel, Book of

Robert B. Chisholm Jr. *(Dallas Theological Seminary)*
Dallas Theological Seminary
Habakkuk, Book of

Sean Christensen *(Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)*
James, Letter of

E. Ray Clendenen *(University of Texas at Arlington)*
Lifeway Christian Resources
Malachi, Book of

Contributors

Graham A. Cole *(Australian College of Theology)*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Shalom; Wrath

C. John Collins *(University of Liverpool)*
Covenant Theological Seminary
Numbers, Book of

Jared Compton *(Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)*
Bethlehem College and Seminary
Corinthians, Second Letter to the

Brandon D. Crowe *(University of Edinburgh)*
Westminster Theological Seminary
Adam, First and Last; Mark, Gospel of; Prosopological Exegesis; Resurrection

John D. Currid *(University of Chicago)*
Reformed Theological Seminary
Enemies of the People of God; Feasts and Festivals; Leviticus, Book of

A. Andrew Das *(Union Theological Seminary in Virginia)*
Elmhurst University
Law

Karl Deenick *(Ridley College)*
Sydney Missionary and Bible College
Circumcision

Stephen G. Dempster *(University of Toronto)*
Crandall University (emeritus)
Genesis, Book of; Kingdom and King; Micah, Book of; Wilderness

Jason S. DeRouchie *(Southern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Covenant; Deuteronomy, Book of; Promises; Zephaniah, Book of

Daniel J. Ebert IV *(Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)*
Center for Biblical Studies, Philippines
Wisdom

Sam Emadi *(Southern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Hunsinger Lane Baptist Church (Louisville, KY)
Typology

David Everson *(Hebrew Union College)*
Emmanuel Baptist Church (Mora, MN)
Targums: A Brief Introduction; Targums: Comparison with the NT Use of the OT; Targums: Thematic Parallels to the NT

John V. Fesko *(University of Aberdeen)*
Reformed Theological Seminary
Bibliology

Duane Garrett *(Baylor University)*
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Hosea, Book of; Joel, Book of; Lamentations, Book of

Simon Gathercole *(University of Durham)*
University of Cambridge
Abraham and Abrahamic Tradition; Son of Man

Radu Gheorghita *(University of Cambridge)*
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Septuagint: Background

Jonathan Gibson *(University of Cambridge)*
Westminster Theological Seminary
Obadiah, Book of

Andrew M. Gilhooley *(University of Pretoria)*
University of Pretoria
Sinai

Benjamin L. Gladd *(Wheaton College)*
Reformed Theological Seminary
Mystery

W. Edward Glenny *(PhD, University of Minnesota; ThD, Dallas Theological Seminary)*
University of Northwestern, St. Paul
Septuagint: Comparison with the NT Use of the OT

Graeme Goldsworthy *(Union Theological Seminary in Virginia)*
Moore Theological College (retired)
Israel and the Church, The Story of

Daniel M. Gurtner *(University of St. Andrews)*
Gateway Seminary
Dead Sea Scrolls, OT Use in; Dead Sea Scrolls, OT Use in: Comparison with NT Use of the OT; Dead Sea Scrolls: Thematic Parallels to the NT; Pseudepigrapha: A Brief Introduction; Pseudepigrapha: Comparison with the NT Use of the OT; Pseudepigrapha, NT Parallels in; Pseudepigrapha, NT Use of

George H. Guthrie *(Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Regent College (Vancouver)
Hebrews, Letter to the

Matthew S. Harmon *(Wheaton College)*
Grace College and Theological Seminary
Galatians, Letter to the; Jude and the Second Letter of Peter; OT Use of the OT: Comparison with the NT Use of the OT; Philippians, Letter to the

Dana M. Harris *(Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Day of the Lord; Priest

J. Daniel Hays *(Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Ouachita Baptist University and Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Ezekiel, Book of; Samuel, Books of

Daniel R. Heimbach *(Drew University)*
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Ethics

Richard S. Hess *(Hebrew Union College)*
Denver Seminary
Joshua, Book of

Andrew E. Hill *(University of Michigan)*
Wheaton College (emeritus)
Chronicles, Books of; Zechariah, Book of

David Instone-Brewer *(University of Cambridge)*
Tyndale House, Cambridge
Mishnah, Talmud, and Midrashim, OT Use in; Mishnah, Talmud, and Midrashim, OT Use in: Comparison with NT Use of the OT; Mishnah, Talmud, and Midrashim: Thematic Parallels to the NT

Karen H. Jobes *(Westminster Theological Seminary)*
Wheaton College (emerita)
Greek Versions and the NT Quotations; Peter, First Letter of; Septuagint, NT Use of

Dennis E. Johnson *(Fuller Theological Seminary)*
Westminster Seminary California (emeritus)
Holy Spirit, Eschatological Role of

Jeremy Kimble *(Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Cedarville University
Justice

Andreas J. Köstenberger *(Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)*
Biblical Foundations and Fellowship Raleigh (NC)
John, Gospel of; Mission

Jon C. Laansma *(University of Aberdeen)*
Wheaton College
Sabbath and Sunday

Peter H. W. Lau *(University of Sydney)*
University of Sydney
Ruth, Book of

Te-Li Lau *(Emory University)*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Shame

Jonathan Leeman *(University of Wales)*
9Marks
Church

Richard Lints *(University of Notre Dame)*
Redeemer City-to-City (New York City)
Idolatry

Bryan Litfin *(University of Virginia)*
Liberty University
History of Interpretation: Early Church

Darian Lockett *(University of St. Andrews)*
Biola University
Canonical Interpretation

Phillip Marshall *(Southern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Houston Christian University
Haggai, Book of

Oren Martin *(Southern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Watermark Community Church (Dallas, TX)
Land; Literal Fulfillment

David L. Mathewson *(University of Aberdeen)*
Denver Seminary
Consummation

Sean McDonough *(University of St. Andrews)*
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Creation; Revelation, Book of; Satan

Catherine McDowell *(Harvard University)*
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Image of God

John D. Meade *(Southern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Phoenix Seminary
Septuagint: Thematic Parallels to the NT

Christopher W. Morgan *(Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary)*
California Baptist University
Glory of God; Love; Sin

Andrew David Naselli *(PhD, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School; PhD, Bob Jones University)*
Bethlehem College and Seminary
History of Interpretation: 1800 to Present; Serpent and Antichrist

Dane C. Ortlund *(Wheaton College)*
Naperville (IL) Presbyterian Church
Gospel

Ray Ortlund *(University of Aberdeen)*
Renewal Ministries
Marriage

John Oswalt *(Brandeis University)*
Asbury Theological Seminary
Isaiah, Book of

David W. Pao *(Harvard University)*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Luke, Gospel of

David G. Peterson *(University of Manchester)*
Moore Theological College (emeritus)
Romans, Letter to the; Worship

Nicholas G. Piotrowski *(Wheaton College)*
Indianapolis Theological Seminary
Exodus, The

Stanley E. Porter *(University of Sheffield)*
McMaster Divinity College
Letter Couriers; Literacy in the Greco-Roman World; Orality; Rhetoric

Iain Provan *(University of Cambridge)*
Regent College (Vancouver)
Kings, Books of

O. Palmer Robertson *(Union Theological Seminary in Virginia)*
Consummation Ministries
New Areas for Exploration of the OT in the NT

Max F. Rogland *(Leiden University)*
Rose Hill Presbyterian Church (Columbia, SC)
Esther, Book of

Brian S. Rosner *(University of Cambridge)*
Ridley College
Biblical Theology; Corinthians, First Letter to the

David S. Schrock *(Southern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Occoquan Bible Church (Woodbridge, VA)
Son of God; Typology

Mark A. Seifrid *(Princeton Theological Seminary)*
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis
Justification

Andrew G. Shead *(University of Cambridge)*
Moore Theological College
Jeremiah, Book of

Gary V. Smith *(Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Languages)*
Union University
Amos, Book of; Ezra-Nehemiah, Books of

Mark L. Strauss *(University of Aberdeen)*
Bethel University
Exile and Restoration; Messiah

Brian J. Tabb *(London School of Theology)*
Bethlehem College and Seminary
Apocrypha: Comparison with the NT Use of the OT; Apocrypha, NT Use of; Apocrypha: Thematic Parallels to the NT; Apocrypha: Use of the OT

Alan J. Thompson *(Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)*
Sydney Missionary and Bible College
Acts, Book of

Daniel C. Timmer *(Trinity International University)*
Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary and Faculté de théologie évangélique (Montreal)
Jonah, Book of; Nahum Book of

Philip H. Towner *(University of Aberdeen)*
Pontificia Università Urbaniana (Rome)
Timothy and Titus, Letters to

Eric J. Tully *(University of Wisconsin–Madison)*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Prophet

Miles V. Van Pelt *(Southern Baptist Theological Seminary)*
Reformed Theological Seminary
Judges, Book of; Song of Songs, Book of

Kevin J. Vanhoozer *(University of Cambridge)*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Theological Interpretation of Scripture

Guy Prentiss Waters *(Duke University)*
Reformed Theological Seminary
Allegory

Stephen J. Wellum *(Trinity Evangelical Divinity School)*
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Christology

Joel White *(University of Dortmund, Germany)*
Freie Theologische Hochschule (Giessen, Germany)
Contextual and Noncontextual NT Use of the OT

Paul Williamson *(Queen's University of Belfast)*
Moore Theological College
Jews and Gentiles

Jonathan D. Worthington *(Durham University)*
Training Leaders International
Philo (1): Use of the OT; Philo (2): Influence on the NT; Philo (3): Comparison with NT Use of the OT; Philo (4): Thematic Parallels to the NT

Introduction

In the last few decades, the field known as "the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament" has blossomed. What was peripheral in the past has now taken center stage. At the annual Society of Biblical Literature conference, one need not wander far to stumble upon a paper devoted to the use of the OT in a particular NT passage. Indeed, entire SBL seminars are devoted exclusively to the cause, such as "Paul and Scripture" and "Scripture and 1 Corinthians." NT scholars are growing more aware of how NT authors, at key points in their arguments, often lean on specific OT passages, events, and concepts.

The fifth edition of the UBS *Greek New Testament* lists approximately 350 OT quotations in the NT (UBS^5, 857–63). The Gospel of Matthew, for example, contains about fifty-five OT quotations, whereas the other three Gospels together cite a total of sixty-five quotations (Blomberg, 1). In Paul's Letters there are about one hundred quotations. Regarding allusions, some scholars argue that the NT contains well over one thousand allusions. By way of comparison, the NT includes far fewer quotations of Jewish and pagan sources. Similarly, though the NT alludes to extrabiblical literature, it alludes to the OT far more frequently. The difference is staggering.

History of Interpretation

We start with a word about how we got here. A host of NT scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries followed the lead of their OT colleagues and expended much energy examining what lies behind the NT documents in order to reconstruct the genesis of early Christianity. The next wave of scholarship became more concerned with the NT writings themselves and took interest in reading each NT book as a whole and appreciating its literary integrity. Around the mid-twentieth century, C. H. Dodd persuasively argued in *According to the Scriptures* that NT authors do not cite the OT detached from its original context but draw from the broad and immediate context of the OT. He concluded, "These [OT] sections were understood [by NT authors] as *wholes*, and particular verses or sentences were quoted from them rather as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves" (Dodd, 126). Dodd's insight was a watershed moment for the field, setting the trajectory for years to come, though many scholars disagreed with his approach. The hermeneutical sapling that Dodd planted soon bore fruit in the ensuing decades as scholars, working with modern literary techniques, began to explore how NT authors employed the OT throughout their narratives and epistles.

The growing field of biblical theology, too, is part of this discussion. J. P. Gabler, often labeled the father of biblical theology, proposed in the late eighteenth century that the field of biblical studies should not be enslaved by dogmatics. This proposal gave way to countless historical-critical trends among NT scholars, but it also, in some sense, paved the way for various expressions of contemporary "biblical theology." Though the enterprise of "biblical theology" and its precise meaning have been the subject of tireless (and tired) debate in recent years, scholars have pursued a number of whole-Bible theologies. The last three decades have witnessed substantial interest in tracing various themes from Genesis to Revelation (e.g., covenant, creation, temple). Not coincidentally, much of this work is built upon the insights of those laboring in the trenches of the use of the OT in the NT. Furthermore, some NT biblical theologies, both in Germany and the United States, have more recently been keen to trace NT ideas back to the OT (e.g., Beale, Stuhlmacher).

Need for This Dictionary

With the torrent of publications on the use of the OT in the NT, the time is ripe for a dictionary dedicated to this rich and diverse field. What makes this field notoriously complex is its relationship to other scholarly disciplines and subdisciplines. Take, for example, the role of the LXX (or Old Greek) in the first century. Since most of the quotations in the NT are taken from the LXX, one cannot study how NT authors use the OT without also reflecting on the nature of the LXX itself and its various textual traditions. The relationship between the LXX and the MT must also be considered in the same breath. We should also be mindful of how sectors of Judaism made considerable use of the OT in their documents. What about the use of the OT in the OT? How do later OT prophets use the writings of earlier OT prophets? Do the NT authors cite the OT contextually? What role does systematic theology have in this discussion? Should we in the twenty-first century follow the hermeneutics of the apostles in the first century? As one can imagine, a host of scholars have thought deeply about such issues and offer wide-ranging answers, so at the heart of this project are essays dedicated to tackling such intricate hermeneutical matters.

This dictionary is written with its companion volume in mind, the *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (*CNTUOT*). That book carefully investigates how each NT book quotes and alludes to the OT, highlighting the various hermeneutical permutations of the OT. This present volume continues that examination but on a synchronic level. More book-by-book reflection is needed. Where the *CNTUOT* examines each quotation and major allusion diachronically, a significant portion of this dictionary does so synchronically. The *CNTUOT* considers only how the NT uses the OT; it does not address how the OT uses the OT. This project attempts to redress this omission by furnishing separate essays on the use of the OT in each OT book.

Since biblical theology is indebted to careful study on how the OT is used in the NT, a third of this dictionary is dedicated to a wide range of biblical-theological topics. Those interested in how the two Testaments relate to each other on a hermeneutical level are often concerned with such prominent themes woven within them. Lastly, a handful of essays take up the important issue of the relationship between theology and inner-biblical exegesis. Exegesis does not take place within a vacuum, especially exegesis that is mindful of how the two Testaments are ultimately bound up with the person of Christ and the church. One's theological commitments profoundly shape such discussions.

Composition of This Dictionary

Though organized alphabetically, this dictionary is composed of five discrete types of entries (see the list of articles by topic).

1. Surveys of biblical books. These entries examine each book of the Bible at a synchronic level for its indebtedness to antecedent revelation. The NT essays summarize and update the *CNTUOT*. The OT surveys are responsible for tracing the influence of prior revelation in each OT book. When the author evaluates the use of the OT in Genesis, for example, the earlier parts of Genesis will be traced in the later parts. Likewise, the essay on Isaiah reflects upon the influence of the Pentateuch and how earlier OT traditions inform the book. Methodologically speaking, the OT surveys are inherently problematic as historical issues abound (dating, authorship, provenance, etc.). A way forward here is to rest upon a canonical approach. The authors of the OT essays in this dictionary depend upon the final shape of the canon as they discern the role of prior revelation. In addition, the contributors of the OT essays are encouraged to keep an eye on how the NT uses their respective OT books.

2. Biblical-theological topical essays. Approximately fifty essays trace prominent biblical-theological themes throughout both Testaments. Each essay studies a theme beginning in the OT and climaxing in the NT. Some themes are concretely embedded in the story line of the Bible (e.g., Adam, Abraham, the exodus, exile and restoration, Sinai). Other themes, while sensitive to the arc of the biblical narrative, tend to be more synthetic in nature (e.g., ethics, glory of God, holiness, justice, shame). In both cases, though, the contributors are responsible for rooting their discussions in the broad outline of the biblical story.

3. Jewish exegetical-traditions essays. One of the ways we appreciate how the NT uses the OT is to compare and contrast how Jewish literature did so in the Second Temple period and later. The task here is to uncover some of the more prominent interpretive techniques of the Jewish community. Such an endeavor is herculean in its own right, so we have assigned seven large essays to cover the use of the OT in some of the major sources of Jewish literature: Apocrypha, Dead Sea Scrolls, OT Pseudepigrapha, Philo, rabbinic literature (Mishnah, Talmud, Midrashim), Septuagint, and targums.

4. Inner-biblical exegesis. Nearly twenty essays take up a wide range of topics related to inner-biblical exegesis—method, definitions, presuppositions, literacy, letter couriers, apostolic hermeneutics, contextual use of the OT versus noncontextual use, history of research, typology, allegory, and so on. The strength of these essays lies in how the authors thoughtfully present the major views and furnish the reader with a curated and up-to-date bibliography.

5. Systematic theology. A considerable amount of theological and hermeneutical reflection has taken place in recent years, so five essays round out this dictionary by focusing on systematic categories that are related to the field of the use of the OT in the NT: theological interpretation of Scripture, bibliology, Christology, ecclesiology, and biblical theology. Theology and exegesis, especially exegesis that is aware of how NT authors incorporate the OT, is a deeply theological enterprise.

Bibliography. Beale, G. K., *A New Testament Biblical Theology* (Baker Academic, 2011); Blomberg, C., "Matthew," in *CNTUOT*, 1–109; Dodd, C. H., *According to the Scriptures* (Nisbet, 1952); Stuhlmacher, P., *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, trans. and ed. D. P. Bailey (Eerdmans, 2018).

in Theological Perspective, ed. R. Lints, M. Horton, and M. Talbot (Eerdmans, 2006), 204–25; Lints, "Introduction to a Theological Concept of Personhood," in *Personal Identity in Theological Perspective*, ed. R. Lints, M. Horton, and M. Talbot (Eerdmans, 2006), 1–10; Marcus, J., "Idolatry in the New Testament," *Int* 60, no. 2 (2006): 152–64; McDowell, C., *The Image of God in Eden* (Eisenbrauns, 2009); Ortlund, R. C., Jr., *Whoredom* (Eerdmans, 1996); Price, S. R. F., *Rituals and Power* (Cambridge University Press, 1984); Rosner, B., "The Concept of Idolatry," *Them* 24 (1991): 21–30; Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry* (Eerdmans, 2009); Rowe, C. K., "New Testament Iconography?," in *Picturing the New Testament*, WUNT 2/193 (Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 289–312.

Richard Lints

Image of God

In the past several years alone numerous substantial studies on the *imago Dei* have been published (Herring, Lints, McConville, McDowell, Peterson), yet basic questions about the meaning of this phrase remain. When applied to humans, does it refer primarily to their mental likeness to God? Is it a relational term? Does it suggest physical similarity to God, or does it, rather, indicate human qualities, gifts, and abilities that reflect God? Further, what is the relationship between humans, as created *in* God's image, and Jesus, whom Paul identifies as "*the* image of the invisible God" (Col. 1:15)? Are there other individuals or groups that Scripture describes as created in God's image? If so, what is the relationship among them?

The key to understanding the *imago Dei*, whether in the context of human creation, as a proclamation of Jesus's identity, or as applied to ancient Israel, to the church, or to individual Christians, lies in the biblical usage of the phrase in the early chapters of Genesis. We also need to give thoughtful consideration to the meaning of the relevant terms within their broader historical context and to the genre and the specific literary contexts in which they appear. After determining the meaning of "image" and "likeness" in Gen. 1:26–27; 5:1–3; and 9:5–7, we will consider how this concept is manifest in a unique way with corporate Israel. We will then turn to the NT where Paul and other NT writers identify Jesus as *the* image of God (Col. 1:15) before concluding with a study of the church, corporately and individually, as bearers of God's image.

The "Image of God" in Genesis

Image and likeness in Gen. 1:26–28. The first three references to the image of God appear in the opening chapter of the Bible:

> God said, "Let us make humanity in our image [*bəṣalmēnû*] and according to our likeness [*kidmûtēnû*] and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the beasts and over all the earth, and over every creeping creature on the earth." So God created humanity in his image. In the image of God he created it [*ʾōtô*]. Male and female he created them. Then God blessed them and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply. Fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky, and over every living thing that moves on the earth." (AT)

According to Gen. 1:26–28 *ṣelem* and *dəmût* possess a reflective quality. Humanity is made *in* God's image and *according to* his likeness, meaning that there is some level of correspondence between the original and those patterned after it. The immediate context suggests that the means by which humanity reflects God is twofold: dominion (1:26, 28) and fruitfulness (1:28). At God's appointment, male and female are to rule over (*ûrədû*) creation and subdue (*wəkibšuhā*) the earth in imitation of God's rule and authority. Similarly, as God created the first human pair, male and female are to multiply and fill the earth through procreative acts of their own (2:24–25). Thus, being made in God's image and according to his likeness includes *both ruling and procreative functions*.

Image and likeness in Gen. 5:1–3. Genesis 5:1–3 preserves the only other instance where "image" and "likeness" are paired within the OT:

> This is the book of the generations of humanity. On the day when God created humanity in the likeness of God he made it [*ʾōtô*]. Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and called their name (named them) "humanity" on the day they were created. When Adam had lived 130 years he fathered a son in his likeness and according to his image, and he called his name (named him) Seth. The days of Adam after he fathered Seth were 800 years, and he fathered other sons and daughters. (AT)

In Gen. 5:3 "image" and "likeness" are physical and relational terms associated with procreation. Adam *fathered* Seth. Consequently, Seth is Adam's *kin* and *kind*. Specifically, he is Adam's *son*. As a member of the human race, Seth's function, like his parents', is to rule, to subdue, and to be fruitful and multiply. What Gen. 5:1–3 makes explicit is that image and likeness is *the language of sonship*.

Image in Gen. 9:6. The third and final use of "image" (this time without "likeness") in Genesis occurs in Gen. 9:5–7:

> And indeed/surely for your lifeblood I will require a reckoning (demand an accounting): from every beast I will require it. And from each human being I will require a reckoning for the life of another human being. Whoever sheds human blood, by humans shall his blood be shed, because in the image of God he [God] made humanity. Now be fruitful and multiply. Swarm/teem on the earth and multiply on/in it. (AT)

As with 5:1–3, Gen. 9:6–7 looks back to creation. Homicide requires the death of the offender because, as the Hebrew word order emphasizes, *in the image of God* he (God) made humanity. This explanation indicates the high value God places on human life, but it does not explain what it means to be created in the image and likeness of God. Why is the death penalty required for homicide?

In 2 Chron. 24:22 a group of rebellious Israelites murders the priest Zechariah. As he dies he cries out, "May the LORD see and *avenge* [*wəyîdrōš*]!" (ESV). Psalm 9 also recognizes God as Israel's divine avenger. Israel is commanded to praise the Lord, "for he who avenges shed blood [*dōreš dāmîm*] is mindful of them" (Ps. 9:11–12 [MT 9:12–13]). In ancient Israel avenging the blood of a murdered family member was the responsibility of the *gōʾēl*, or "kinsman redeemer." We are familiar with the role of the *gōʾēl* from the book of Ruth, where Boaz, kinsman of the deceased Mahlon, fulfills the duty of the redeemer by marrying the widowed Ruth and assuming responsibility for her mother-in-law, Naomi. Although not mentioned in Ruth, a *gōʾēl*'s responsibility also included avenging the death of a murdered family member (Num. 35:19, 21, 24, 27; Deut. 19:6, 12; Josh. 20:3, 5, 9; 2 Sam. 14:11). This particular role was known as the *gōʾēl haddām*, or "the blood avenger." Given Zechariah's dying plea for the Lord to avenge his death, and the psalmist's praise of God as one who avenges the shed blood of his people, Israel apparently understood the Lord to be their blood avenger. As the father of his people, and, hence, their closest male "relative," Yahweh was Israel's *gōʾēl*. He rescued and redeemed them, he cared and provided for them, and when one of his kin was murdered, he avenged their wrongful death (cf. Zech. 2:8 [MT 2:12]). The reason for the death penalty in the case of homicide, as Gen. 9:6 states, is because humanity is made in God's image—that is, *humans ultimately belong to the family of God.* To kill someone is to murder one of God's family members. As the paterfamilias of humanity and thus its *gōʾēl* / blood avenger, the Lord demands life for life.

To be created in the image and likeness of another has both functional and ontological implications. In Gen. 1 it refers to humanity's function *to rule as God's representative*, and *to (pro)create (i.e., multiply, fill the earth) in imitation of God's creative acts*. Genesis 5:1–3 emphasizes the ontological aspect: to be made in Adam's image and likeness defines Seth as a member of Adam's kind—that is, as a human being. They are kin, specifically father and son. This same emphasis on image as kin underlies the reason for the death penalty in the case of homicide (9:6). As those made in God's image, humans are members of God's family. As humanity's paterfamilias, God, the *gōʾēl* / blood avenger, demands life for life.

Given that both Gen. 5:3 and 9:6 connect image and likeness with kinship/sonship, and that both of these texts appeal to Gen. 1:26–28, is there any indication in Gen. 1 itself that to be created in God's image and likeness defines humans ontologically as "sons" or "children" of God? In Gen. 1 there *is* an emphasis on the relationship of one generation to the next. *Ten times in seven verses alone* (Gen. 1:11–12, 21–25) the author notes the creation of the plants and animals "according to its/their kind." While humanity will also procreate "according to their own kind" (cf. Gen. 5:3), Gen. 1 declares instead that male and female were created in the image and according to the likeness *of God*. Humanity is distinct from the rest of creation because, on some level, it is made "according to God's kind." Without divinizing humanity, the early chapters of Genesis seem to agree that to be made in God's image and likeness is to be his royal son/child.

The genre of Gen. 1. Genre plays a crucial role in understanding these terms as well, but the question to which genre Gen. 1 belongs has proven difficult to answer. Is it history? Is it poetry? Should it be classified as a liturgical text, or a hymn? Several scholars have noted its affinities with ancient Near Eastern temple building texts, including its seven-day structure (Fisher, 319; Beale). They conclude that Gen. 1 is not simply the story of creation *but an account of God constructing his macro-temple, the heavens and the earth*. Later biblical texts concur. Psalm 104:2–3, 5 depicts the Lord as the earth's master builder, "stretching out the heavens like a tent. . . . He lays the beams of his chambers on the waters . . . He set the earth on its foundations, so that it should never be moved" (ESV). In Job 38:4–11 God is the divine carpenter who laid the foundation of the earth, determined its measurements, stretched the line, sunk its bases, laid its cornerstone, and added bars and doors. Isaiah 66 identifies heaven and the earth as the very throne room of God's cosmic palace-temple. God then asks, "What is the house that you would build for me, and what is the place of my rest? *All these things my hand has made, and so all these things came to be*" (66:1–2a). These reflections on Gen. 1 further support the idea that when God created the heavens and the earth he was constructing his cosmic temple.

What significance does this bear on our interpretation of image and likeness? By defining humanity as created in the image and likeness of God in the context of a temple, the author of Isaiah makes a bold and daring pronouncement: *God is represented not by man-made statues of silver and gold but by living, breathing human beings that he himself creates*. Rather than manifesting God, as the statue of a god was thought to do, human beings represent God in the world by ruling, subduing, creating, and cultivating as his vice-regents over creation.

Image and likeness in the ancient Near East. The use of royal images as representatives of a king's presence, sovereignty, and power was a common practice in the ancient Near East. One example is a statue of Hadad-yis'i, the governor of Guzan in the ninth century BC, found at Tell Fekheriye in Syria. A bilingual

Aramaic-Akkadian inscription on the statue refers to it as both "the image" and "the likeness" of the governor, with terms cognate to those in Gen. 1:26–27 (Millard and Bordreuil). Textual evidence indicates that in the ancient Near Eastern world, "image" meant more than merely "representative." The cognate Akkadian term *ṣalmu* occurs in the Assyrian Tukulti-Ninurta hymn (mid- to late 13th c. BC), where it refers to the king as both a statue and the god's son. Similarly, an Egyptian wisdom text from the Tenth Dynasty identifies humans born of the god as *snnw*, "image," referring to a statue (Lorton, 131–32). In context, however, it clearly refers to offspring, who are the "images" (children) of the god. Further, synonyms for "image" and "likeness" appear in the beginning of the Babylonian creation story, the Enuma Elish, to denote the children of the gods. For these reasons, it seems all the more likely that "image" and "likeness" in Gen. 1 are *double entendres*. God's people represent him in the world as his living "statuettes," but they do so because they are, first, his royal children.

Image and likeness in Gen. 2? Although Gen. 2:5–3:24 presents a view of human creation different from the previous chapter, it does seem to develop the functional aspect of *ṣelem* and *dəmût* embedded in these terms as they are used in Gen. 1:26–27. Specifically, it portrays Adam as a royal figure whose responsibility it is to care for and cultivate God's garden. He is to make it fruitful and to cause its vegetation to reproduce in imitation of God, *the gardener par excellence* (2:8), in whose image Adam was made.

To understand Adam's role in the garden of Eden we must first ask who, in the cultural world of the OT, tended royal and sacred gardens and parks. Although servants would have done the actual labor, Mesopotamian royal ideology ascribes this role *to the king*. He bore the title "gardener" (NU-KIRI$_6$/*nukaribbu*) and "farmer, cultivator" (ENGAR/*ikkaru*), and was credited with harvesting rare trees and plants from conquered lands and cultivating them (making them fruitful and causing them to multiply) within his own royal and sacred gardens, as a display of his, and his god's, sovereignty over those lands (see NU-KIRI$_6$/*nukaribbu* in CAD N/2, 323–27; ENGAR/*ikkaru* in CAD I/J, 49–55; Widengren, 1–19; Callendar, 61–62). Solomon was also known for his vast botanical knowledge: "He spoke of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon to the hyssop that grows out of the wall" (1 Kings 4:33 ESV). Similarly, in Eccl. 2:4b–6 the king of Jerusalem claims, "I built houses and planted vineyards for myself. I made myself gardens and parks, and I planted in them all kinds of fruit trees. I made for myself pools from which to water the forest of growing trees." Commentators have thus concluded that Adam's role as cultivator and caretaker of the garden was a *royal* task, in the tradition of ancient Near Eastern monarchs. What the Genesis author suggests, however, is that what is later manifested as a royal task among kings of the ancient Near East was originally a *human* function. To care for creation and to cultivate it was one way that humanity was intended to function as God's image.

Finally, as many have noted, the verbs used for Adam's role "to work and to guard" the garden (*šmr* and *ʿbd*, Gen. 2:15 AT), are the same verbs used to describe the duties of the Levites who are to guard and serve (minister) at the tabernacle (Num. 3:7–8; 8:26; 18:5–6). Thus, scholars have determined that the use of *šmr* and *ʿbd* to describe Adam's work in the garden indicates that he served not only as a royal administrator of the kingdom but also as a priest of Yahweh's "sanctuary" in Eden. This idea is not without precedent in the ancient Near East. One of the titles borne by Assyrian kings was *šangû*, a term that denotes the king's role as the divinely appointed chief priest who participates in rituals and is responsible for the provision and maintenance of all the sanctuaries in his jurisdiction. This dual office is also well attested in earlier Sumerian royal hymns and inscriptions in which the king was appointed as the high priest of his domain (Seux, 228–29; van Driel, 173). What some identify as a priestly role for Adam was simply part of what it meant to be human—to cultivate God's sacred garden and to serve and worship him. Perhaps we should understand instead that Israel's priests were assigned this particular aspect of God's original creational intent for humanity. After the fall, it was reserved for and embodied by the Levites, for a time, until this priestly role would be distributed once again to all of God's people (1 Pet. 2:9).

In sum, the terms *ṣelem* and *dəmût* in Gen. 1 are multivalent. They define humanity both ontologically, as sons or children of God, and functionally, as those who rule and subdue, multiply and fill, represent God, and serve and worship him, in part, by tending and cultivating his good creation.

Corporate Israel as the "Image and Son" of God

The opening chapter of Exodus notes, "The people of Israel were fruitful and increased greatly; they multiplied and grew exceedingly strong, so that the land was filled with them" (Exod. 1:7). As many have recognized, this language echoes Gen. 1:28. It intentionally links God's people, Israel, with humanity in Gen. 1, to show that God's original creational intent was moving forward. Despite sin and rebellion, all nations would indeed be blessed, as God had promised, through Abraham's descendants. Even more, God's original creational intent—for his people to multiply and fill the land—was coming to pass through Israel.

Given this connection in Exod. 1:7 between Israel and humanity in Gen. 1, we should not be surprised to read, "Then you [Moses] shall say to Pharaoh, 'Thus says the Lord, "My son, my firstborn, is Israel, and I say to you, release my son that he may serve/worship [*ʿbd*, cf. Gen. 2:15] me." But if you refuse to release him, I will indeed kill your firstborn son'" (Exod. 4:22–23 AT). Not only does the text identify Israel explicitly as God's "son," and notably his *firstborn* son, but also Yahweh demonstrates himself to be Israel's divine kinsman (*gōʾēl*) who will carry out his role as the avenger of blood. This is similar to God's response in Gen. 9:5–6, which implies that Yahweh is the kinsman of his people, humanity (cf. *pdh*, "to ransom," and *gʾl*, "to redeem," in Jer. 31:11 ESV).

In addition to the intentional link between Israel and humanity in Exod. 1:7 (cf. Gen. 1:26–28), and the explicit identification of Israel as Yahweh's son in Exod. 4, we also see the royal and priestly aspects given to humanity at creation resurface in Israel—for example, in Exod. 19:5–6, "If you will indeed obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my treasured possession among all peoples, for all the earth is mine; and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." These human roles were assigned to Israel so that they might demonstrate what it meant to be human. As Michael Goheen puts it, Israel was to be "an attractive sign before all nations of what God had intended in the beginning, and of the goal toward which he was moving: the restoration of all creation and human life from the corruption of sin" (25). This was to be accomplished not only through sacrifice, prayer, studying the Torah, abstaining from idolatry, and observing religious feasts and festivals, but by the way Israel used their resources, how they treated their employees, how they conducted business, and how they cared for the poor—all before the watching eyes of the nations (Lev. 19:9–10, 13, 35–36). Israel was commanded not to glean the edges of the field, not to strip the vineyards bare or to gather the fallen grapes, not to steal, lie, oppress, rob, commit injustice, slander, hate, or seek vengeance. They were to use honest weights and measurements so as not to increase their own wealth by cheating the buyer (Lev. 19). As Israel conformed to the law, the law would conform them to the image and likeness of the Father. Although the OT does not describe Israel explicitly as created in God's image and likeness (*ṣelem* and *dəmût*), this is implied by their position as firstborn son and royal priest. Through obedience Israel would manifest its true identity as a people created in the image of God, and thus show the nations God's original creational intent for all of humanity.

Christ as the Image

The *imago Dei* comes to its fullest expression in Jesus, whom Paul identifies explicitly as "the image of the invisible God" (*eikōn tou theou tou aoratou*, Col. 1:15). By contrasting "image" (*eikōn*) with "invisible" (*aoratos*), Paul emphasizes that God the Father, largely unseen until Jesus's arrival, *has been made visible in Christ*. However, Jesus is not merely a *representation* of God. By using the language of Gen. 1:26–27 (*eikōn*), Paul creates a series of significant contrasts that reveal Jesus's identity. First, whereas humanity was created *in* the image of God (*kat' eikona theou*, Gen. 1:27), Jesus *is* the image of God (*hos estin eikōn tou theou*, Col. 1:15). Whereas humanity was created *as* God's royal representative, to rule and subdue creation on God's behalf (Gen. 1:26, 28), Jesus *is himself* the king (Col. 1:13). Whereas humanity *represents* God visibly on the earth, Jesus *manifests* God visibly on the earth. By declaring, "For by him all things were created, in heaven and on earth [*en tois ouranois kai epi tēs gēs*; cf. LXX of Gen. 1:1: *en archē epoiēsen ho theos ton ouranon kai tēn gēn*], visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities—all things were created through him and for him. And he is before all things, and in him all things hold together" (Col. 1:15–16), Paul identifies Jesus with none other than Elohim of Gen. 1.

Further, Paul's use of *eikōn* to designate Jesus as *the* image of God (Col. 1:15) may be an intentional contrast with false images, which the LXX refers to with the same term over fifteen times (Deut. 4:16; 2 Kings 11:18; 2 Chron. 33:7; Isa. 40:19; Hosea 13:2; Ezek. 7:20; 16:17; Dan. 2:31, 34, 35; 3:1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15). In his rant against idolatry (*eikōn*/idol in LXX Isa. 40:19), Isaiah proclaims Yahweh as the *sole creator* and the *exclusive sovereign over all authorities* (Isa. 40:21–26). Given this background, it is not surprising that Paul would describe Jesus as the *eikōn* of God who created all things, in heaven and on earth, including all thrones, dominions, rulers, and authorities (Col. 1:16). He identifies Jesus not only with Elohim of Gen. 1, but also as the *true*, *living* image of God, over and against lifeless man-made idols that were worshiped in ancient Israel and in Jesus's day, including at Colossae (Magie).

It is also worth considering that Paul's use of *eikōn* in Col. 1:15 without the prepositions that appear in Gen. 1:26–27 (*kata* in the LXX, *bə*/*kə* in the MT) suggests that Jesus is the *archetype after which humanity is patterned.* That is, to be created in the image of God is to be made according to the likeness *of Christ*, who is "before all things" (Col. 1:17). Just as Jesus is the template for the *new* humanity, created by the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:18), he was the template for *original* humanity, also created by the Spirit (Gen. 1:2; 2:7). Thus, to bear Christ's image (1 Cor. 15:49; Rom. 8:29) and to be transformed into his likeness (2 Cor. 3:18) imply the restoration of humanity's original identity, function, and purpose—to rule, subdue, cultivate, be fruitful and multiply, and extend the blessing and presence of God in the world.

Christians as Children and "Images" of God

Many of the NT authors mention this transformation. Having borne the image of Adam, those who belong to Christ will also bear his image, as humanity did prior to the fall (1 Cor. 15:49; see also Gladd, 302–3). As "sons of God" we will be fully restored through *the* Son, who is "the firstborn *among many brothers*" (Rom. 8:29; cf. Heb. 2:11–15). Our transformation into Christ's likeness results not only in the restoration of our sonship to God; we also gain the added blessing of becoming *the younger siblings of Christ*! We will share a family resemblance with our Father and our elder Brother that will be recognizable (1 John 3:1–2). Our resurrected bodies will resemble the radiant face of Moses as he descended Mount Sinai, the glorified bodies of Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration (Luke 9:30–31), and the body of Jesus himself, whose face "shone like the sun" (Matt. 17:2) and whose clothing was "dazzling white" (Luke 9:29; cf. Rev. 1:16b, 3:4–5; 4:4; 10:1). What's more, our family resemblance will be manifest in our character: our thoughts, motives, desires, and actions will be aligned with the character of God our Father and Christ our Brother. After referring to believers as a new creation "in the likeness of God [which] has been created in righteousness and holiness and truth" (Eph. 4:23–24 AT), Paul says we will speak the truth, turn from sin, and abandon corrupt talk for that which is good and builds up (4:25–29). We will put away bitterness, wrath, anger, clamor, slander, and malice and be kind to one another, tenderhearted, and forgiving—walking in love (4:31–5:2). Like our Father and elder Brother, we will eschew sexual immorality, impurity, covetousness, filthiness, foolish talk, and crude joking (5:3–4). This is what it means to be made in God's image and to belong to the family of God. We will be like him when we see him as he is (1 John 3:2).

Conclusion

It is critically important for our understanding of God and the divine-human relationship, and for realizing our identity and purpose in this world, to have a proper sense of the *imago Dei*. Genesis 1 associates it with ruling and procreation but also, based on 5:1–3, with sonship. To be created in God's image and likeness is, first and foremost, to be his child. Genesis 9 further emphasizes the kinship aspect of the *imago Dei* by showing that the "life for life" principle is based on the idea that humans belong to the family of God. God avenges their life because he is their divine paterfamilias.

Given that Gen. 1 commemorates God's construction of his macro-temple, to be created in God's image and likeness implies that humans are in some way comparable to "statuettes." Indeed, they are living images, who represent God in the world. Further, they are to be cultivators of God's good creation, as they work and serve the Lord in his cosmic temple.

As humanity multiplied, they were to fill the earth, bearing God's presence and blessing as their numbers expanded. After the fall Israel took on the role of son and royal priest, serving as the vehicle through whom God's light would come to the nations (Isa. 49:6). Where Israel failed, however, Jesus succeeded. He is *the* image of God—the true, living manifestation of the Father, God's faithful firstborn son, our elder brother, and the template after which humanity was originally created. God's people will be re-created, again formed after the pattern of Christ. Like Moses and Elijah atop the Mount of Transfiguration, we will bear God's glory—a physical, outward sign that marks our (re)creation in God's image and membership in his family. To be changed into the likeness of Christ means nothing less than the restoration of our status as God's children (Rev. 21:3, 7) and a new era of ruling, cultivating, and worshiping God, for eternity.

See also Adam, First and Last; Image of God; Son of God

Bibliography. Beale, G. K., "Eden, the Temple, and the Church's Mission in the New Creation," *JETS* 48 (2005): 5–31; Callendar, D., *Adam in Myth and History* (Eisenbrauns, 2000); Fisher, L. R., "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old Testament," *VT* 15 (1965): 313–24; Garr, R. W., "'Image' and 'Likeness' in the Inscription from Tell Fakhariyeh," *IEJ* 50 (2000): 227–34; Gladd, B. L., "The Last Adam as the 'Life Giving Spirit' Revisited," *WTJ* 71 (2009): 297–309; Goheen, M., *A Light to the Nations* (Baker Academic, 2011); Herring, S. L., *Divine Substitution* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Klein, J., "The Coronation and Consecration of Šulgi in the Ekur (Šulgi G)," in *Ah, Assyira*, ed. M. Cogan and I. Eph'al (Magnes, 1991), 292–313; Lints, R., *Identity and Idolatry* (IVP Academic, 2015); Lorton, D., "God's Beneficient Creation," *SAK* 20 (1993): 125–55; Magie, D., "Egyptian Deities in Asia Minor in Inscriptions and on Coins," *AJA* 57 (1953): 163–87; McConville, J. G., *Being Human in God's World* (Baker Academic, 2016); McDowell, C., *The Image of God in the Garden of Eden* (Eisenbrauns, 2015); McDowell, "In the Image of God He Created Them," in *The Image of God in an Image Driven Age*, ed. B. F. Jones and J. W. Barbeau (IVP Academic, 2016), 29–46; Millard, A. R., and P. Bordreuil, "A Statue from Syria with Assyrian and Aramaic Inscriptions," *BA* 45 (1982): 135–41; Peterson, R. S., *The* Imago Dei *as Human Identity* (Eisenbrauns, 2015); Seux, M. J., *Epithetes* (Letouzey et Ane, 1967); van Driel, G., *Cult of Aššur* (van Gorcum, 1969); Widengren, G., *The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion* (Almqvist & Wiksell, 1951).

Catherine McDowell

Intertextuality

See Quotation, Allusion, and Echo; Theological Interpretation of Scripture

Introductory Formulas of Quotations

See Quotation, Allusion, and Echo

Isaiah, Book of

Isaiah son of Amoz prophesied in Judah (the Southern Kingdom) in the eighth century BC, from at least the death of Uzziah (6:1) until the departure of Sennacherib upon the destruction of his army (37:37). The probable dates of these events are 739 and 701 BC. Thus, Isaiah's ministry occurred during the last days of Israel (the Northern Kingdom) and the threat that Assyria would

Conclusion

Each NT author offers a distinctive approach to the law, and yet there is significant overlap. The NT authors are unanimous in seeing the OT law as pointing forward as a witness to what has taken place in Jesus's saving work. As for the law's regulations and requirements, the Christ believer "fulfills" that law and obeys it as directed through the lens of Christ and his Spirit.

See also Circumcision; Covenant; Feasts and Festivals; Jesus's Use of the OT; Jews and Gentiles; Justice; Love; Sacrifices and Offerings; Sinai; Temple; Wilderness

Bibliography. Allison, D. C., Jr., "Jesus and the Covenant," *JSNT* 29 (1987): 57–78; Bahnsen, G. L., et al., *Five Views on Law and Gospel* (Zondervan, 1993); Das, A. A., *Paul and the Jews*, LPS (Hendrickson, 2003); Das, "Paul and the Law," in *Paul Unbound*, ed. M. D. Given (Hendrickson, 2009), 99–116; Dunn, J. D. G., *The New Perspective on Paul*, WUNT 185 (Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Loader, W. R. G., *Jesus' Attitude towards the Law*, WUNT 2/97 (Mohr Siebeck, 1997); McKnight, S., *The Letter of James*, NICNT (Eerdmans, 2011); Patrick, D., "Law in the OT," in *NIDB*, 3:602–14; Patrick, *Old Testament Law* (John Knox, 1985); Räisänen, H., "The Law as a Theme of 'New Testament Theology,'" in *Jesus, Paul, and Torah*, JSNTSup 43 (Sheffield Academic, 1992), 252–77; Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (Fortress, 1983); Sanders, E. P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Fortress, 1977); Schreiner, T. R., *40 Questions about Christians and Biblical Law* (Kregel, 2010); Thielman, F., *The Law and the New Testament*, CompNT (Crossroad, 1999).

A. Andrew Das

Letter Couriers

This essay addresses the question of the nature of letter couriers in the ancient world, and in particular in the Greco-Roman world in which the NT was written. It is easy to overlook the mechanics of letter conveyance and the role of the letter courier since little to nothing is made of these elements within the NT and the letters that were sent were ostensibly delivered to their intended destinations. However, the delivery of a letter was a more complex situation than one might at first imagine, and the role of the letter courier is itself far more complex than might at first appear. In this essay, I will address two major issues regarding letter couriers. First, I address the history of letter delivery in the ancient world in order to establish what the possibilities were for letter conveyance. Second, I address the role of the letter courier and what may have been expected of such a person within the letter conveyance system. Letter couriers play an important role not just in the physical dissemination of letters but also in their reception and interpretation.

A Brief History of Letter Delivery in the Ancient World

The postal system of the ancient world of the Mediterranean can be divided into two types: the official postal service and the private postal service. Since possibly the Assyrians and certainly the Persians, we have known of sophisticated official postal services in the ancient world. There was, however, no developed private postal service, certainly not during the Roman era. I will discuss the official postal service within the ancient world first, followed by the means of sending mail for those in the private sector. (In what follows, I summarize the descriptions regarding the ancient postal services given by Epp, 393–407; Harmon; Klauck, 60–65; Llewelyn, "Conveyance," 2–22; "Sending," 339–49; White, 214–15.)

The earliest postal system for which we have significant documentation was apparently developed by the Persians in the sixth century BC. This system, established by Cyrus, is referred to in several ancient sources. The structure of the system is recounted in a passage from the ancient Greek historian Herodotus (*Hist.* 8.98.1–2; cf. 3.126), who recounts the relay system that the Persians developed, with one rider per day of the journey transporting the mail by horse. Xenophon, the later Greek historian, mentions how quick the system is in delivering the post, based upon the relay system (*Cyr.* 8.6.17–18). This postal system, probably headed by a government official (see Plutarch, *Alex*. 18), was used for official purposes, including government and military communication, but was also apparently used by the king and other officials within the government for personal matters. A road system was also developed alongside the postal system to facilitate empire-wide communication and transportation. The cost of maintaining the 1,700 miles of the system was paid by those within whose territory the roads ran. We get an idea of how effective the system was from the book of Esther. On two occasions—once when Haman executes his order to kill the Jews (3:12–13) and once when Mordecai, through King Ahasuerus, countermands that order (8:10)—the Persian system of letter delivery is mentioned in the Bible and noted for its speed and effectiveness. Josephus also refers to those who sent out the announcement of Ahasuerus's wedding (*Ant*. 11.203).

Since the Greek empire consisted of individual city-states, even if in leagues, no similar postal system developed in Greece. It was Alexander the Great's capture of Persia that inspired the Greeks to develop their own postal system for the Hellenistic Empire. Alexander's successors, the Diadochi, reorganized the Persian postal system for their own areas of influence, and thus Antigonus I developed such a system in Asia Minor and Greece, and the Seleucids and Ptolemies did similarly in Syria and Egypt, respectively. The Egyptian system, as one might expect, focused upon the course of the Nile for north-south delivery of letters (by horse) and packages (by boat) but also developed a series of east-west delivery systems for letters (by foot) and packages (by camel).

Rome improved upon these early postal systems. Its postal system, called the *cursus publicus*, was inaugurated by Julius Caesar but fully instigated by Augustus as one means of uniting his growing empire. Augustus's system apparently began with carriers transporting mail by foot around Italy and other western areas, but he then expanded the system and adapted it to the eastern Greek/Persian system. Suetonius, the Roman historian, mentions the postal system in his account of Augustus's life (*Aug*. 49.3). Rome initially used the relay system but then introduced the use of carts of various sorts to carry the mail. It eventually abandoned the relay system for one in which the same rider proceeded along the entire distance, changing animals at designated places. The system was not as fast as the Persian system with its relayed riders but probably improved reliability (since one rider went from start to finish), and riders could, some think, cover up to fifty miles in a day. The carriers were issued special papers (a diploma) that designated their privileges.

This Roman postal system was designed to serve the Roman Empire, and so it was designed for governmental correspondence, including both administrative and military matters. Sometimes the military used the road system for its own purposes and movements. This does not mean that private citizens did not sometimes use the official postal system, by perhaps having a carrier transport a letter or package for them, or that officials did not use the system for some of their personal business. Almost assuredly they did. However, it would have been more usual for those who could afford it to hire special governmental couriers, called *tabellarii*, or have their own servants make the journey (on *tabellarii*, see Llewelyn, "Sending," 342–48, although it is not entirely certain who the *tabellarii* were or how they functioned in relation to the official Roman postal system). But this was reserved for those with financial means. There were also select soldiers who sometimes delivered the mail, especially for the emperor. Other functions also developed along with the system. These included the *frumentarii*, who were postal carriers responsible for the delivery of especially important mail, and they took on the characteristics of a kind of secret police.

For most people, however, there was effectively no official postal service, and hence no simple and relatively reliable means of delivering letters or other documents or goods. There are three major ways that the post was delivered for those who did not hold official positions. As mentioned above, the wealthy could afford to send one of their own servants or to use a special courier to send their mail. Second, a group of people could hire one of the special governmental couriers to carry mail for the entire group. There apparently were some local tax officers who banded together to hire private couriers who could also be used by others. This was still costly. The third option—and one that was used by the vast majority of people—was to entrust one's letter or letters to someone who happened to be traveling in the direction that one wished the letter to go. In an ideal situation, this person might have been a friend, so as to help guarantee the reliability of the delivery. In other instances, this person might have been a businessman traveling with a camel caravan and other businessmen, or even a complete stranger who was passing through on the way toward the desired destination of the letter.

As a result, postal delivery for nongovernmental letters and packages was unreliable. Many circumstances could thwart the successful delivery of a letter or a package. The addressee might not be found, or the address might be insufficient. Or the letter carrier might not arrive. Or the person might lose the letter, delay its delivery, access confidential information, or even steal a package. We have papyri that record what is being sent in packages so that the recipient can check the package against the list to ensure that everything has arrived, going so far as to ask the recipient to write back in confirmation.

The Roles and Responsibilities of Letter Couriers

In light of the discussion above, we will concentrate upon the possible roles and responsibilities of letter couriers for nongovernmental letters. Some have, on occasion, raised the question of whether Paul utilized the official postal service as a means of his correspondence with some of his churches, and in particular to deliver some of the letters that he sent to them. This question is sometimes raised in relation to the Letter to the Philippians. Near the end of the letter, Paul sends greetings and says that among those who send greetings are "those who belong to Caesar's household" (Phil. 4:22). This has prompted the question, first, of the origin of Paul's letter and, second, whether those members of Caesar's household had anything to do with the postal system and carrying this letter to the Philippians. There has been much discussion of the origin of Paul's imprisonment letters, and Philippians in particular, with most scholars believing that Rome is the most likely option (Porter, 62–68). However, several of the other options, such as Caesarea, Ephesus, and even Corinth, were imperial cities in the sense that they had a strong Roman influence and even presence, and so it is difficult to know from origin—as uncertain as it may or may not be—what that means in relationship to the Roman government. The second issue concerns Caesar's household and whether any of those in the household would have been among the special couriers of the postal system, *tabellarii*. The first difficulty in making this assessment is that it is difficult to establish exactly who the *tabellarii* were and how they functioned. Stephen Llewelyn raises several questions regarding whether those referred to in Philippians as being in Caesar's household could be *tabellarii*. The first difficulty is that *tabellarii* may not have been able to use the Roman governmental postal system. We simply do not know enough about the *tabellarii*, the diplomas they were given, and what these diplomas may or may not have allowed for them in relation to the Roman postal system. Second, there is no indication by Paul in Philippians that the members of Caesar's household were *tabellarii*, since the members of the household comprised a wide range of positions from lower-level to relatively high administrative positions. A third difficulty is that there is no indication in the letter that its couriers may have been Christians since the number of Christians and their likelihood as letter couriers would have been small. A fourth and final difficulty is that there is no need for the hypothesis. The hypothesis seems to have been formulated because of a need for a clear means of communication between Paul and the Philippians. However, the route to be traveled—probably to and from Rome (although this location is not required)—was well and frequently traversed (Llewelyn, "Sending," 342–48).

So, without the public postal system available, we must examine the role of the letter courier in relation to the possible private means available. Before we are able to do that, we should probably establish the major reasons for sending a letter in the ancient world. Letters had three primary purposes: to establish and maintain relationships (as a substitute for the author's personal presence), to form a dialogical interchange in which one side conveys something or responds to the other (probably information, but not necessarily only information), and to provide a permanent record of the interaction between the two parties (Porter, 140–41). Each one of these is important. Much has been made of Robert Funk's statement about the importance of the letter as conveying Paul's apostolic presence, and thereby apostolic authority. It is questionable whether the letter itself conveys the apostolic authority, as Paul seems to continue to have numerous problems with some of his churches, but there is definitely a sense in which the letter conveys the apostle's presence—though probably no more so than other letters in the ancient world. We have records of many personal letters from the ancient world where a personal presence is created by means of the written letter, whether a husband to a wife, or a child to a parent, or the like. Further, it is often thought that language is primarily used simply to convey information. The conveyance of information can often be important in a letter, but one must be careful how one defines information. The "information" of a letter may relate to things (donkeys, citrus plants, olives, etc.) as well as to thoughts and feelings (friendship, recommendation, etc.). Finally, many letters of the ancient world provided a permanent record of the interaction between parties. The reasons for this vary, from ensuring faithful delivery of the letter and/or goods to much more personal reasons regarding the status of the relationships involved.

As a result, we can outline a number of different functions of the letter courier.

Deliver the letter. The first, and most obvious, responsibility of the letter courier was to ensure that the letter was delivered to its proper destination. This was not necessarily an easy task, as travel could involve not only the road system but also travel by sea, along with all the potential dangers of such travel (Richards, 189–200). As we saw above, ensuring the delivery of a letter was perhaps a more difficult task than one might first realize. It is worth asking how it was that the NT letters were constructed so that they would arrive at their proper destination. If they were sent by personal friends who knew the recipients (either a church or individual), then it may have been very straightforward: a simple address on the back of the letter. However, as Llewelyn points out, letters were addressed many ways due to varying needs for clarity. A letter to a small village might be relatively easy to address, but a letter to a major city, such as Rome (or a place that had several church groups), may have required much more, especially if the letter courier did not know the recipients very well or at all. Some of the ways of addressing letters include an attached label specifying the directions, a separate sheet of papyrus with directions, the verso of the letter containing the directions along with the address, and indications of ways to find the destination other than directions. Sometimes directions were also given for the sending of a return letter (Llewelyn, "Conveyance," 29–43). We can imagine that any number of these may have been used by NT authors, even if they were entrusting their letters to friends, since some of the addressees found in the letters themselves are not altogether clear as to their specific point of destination.

Before we discuss specific letter couriers and then their further responsibilities, we should discuss the question of the difference between letter carriers and emissaries or envoys. We know that Paul used a number of emissaries or envoys—that is, people who represented him and worked on his behalf in relationship with the churches for which he felt responsibility. There are a number of emissaries mentioned in the Pauline Letters (Llewelyn, "Conveyance," 55): Artemas (Titus 3:12), Crescens (2 Tim. 4:10), Epaphras (Col. 1:7–8), Erastus (2 Tim. 4:20; cf. Acts 19:22), Silas (2 Cor. 1:19; cf. Acts 17:14), Timothy (1 Cor. 4:17; 2 Cor. 1:19; Phil. 2:19–23; 1 Thess. 3:2–6; 1 Tim. 1:3–4; cf. Acts 17:14; 19:22), Titus (2 Cor. 7:6–7; 8:6–7, 16–24; 9:5; 12:17–18; 2 Tim. 4:10; Titus 1:5), and Tychicus (Eph. 6:21–22; Col. 4:7–9; 2 Tim. 4:12; Titus 3:12). These emissaries or envoys appear to be people within the scope of the Pauline mission who act on behalf of Paul, conveying information, receiving information, helping to spread the gospel, and doing other kinds of ministry functions on behalf of the apostle (on the importance of envoys, see Mitchell, "Envoys"). Such emissaries were an important part of the Pauline missionary venture. However, these emissaries or envoys were not necessarily letter couriers. They may have simply gone with oral instructions from Paul or even just with the commission of performing a necessary task and then reporting back to him about the progress of the gospel.

Still, these two functions may have overlapped. We do not have complete information for the letters of the NT, but we believe that the following were letter couriers (not all letters give an indication of the courier) (see Llewelyn, "Conveyance," 51–54; expanded by Harmon, 136–45, on whom the following discussion is dependent; cf. Head, "Named," 279–82; Porter, passim on the various letters).

Phoebe. In Rom. 16:1–2, Paul states, "I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deacon of the church in Cenchreae. I ask you to receive her in the Lord in a way worthy of his people and to give her any help she may need from you, for she has been the benefactor of many people, including me." This passage does not identify Phoebe as the letter carrier, but it does commend her to the recipients, a feature that many scholars consider indicative of being the letter carrier.

Timothy. First Corinthians 4:17 may indicate that Timothy carried 1 Corinthians to the Corinthians, although most scholars do not accept this in light of 1 Cor. 16:10, which seems more tenuous on Timothy's arrival (contra Harmon, 140–41, who follows Mitchell, *Paul*, 222–23, on interpreting 1 Cor. 16:10). Timothy would still be an emissary, instructed to remind the Corinthians of Paul's life in Christ and what he teaches elsewhere. In Phil. 2:19–24, Paul states that he is hoping to send Timothy to the Philippians soon. The passage does not say that he is intending to send a letter by Timothy, but the commendation of him is followed by the commendation of Epaphroditus, who is also being sent.

Titus. Titus is thought to have possibly been the one who delivered either 1 Corinthians (2 Cor. 12:18) or Paul's "tearful letter" (2 Cor. 7:12–14) or even 2 Corinthians (2 Cor. 8:16–24). Titus was clearly relieved at the response of the Corinthians if he delivered the tearful letter. If he is the one carrying 2 Corinthians, he is said to be coming with enthusiasm as a partner and coworker of Paul.

Epaphroditus. In Phil. 2:25–30, Paul states that he finds it necessary to send Epaphroditus to the Philippians. The interesting fact is that Epaphroditus appears to have been sent first from the Philippians to Paul and acted as their messenger, but now he is acting as Paul's.

Tychicus. Colossians 4:7–9 speaks of Tychicus bringing information to inform the Colossians about Paul and encourage them. He is said to be accompanied by Onesimus. Many think that Tychicus was the carrier of the letter.

Onesimus. It has recently been (re)argued that Onesimus is the carrier of the Letter to Philemon, rather than Tychicus, Timothy, or an otherwise unspecified carrier (Head, "Onesimus," notes that the traditional view is Onesimus, held by many from Jerome and Chrysostom to the present).

These examples do not constitute a large body of strong evidence regarding Pauline letter carriers, and offer even less as to the role of the letter carrier, besides that of physically transmitting the letter to the intended recipients.

The task of the letter courier was not finished upon delivery of the letter. A range of functions has been suggested for the letter courier, even if we do not get clear indications from the NT letters what those functions may have been specifically in relation to the NT itself. Comments made in a number of documentary papyri indicate that the letter courier served an important role not just in ensuring the arrival of the letter but also in its presentation and even understanding. I will discuss five additional tasks and functions of the letter courier (see Richards, 182–85, 201–4; Harmon, 134–36; cf. Head, "Named").

Deliver goods. As we have already observed, the Roman postal system was designed for more than simply letters. It was designed for letters and packages. Similarly, those who were not able to avail themselves of the official Roman system needed to send both documents and goods (one might argue that a letter was just a small form of goods or package). Many of the documentary papyri that have survived from the ancient world are financial documents that record various financial transactions, such as the buying, selling, sending, and receiving of goods. Just as governments needed to communicate and move equipment, so did individuals. However, the risks of moving goods for individuals were much greater because they had to be entrusted to individuals. This accounts for the fact that those sending goods often looked for those they knew to send their goods—to help ensure their safe arrival. This also accounts for the accompanying letters in which those sending goods would specify what the courier was carrying, such as money or various items, sometimes even listed. This would serve to ensure that the goods—all of the goods—were delivered as they were supposed to be.

Read the letter. Scholars often comment that the reading of the letter by the courier was an expectation in the ancient world, and many discussions of the letter courier include the reading of letters as one of the courier's duties (e.g., Botha, 417–19, who treats the discussion as a matter of rhetoric; Richards, 202; Harmon, 135–36). This seems to make logical sense in the light of the relatively widespread illiteracy in the Greco-Roman world (Stanley, *Arguing*, 63). An opposition is often drawn within the Greco-Roman world between orality and literacy, to the point that some scholars emphasize one over the other. The debate over how to think about these two factors has been ongoing over the last century or more. In many ways, this is a false disjunction. There are varying types of literacy of which one may speak, including differences in being able to actively and passively use language, as well as being able to read and/or write. There is no denying that orality was important in the ancient world, and we cannot minimize the fact that probably the great majority of people in the ancient world were illiterate if by that we mean that they were unable to read and write. However, this fails to note that the Greco-Roman world was a literate culture. By that, I mean that even those who were functionally illiterate within the world of the first century lived within a world in which written documents played a major role, to the point that they could not survive without the use of and dependence upon such documents. We can see evidence of this in many different ways. Even if, as William Harris (266–67) has estimated, only about 15 percent of people in the ancient world were literate (although this figure has been challenged by, e.g., Humphrey; Bagnall), virtually all of them were dependent upon written documents for their existence and livelihood, especially in the Roman bureaucratic world. Even those who were illiterate were expected to communicate with others in permanent ways, issue or sign receipts, perhaps sign contracts, and file Roman census reports at appropriate times in which they acknowledged their possessions. Even if they could not write these documents themselves, or even read them without the help of someone else, they were required to hire someone to write these documents for them, and they had to live by the terms of their legal obligations.

In such a world, someone who could read a letter was valuable, and a letter courier who could read would arguably often have to do so especially in a context such as Paul writing to a congregation where many, if not most, of those present would not have been able to read for themselves. Harmon points out that Xenophon in his *Hellenica* (7.1.39) speaks about a gathering of Thebans to hear a letter from the king read by a Persian to them (135n25). But Peter Head claims that he "did not find any evidence that any particular letter-carrier was also expected to read the letter aloud to the recipient" ("Named," 297, cited by Harmon, 135n25). Head even thinks there is some evidence against it. Head does admit that perhaps the evidence is limited and perhaps is not something to be remarked upon in such letters, and he even suggests that other letters might reveal such a practice. Nevertheless, there is minimal to no evidence from documentary letters of the letter courier reading the letter to the recipients.

There are several considerations to note here. The first is suggested by Head himself—namely, that "perhaps . . . we should not think of the letter-carrier as the most obvious candidate to recite the letter" ("Named," 297). In other words, it may still be the case due to the nature of the literate culture of the time that the letter was read to the recipient(s) but not by the letter courier. A second consideration is that Paul seems to provide evidence that he expected his letters, or at least some of them, to be read aloud by someone to the audience. Paul states at the end of 1 Thessalonians, "I charge you before the Lord to have this letter read to all the brothers and sisters" (5:27). Again, in Col. 4:16, Paul states, "After this letter has been read to you, see that it is also read in the church of the Laodiceans and that you in turn read the letter from Laodicea."

I will make several observations about these comments in the Pauline Letters. The first is that the admonition for reading aloud is placed at the end of the letter in both instances. This would appear to require that the letter courier either already know the contents of the letter—a possibility we will discuss further below—or that the reading is a subsequent act and not an initial one. In fact, the language seems to indicate that in both instances there is an admonition for subsequent readings to be made before the entire congregation. However, it would also appear that the initial reading is being made before the congregation, which would imply reading aloud, as Acts 15:30–32 seems to indicate (although not a Pauline letter). A third consideration is the passage from Xenophon cited above regarding an authority figure's letter being read before a group. A fourth consideration is, as Luther Stirewalt (19) has suggested, that Paul's Letters may not be forms of expanded personal letters but rather be based upon models of official letters and treated in that way. This may be in harmony with the pattern of the third consideration.

In sum, a letter courier may have been, in some circumstances, responsible for reading a letter aloud to the recipient. However, this is not a given since someone else may have read the letter if the recipient were illiterate. It appears that it would have been more likely that the letter courier read the letter, or at least gave the letter over to someone to read aloud if there were a group gathered to hear the letter. This certainly seems to have been the procedure, and it was followed in subsequent readings as well.

Provide additional information. A letter courier might also have provided additional information not included within the letter. A number of scholars have determined that the letter courier provided additional information to the readers (see Doty, 37; Richards, 183–84, 201–2; Head, "Ancient"; "Named," 296; Harmon, 134–35). Head calls it "extending the communication initiated by the letter" ("Named," 296). By that, he seems to mean that the letter courier, because of an association with the letter writer, was able to provide further information and extend the knowledge of the readers. The nature of this extended information apparently varied considerably. Documentary papyri and other ancient documents indicate that sometimes the additional information extended what was found in the letter, while at other times the information provided was not related to the material in the letter but was perhaps information that was more appropriate to be conveyed orally than in written form.

Randolph Richards provides two examples of such extended information in the NT (201–2). The first illustrates how others may have conveyed information by means of the letter courier in addition to the letter. In 1 Cor. 1:11, Paul says, "Some from Chloe's household have informed me that there are quarrels among you," which may well indicate that additional information was given to Paul about the Corinthian situation by the member of Chloe's household that brought the letter from Corinth. Paul then deals with those matters in 1 Cor. 1–6, before he states in 7:1, "Now for the matters you wrote about," thus indicating that he has concluded responding to the additional information and is now addressing the content of the letter. In Eph. 6:21–22, Paul says to the Ephesians, "Tychicus, the dear brother and faithful servant in the Lord [and probably the letter courier], will tell you everything, so that you also may know how I am and what I am doing." Richards wonders whether the matter concerns Paul's imprisonment (see 6:20). In any case, Paul continues: "I am sending him to you for this very purpose, that you may know how we are, and that you may encourage him" (6:22). That is, Paul states that one of the purposes of Tychicus being sent to the Ephesians with the letter is to convey additional information about Paul's situation, information that Tychicus as an associate of Paul knows and is authorized to convey. We might add a third example from outside of the Pauline Letters. In Acts 15:30–32, Judas and Silas, two of the letter couriers of the letter from Jerusalem to Antioch (along with Paul and Barnabas), are said to encourage and strengthen the church after they read the letter.

Serve as an envoy or emissary. We have already distinguished between an envoy and a letter courier. There were apparently many Pauline emissaries or envoys who were not letter couriers. Some of them have been noted above. There may have been some letter couriers who were not envoys or emissaries, but that appears to be much less likely. Named letter couriers in particular seem to have this function (Head, "Ancient," 219). The nature of the letter carriers' task, at least for those who carried Paul's letters, appears to have been, as noted above, to establish and/or maintain a relationship between Paul and his audience (a basic epistolary function), to serve as Paul's representative in his absence (one of the related basic letter functions), to represent Paul's teachings and directives to the recipients, including both the letter and any additional information (as noted above), to gather the information that Paul should know and convey this information back to Paul, to continue to build up various churches when Paul had to move on to other locations (Llewelyn, "Conveyance," 55), and any number of other functions of such a representative. The role of the Pauline envoy has been more widely recognized in more recent research (Mitchell, "Envoys"; cf. Harmon, 141–45), especially as scholars have come to appreciate more fully that the Pauline mission involved more than just the individual Paul but a group of traveling companions who ministered throughout the eastern Mediterranean. Paul may have been at the center of this group, but he relied upon a host of others to be engaged in important communication with his churches and even individuals.

Interpret Paul's letters, including the use of the OT. A number of scholars have recently emphasized that one of the possible functions of the Pauline letter courier was to interpret Paul's letters, including and perhaps especially his uses of the OT. This possible function of the letter courier goes further than the idea simply of adding information, as it requires a level of understanding of Paul that is perhaps more in line with the role of the envoy or emissary who speaks not just the words of Paul but with the voice and authority of Paul. In discussing the reception of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the audience's familiarity with the OT, Ross Wagner (38) states that "it is quite likely that the bearers of Paul's letters were charged by the apostle with the further responsibility of helping to interpret them." Greg Beale (10) goes further by focusing in particular upon apprehending the meaning of OT references for an early Christian audience that, for the most part, were recently converted gentiles who were not conversant with the Scriptures of Israel. There has been a challenge to this position that argues that, while Paul's audience may have been relatively ignorant of the Scriptures of Israel, Paul provided all that was necessary within the literary context and used his authority to establish the meaning in that particular context (e.g., Stanley, *Arguing*, 36–61; "Pearls"; see Abasciano for a response to Stanley). Such a position would tend to minimize the function of the letter courier—or any other interpreter—for understanding Paul's letters and the use of the OT. There is admittedly something to be said for the integrity of an epistolary argument; however, texts in general are not nearly so clear as some seem to think that they are, and Paul's are no different, so that, even if Paul may not have directly advocated it, it is entirely likely that questions of interpretation of his letters arose—in fact, we know that they did (see 2 Pet. 3:16)—that led to his letter couriers or other emissaries engaging in early Pauline interpretation.

Final Thoughts regarding Letter Couriers

Despite the abundance of documentary papyri, as well as the NT letters, we know surprisingly little about the roles that the letter courier played in the process, besides the obvious one of delivering the letter to the intended audience—and they didn't always successfully do that. The most that we can do is to use analogies from other literature, from history, and from the documentary papyri, as well as the NT, to provide a rough grid of the kinds of roles and functions that letter couriers may have played. We may acknowledge that their primary task was to ensure that the letter was delivered, a task that was not necessarily that easy, even with communication in the Greco-Roman world as advanced as it was. As far as other possible functions of the letter courier—such as delivering goods, reading letters aloud, providing additional information, serving as envoys, and interpreting Paul and his use of the OT—we have some good basis for thinking that at least some of these tasks were performed at least some of the time. We cannot eliminate any of them from consideration, but we may rightly question whether they were always expected to play a role in the delivery of a letter. Letter couriers for documentary letters certainly held additional responsibilities, whether ensuring that goods arrived or providing some additional information, but the case is more complex for the NT letters. We have tantalizing information about the role that Paul's letter couriers and envoys may have played in the letter delivery system, but we must be careful not to overextend and overgeneralize. The evidence that we have examined above seems to indicate that the function of the letter courier may have varied according to each individual letter and situation.

Conclusion

The Roman postal system, based upon Persian and Hellenistic precedents, was one of the several marvels of the Roman bureaucracy and provided a means for reliable communication throughout the Roman Empire. However, this system would not have been available to most people, as they were not part of the Roman governmental hierarchy. The vast majority of people were required to find other means to communicate by written correspondence, including relying upon a variety of much more casual and ad hoc means. This does not mean that these informal systems were not used—they were in fact widely relied upon and proved reasonably reliable, all things considered—but that the role of the letter courier took on a special character. I have attempted to discuss and outline some of the major functions of the letter courier in the Greco-Roman world, especially as that courier functioned in relation to the NT letters. The evidence that we have is suggestive that the letter courier played, at least on occasion and in part, a vital role beyond that of simply delivering the letter to its intended recipient. However, we must remain skeptical about the full extent of that role.

See also Literacy in the Greco-Roman World; *Septuagint articles*

Bibliography. Abasciano, B. J., "Diamonds in the Rough," *NovT* 49 (2007): 153–83; Bagnall, R. S., *Everyday Writing in the Graeco-Roman East* (University of California Press, 2011); Beale, G. K., *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Baker Academic, 2012); Botha, P. J. J., "The Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht (Sheffield Academic, 1993), 409–28; Doty, W. G., *Letters in Primitive Christianity* (Fortress, 1973); Epp, E. J., "New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts and Letter Carrying in Greco-Roman Times" (1991), repr. in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism*, NovTSup 116 (Brill, 2005), 383–409; Funk, R. W., "The Apostolic Parousia," in *Christian History and Interpretation*, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr (Cambridge University Press, 1967), 249–68; Harmon, M. S., "Letter Carriers and Paul's Use of Scripture," *JSPL* 4 (2014): 129–48; Harris, W. V., *Ancient Literacy* (Harvard University Press, 1989); Head, Peter M., "Letter Carriers in the Ancient Jewish Epistolary Material," in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, ed. C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias (T&T Clark, 2009), 203–19; Head, "Named Letter-Carriers among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri," *JSNT* 31 (2009): 279–99; Head, "Onesimus the Letter Carrier and the Initial Reception of Paul's Letter to Philemon," *JTS* 71 (2020): 628–56; Humphrey, J. H., ed., *Literacy in the Roman World* (Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991); Klauck, Hans-Josef, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament* (Baylor University Press, 2006); Llewelyn, S. R., "The Conveyance of Letters," in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 7, ed. S. R. Llewelyn (Eerdmans, 1994), 1–57; Llewelyn, "Sending Letters in the Ancient World," *TynBul* 46 (1995): 337–56; Mitchell, M. M., "New Testament Envoys in the Context of Greco-Roman Diplomatic and Epistolary Conventions," *JBL* 111 (1992): 641–62; Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation* (1992; repr., Westminster John Knox, 1993); Porter, S. E., *The Apostle Paul* (Eerdmans, 2016); Richards, E. R., *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing* (InterVarsity, 2004); Stanley, C. D., *Arguing with Scripture* (T&T Clark, 2004); Stanley, "'Pearls before Swine,'" *NovT* 41 (1999): 124–44; Stirewalt, M. L., *Paul the Letter Writer* (Eerdmans, 2003); Wagner, J. R., *Heralds of the Good News* (Brill, 2002); White, J. L., *Light from Ancient Letters* (Fortress, 1986).

Stanley E. Porter

Leviticus, Book of

The title "Leviticus" comes from the Latin Vulgate, which has adapted it from the LXX. The Greek word is *leuitikon*, an adjective meaning "Levitical" or "that which pertains to the Levites." This is perhaps not the best heading for the book, first of all because the name "Levite" appears in the document only four times, and these in the span of two verses (25:32–33). The book actually has more to do with directions for the entire congregation of Israel and for the priests rather than the entire tribe of Levi. An old adage is appropriate here: "All priests are Levites, but not all Levites are priests." Later Jewish scribes (Tannaitic period, ca. 200

Q

Qumran *See Dead Sea Scrolls articles*

Quotation, Allusion, and Echo

This article explores the three literary modes of reference known as quotation, allusion, and echo. Their nature is discussed, some examples are presented—especially for allusion, which is the most misunderstood of the three—and definitions are provided. The article also briefly touches on these modes of reference and their relationship to and significance for biblical theology. Yet before beginning discussion of quotation, allusion, and echo, we must first situate them within the broader literary concept known as *intertextuality*.

Intertextuality

The literary critic Julia Kristeva is credited as having coined the term *intertextuality* (*intertextualité*) in her 1969 essay "Word, Dialogue, and Novel" (in Kristeva, *Sēmeiōtikē*; published in English in 1980 in Kristeva, *Desire*), although the concept is rooted in the earlier work of others, including the Russian literary critic M. Bakhtin, whose thought on this shaped Kristeva's own (Allen, 14–15; Orr, 25–27). Therefore, the concept originated squarely within the field of literary criticism, and *intertextuality* is a technical term of that discipline. Unfortunately, today the term "is one of the most commonly used and misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary," even though it is "one of the central ideas in contemporary literary theory" (Allen, 2). Broadly speaking, intertextuality refers to theories that understand that a text can only ever be understood within its larger network of interconnected relations with other, prior texts (Allen, 1). All texts are intertexts because they dialogue with, refer to, recycle, and are dependent on preexisting texts; no text is an island (Kilbride).

Part of the problem with the term *intertextuality* is that it has come to encompass such a broad range of theories and ways of reading that its meaning has become vague. The critic wanting to conduct an "intertextual" study must therefore provide further explanation to clarify the actual type of approach to be taken in their work. Mary Orr (60) writes, "For interest groups [such as biblical scholars!] wanting to use such a capacious umbrella concept for strategic purposes, intertextuality offers rather small ideological leverage and surprisingly limited sites of operation before the need for distinctive terms re-emerges." Orr's "directory of alternative terms for 'intertext,' 'intertextuality'" at the end of her book demonstrates just how broad of an umbrella concept intertextuality is. She lists a magnificent and dizzying array of terms, ranging from "abridgement" to "hypertext" and from "midrash" to "prefiguration" and "worldwide web" (Orr, 238–46). It becomes obvious that any scholar claiming to conduct an "intertextual" study must further explain what he or she is doing, including providing clear definitions of the subset terms that are going to be employed in the research.

From the 1960s onward, the concept of intertextuality was developed most notably by poststructuralist, deconstructionist, and postmodern literary critics who questioned the authority of the author as originator of a text's meaning (e.g., Barthes). Intertextuality is therefore today predominantly understood as a text-oriented and/or reader-oriented enterprise. Yet literary critics continue to debate the nature of the complex relationships between meaning and the author, the text, and the reader. So even to the present day the concept of intertextuality, at least in theory, continues to have space under its vast canopy for the more modest and traditional author-oriented, diachronic approaches that typically limit study to intentional references to prior texts—such as quotations and allusions. Yet this space under the intertextual umbrella is often grudgingly conceded and vocally contested by many postmodern critics who argue that such author-focused studies are oppressive, privileging some texts or canons while silencing others (see Orr, 60–93). Many postmodern critics do therefore in fact desire the "death of the author" in intertextual study and reject author-oriented approaches.

Others, however, take exception to this postmodern coup d'état, which is viewed as just as much a grasp for power as all the prior ones that postmodern literary critics abhor. Atheist philosopher William Irwin argues that it is *intertextuality* instead that should be "stricken from the lexicon of sincere and intelligent humanists," as it dubiously "implies that language and texts operate independently of human agency," a theory riddled with issues ("Against," 240). He continues, "The term *intertextuality* is at best a rhetorical flourish intended to impress, at worst it is the signifier of an illogical position" (240). He argues it should therefore be dropped as a term (and, more fundamentally, as a credible theory of how literature works). The scholarly debate about this will no doubt continue for some time to come.

Quotation

Quotation stands at the most explicit end of the continuum among the three literary modes of reference explored in this essay. A quotation is an author-oriented, intentional, and overt act. An unintentional quotation is an oxymoron. An author creates a quotation when he or she chooses a selection of text from a prior author and embeds it into his or her own in an explicit and direct attempt to have the reader recognize the embedded material and then interpret the selection *in its new context*. ("Text," "author," and "context" here are broadly conceived, since a "text" could be, e.g., a speech, while an "author" would then be a speaker, not a literal writer.) A quotation of a previous text is normally verbatim or near verbatim, and the words quoted follow one another in what is typically an uninterrupted sequential order. In a successful quotation, the author quotes enough of the prior text for the ideal reader to recognize that the author has embedded words of another text into their own. Often the author provides an explicit marker of some kind to signal to the reader that a quotation has been embedded in the immediate context (typically called a *quotation formula* or *introductory formula*). It must be emphasized with a quotation that the author *wants* the reader to recognize that he or she is quoting a previous source. This should not be understated and is fundamental to quotation. It is an intentional, authorial act of referring to a prior text.

The NT contains 355 quotations according to NA[28]. Other tallies vary depending on the scholar, the text used, the method employed, and how one counts combined quotations (on combined quotations, see Adams and Ehorn). The statistics that follow are based on NA[28]. We use NA[28] as a base in this essay because it is the standard critical edition most used by scholarship, and its editors' identification of quotations will encompass in most cases those references to OT Scripture that would most qualify as quotations due to volume and the presence of explicit markers. The NA[28] italicizes text wherever its editors believe the NT text is quoting text from the OT. Of these 355 quotations, 240 have some sort of quotation formula, and 115 have no quotation formula. Thus, approximately 67 percent of the quotations of the OT in the NT have a quotation formula. A *quotation formula* (or *introductory formula*) is a marker that the author provides to signal to the reader that what follows (or immediately precedes) is a quotation of a prior text.

Table 1. The Longest and Shortest OT Quotations in the NT

OT Text	Location in the NT	Quotation Formula?	Number of Words (in Greek)
Longest Quotations			
Jer. 38:31–34 LXX [31:31–34]	Heb. 8:8–12	yes	131
Joel 3:1–5 LXX [2:28–32]	Acts 2:17–21	yes	95
Ps. 94:7–11 LXX [95:7–11]	Heb. 3:7–11	yes	67
Shortest Quotations[1]			
Exod. 20:15 LXX [20:13] // Deut. 5:18 LXX [5:17]	Matt. 5:21	yes	2
Exod. 20:13 LXX [20:14] // Deut. 5:17 LXX [5:18]	Matt. 5:27	yes	2
Jer. 7:11	Mark 11:17[2] // Luke 19:46[2]	yes	2
Gen. 15:6	Rom. 4:23	yes	2
Exod. 20:17 // Deut. 5:21	Rom. 7:7	yes	2
Deut. 9:19	Heb. 12:21	yes	2
Exod. 20:13 LXX [20:14] // Deut. 5:17 LXX [5:18]	James 2:11a	yes	2
Exod. 20:15 LXX [20:13] // Deut. 5:18 LXX [5:17]	James 2:11b	yes	2

[1] Each of the two-word quotations listed under this header has a quotation formula, which confirms they are quotations and not allusions or echoes.

[2] This quotation is part of a larger, combined quotation.

The NT authors most frequently quote Psalms (over 85x), Isaiah (over 70x), Deuteronomy (at least 35x; more if references to the Decalogue are attributed to Deut. 5 and not Exod. 20), Exodus (over 35x if all quotations of the Decalogue are attributed to Exod. 20 and not Deut. 5), Genesis (at least 27x), Leviticus (14x), Jeremiah (13x), Hosea (10x), Daniel (8x), and Zechariah (8x). There are no quotations from Judges, Ruth, Ezra, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Obadiah, or Nahum. It is also worth noting that there are no quotations from the Apocrypha or deuterocanonical books. The most frequently quoted text is Lev. 19:18.

Table 2. The Most Frequently Quoted OT Texts in the NT according to NA^{28}

OT Text	Number	Wording and Location
Lev. 19:18	9x	"You shall love your neighbor as yourself." Matt. 5:43; 19:19; 22:39; Mark 12:31, 33; Luke 10:27; Rom. 13:9; Gal. 5:14; James 2:8
Ps. 110:1[1]	6x	"The Lord said to my Lord: 'Sit at my right hand . . .'" Matt. 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42; Acts 2:34; 1 Cor. 15:25; Heb. 1:13
Exod. 20:12 // Deut. 5:16	6x	"Honor your father and mother." Matt. 15:4; 19:19; Mark 7:10; 10:19; Luke 18:20; Eph. 6:2
Exod. 20:13 // Deut. 5:17	6x	"You shall not murder." Matt. 5:21; 19:18; Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20; Rom. 13:9; James 2:11
Exod. 20:14 // Deut. 5:18	6x	"You shall not commit adultery." Matt. 5:27; 19:18; Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20; Rom. 13:9; James 2:11

[1] If one includes allusions and echoes in the tally, Ps. 110:1 is by far the most frequently referenced text in the NT (Hays, 163–64).

The widespread use of quotation formulae in the NT shows that the phenomenon of quoting is not a modern invention. Ancient writers knew how to quote, and they did so in many ways that mirror our own ways of quoting and use of quotation formulas today. The hard data from the NT suggest that, in general, its authors employed a quotation formula when they wanted to ensure that the reader would recognize and understand that the text that followed (or immediately preceded) was a quotation of a prior text. As stated above, approximately sixty-seven percent of NT quotations have a quotation formula. That means thirty-three percent do not. Why do these latter quotations not have a quotation formula?

If a NT author can successfully quote a passage with or without a quotation formula and, as stated above, a quotation is an author's explicit attempt to have the reader recognize the embedded material in its new context, then one would be reasonably led to believe that a NT author would provide a quotation formula if his quotation was short and/or less explicit and thus in danger of not being detected by the reader. And at times this is true (see, e.g., the two-word quotations in table 2). But in fact, the evidence shows that the opposite is often the case. For every NT book with at least six OT quotations, the average word-count lengths of the quotations *with* a quotation formula are *longer* than the quotations *without* a quotation formula—at times much longer (see table 3).

Table 3. Average Word Counts of OT Quotations in the NT

NT Book	Total Quotations	With a Quotation Formula		Without a Quotation Formula	
		Number	Average Word Count	Number	Average Word Count
Matthew	59	40	14.25	19	7.84
Mark	30	17	13.05	13	8.53
Luke	29	20	12.70	9	6.88
John	17	13	8.15	4	6.25
Acts	32	27	25.37	5	12.80
Romans	51	43	12.95	8	11.12
1 Corinthians	19	13	8.61	6	6.50
2 Corinthians	12	8	9.12	4	6.25
Galatians	10	7	11.28	3	6.33
Ephesians	6	2	13.00	4	9.75
Philippians	0	0	-	0	-
Colossians	0	0	-	0	-
1 Thessalonians	0	0	-	0	-
2 Thessalonians	0	0	-	0	-
1 Timothy	3	2	n/a	1	n/a
2 Timothy	2	2	n/a	0	-
Titus	0	0	-	0	-
Philemon	0	0	-	0	-
Hebrews	43	35	16.09	8	11.00
James	7	5	5.60	2	4.00
1 Peter	18	2	10.50	16	9.60
2 Peter	1	0	-	1	n/a
1 John	0	0	-	0	-
2 John	0	0	-	0	-
3 John	0	0	-	0	-
Jude	1	1	n/a	0	-
Revelation	14	3	15.66	11	9.63

Note: Counts are of Greek words. The editors of the NA^{28} mark what they consider a quotation by setting text in italics. For the calculations in this table, based on the NA^{28}, words of continuously running italics constitute one quotation. If *kai* ("and") or another word in roman font intervenes and breaks a quotation, and what follows is a quotation from a different OT text, then the material is counted as two quotations. If they come from the same OT text, then they are counted as one. So then, e.g., the catena of OT texts in Rom. 3:10–18 is counted as one quotation even though it is made up of at least six OT texts because the sequence runs continuously in italics with no breaks. Every NT book with a total of at least six OT quotations was included in the calculations.

For example, in Matthew, the average word count for a quotation *with* a quotation formula is 14.25 words, while the average word count for a quotation *without* a quotation formula is 7.84. For Acts, it is 25.37 to 12.80. The evidence thus leads in a different direction. Quotation formulae are used, on average, with the longest and most overt quotations because the author *is in fact always quoting* in these instances. With the quotations without quotation formulae, with their lower average word counts and less explicit nature, a measure of doubt begins to creep in with some or even many of them about whether NA[28] has labeled them correctly as quotations. Many could and probably should be classified as allusions or echoes instead (on which, see below). There are, of course, exceptions. There *are* references to the OT in the NT with no quotation formula that are truly quotations, and the author means for them to be understood as such. But the bottom line is that we can know for certain that a quotation would have been understood as a quotation by an original audience only if the author provides a quotation formula of some sort to indicate this. All other NT references to OT Scripture will simply have to be studied on a case-by-case basis to determine their nature and thus what label might best be used to classify each one. This is important, since each literary mode of reference—quotation, allusion, and echo—is different, with different implications for what the author was attempting to do and thus communicate. It is therefore important to determine as precisely as possible the nature of each literary mode of reference since it impacts one's understanding of the author's intended meaning as that meaning is embedded and encoded in the written text.

The NT includes a few puzzling instances of quotation that scholars continue to discuss. Some NT authors quote material in a way that suggests they believe that what they are quoting is Scripture, but the quotation doesn't match any specific text of OT Scripture as we have them today. For example, the author of John's Gospel has Jesus stating that "whoever believes in me, as Scripture has said, rivers of living water will flow from within them" (7:38). The quotation formula "as Scripture has said" (*eipen hē graphē*) is clearly a reference to the OT, but no specific text of the OT states anywhere exactly that "rivers of living water will flow from within them." It is possible that a collage of OT texts may be in view. In 1 Cor. 9:10 the NA[28] italicizes words that are nowhere found in OT Scripture ("Whoever plows should plow in hope and whoever threshes should thresh in hope of a share in the crop" [NRSV]). Scholars debate whether it should be considered a quotation at all and, if it is a quotation, from where it might originate. Another instance is found in Eph. 5:14, where the author uses the same quotation formula (*dio legei*) he used in 4:8 to introduce a quotation from Ps. 68:18. Yet the text quoted at 5:14—"Wake up, sleeper, rise from the dead, and Christ will shine on you"—is nowhere found in OT Scripture. A final example is found in James 4:5, where the author writes, "Or do you suppose that it is for nothing that the scripture says [*hē graphē legei*; cf. Rom. 4:3], 'God yearns jealously for the spirit that he has made to dwell in us'?" (NRSV). Yet no text of OT Scripture reflects these words.

The NT authors occasionally quote other writings as well. First Timothy 5:18 appears to quote material embedded in Luke 10:7—a NT text. Elsewhere, NT authors appear to quote early Christian hymns, liturgies, poetry, and confessional material (e.g., Phil. 2:5–11; Col. 1:15–20; 1 Tim. 3:16; 2 Tim. 2:11–13; cf. John 1:1–18; Rev. 4–5). Some NT authors quote Greco-Roman writings (e.g., Aratus, *Phaen.* 5 in Acts 17:28; a Greco-Roman proverb in 1 Cor. 15:33, possibly from Menander's *Thais*; Epimenides, a Cretan poet, in Titus 1:12).

What is the purpose or goal of quotation? Today we often place quotation marks around words to ensure we appropriately highlight sources we have borrowed and to avoid accusations of plagiarism. The Greco-Roman world, "contrary to some modern misstatements," also had a concept of plagiarism (Silk). Yet both ancient and modern writers quote for more reasons than merely to credit their sources for information borrowed. Ruth Finnegan (259) writes, "Given its variegated manifestations . . . quoting can be put to multiple uses, deployed for just about any purpose under the sun." Authors of nearly all genres from almost all periods quote in order to "do" all sorts of things within their writings.

Yet the NT authors hold a certain view of the OT that shapes their quotations of that corpus. They understand the OT to be sacred writings, inspired by God himself, and thus to be authoritative and normative. Its epic story is the true story of the whole world, its writings are divine self-disclosure, and its laws are just and true and to be fully obeyed. It is therefore unsurprising that the NT authors often quote Scripture to appeal to divine authority in order to provide support for a point being made in the new context. Yet other purposes can doubtless be detected, and each OT quotation in the NT must be explored on a case-by-case basis to determine the author's purpose for the quotation in its immediate literary context.

We conclude this section on quotation by offering the following definition for this literary mode of reference.

> **Quotation:** A verbatim or near-verbatim selection of a prior text that an author intentionally embeds into their own text in an explicit and direct attempt to have the reader recognize the embedded material and interpret it in its new context. Authors often signal the presence of a quotation by providing a quotation formula or introductory marker.

Allusion

It is true that an allusion is a mode of reference that stands between echo and quotation on the literary continuum of explicitness. Yet it is a fatal literary error to think of allusion merely in terms of a rhetorical hierarchy of overtness. For allusion is in fact a specific and brilliant literary device that an author intentionally employs to evoke a prior text in a new context, and true allusions are infrequently used in the NT (cf. Irwin, "Aesthetics," 530). Many references to the OT in the NT that are classified as "allusions" by NT scholars are in fact often just indirect references or heightened echoes that don't truly allude at all (cf. Coombs, 480). Biblical scholars rightly explore these so-called allusions but have not always attended carefully to those outside their discipline whose field of expertise involves the reasoned study of all sorts of questions about the nature of literature and how it works, including allusion. It therefore seems advisable to explore what literary specialists have to say about allusion rather than using the terminology while missing something essential about how it works. What follows has literary allusions specifically in view, but of course "allusions can and do occur outside of literature" (Irwin, "What," 294). Four elements are essential to the nature of allusion (what follows develops Beetham, 18–20).

Intentionality. An allusion is an author's intentional attempt to point a reader back to a prior text. John Hollander (64) writes that "intention to allude recognizably is essential to the concept" and that "one cannot allude unintentionally—an inadvertent allusion is a kind of solecism." Carmela Perri states that "the author *intends* that the allusion-marker's echo will identify the source text for the audience" (300, emphasis added). Irwin writes that "authorial intention is a necessary condition for allusion" and "an author must intend this indirect reference" ("What," 291, 293). Robert Alter asserts that "allusion implies a writer's active, purposeful use of antecedent texts" (112). Göran Hermerén argues that in allusion "the artist *intended* to make beholders think of the earlier work" (211; italics added). Stephanie Ross (63–64), discussing allusion in art, argues that intent is fundamental to allusion. Ziva Ben-Porat's entire essay on the nature of allusion presupposes that allusion is an intentional, conscious activity. For example, she writes that an allusion marker is "*for* the activation of independent elements from the evoked text" and that this activation of an allusion is "*for* the formation of intertextual patterns" (108–9; italics added).

Single identifiable source. Also fundamental to allusion is that it has "in each instance, a single identifiable source" (Miner, 39). In allusion the author attempts to point the reader to one specific predecessor. This precursor need not be a specific line of prior text; it could be a person, event, tradition, or thing—whether concrete or abstract—outside of any given literary text (cf. Miner, 38–40). In theory the allusion is "identifiable" since the nature of an allusion is such that its wording derives from a prior text or entity that the author has read or knows about and anticipates that his ideal audience will also know. Ben-Porat writes regarding allusion in literature that "allusion is a device for the simultaneous activation of [only] two texts," the alluding and the alluded (107). Yet although each such allusion alludes to one and only one prior text, an author can allude to several texts together in a tight cluster. Each of these would constitute a separate allusion, and each would need to be explored in terms of its essential interpretive links and meaning effects created in the new context (on which, see below).

Sufficient explicitness. While allusion itself is considered an indirect mode of reference, the marker embedded in the alluding text must be sufficiently explicit to be recognized by the ideal reader. Perri (290) writes that it is "generally assumed that allusion-markers are possible to recognize, an assumption which entails that [it] be sufficiently overt to be understood." This further presupposes that author and audience share a "high degree of cultural literacy" that includes "fixed literary canons and a high capacity for verbatim retention of texts" (Alter, 119). A "portable library" must be "shared by the author and his ideal audience" (Hollander, 64). Without this shared library, the audience will almost certainly fail to successfully interpret an allusion made within the assumed cultural-historical-canonical matrix. When this happens, the reader grasps only the surface-level meaning or the "un-allusive" sense of the text (Perri, 295). Yet, depending on the allusion, the reader may still be able to piece together a partial understanding of the author's overall meaning when this occurs. The amount of meaning lost will depend largely on the helps present in the immediate context. Yet an allusion can also miscarry because the author fails to provide a sufficiently explicit marker. An obscure marker renders the audience less likely to recognize the allusion and thus unable to fully grasp the author's meaning.

Essential interpretive link. This is the fundamental feature of allusion that uniquely distinguishes it from quotation and echo and gives it its brilliance and playful, artistic genius. In allusion, the author embeds a marker pointing to another, prior text, inviting the audience to recognize the marker, remember the other text's original context, and link "the appropriate components that the new context requires to be fully understood" (Beetham, 19). Perri (301) writes, "Recognizing, remembering, realizing, connecting: these are the effects of a successfully performed allusion for its audience" (cf. Ben-Porat, 109–11). Michael Thompson develops Perri's thought: "In order for the allusion to be successful, the audience must *recognize* the sign, *realize* that [it] is deliberate, *remember* aspects of the original text to which the author is alluding, and *connect* one or more of these aspects with the alluding text in order to get the author's point" (29). John Campbell (19) adds, "Allusions invite us to select from our mental library, knowledge which is not in the text itself and without which the writer's intention will not be fully communicated." Irwin agrees:

"For an allusion to be successful, in the sense of being understood, the reader must call to mind something not explicitly in the text" ("What," 293).

Yet further it must be emphasized that in allusion the author *intends the audience to connect very specific elements* from the source text to the new context. Irwin writes, "In a successful allusion an author manages to get the audience to fill the gap in just the way he or she intended" ("What," 293). The allusion marker "tacitly specif[ies] the property(ies) belonging to the source text's connotation relevant to the allusion's meaning" (Perri, 291). Michael Leddy (112) writes that allusion "invokes one or more associations of appropriate cultural material and brings them to bear upon a present context," and Irwin asserts that it is these very associations that are absolutely "necessary for correct and completed understanding" ("What," 288). Irwin states that a reader cannot just "call to mind anything at all in his or her 'library of knowledge' to complete the allusion" but must rather "call to mind what the author intended for him or her to call to mind" (293). Any other connections made between the source text and the new text apart from the author's intention we can call "accidental associations," but these are not part of the allusion itself because the author did not intend to create those associations (294).

OT example: Isa. 11:1 and the stump of "Jesse." A couple examples will demonstrate that allusion as outlined above is not a modern literary innovation anachronistically foisted on ancient biblical texts but is itself an ancient literary mode of reference. Our first example comes from Isa. 11:1, where a new oracle is introduced. It reads:

> A shoot shall come out from the stump of
> Jesse,
> and a branch shall grow out of his roots.
> (NRSV)

The allusion marker in this case is "Jesse." Jesse is obviously an individual's name and thus a reference to a person, but the verse itself provides no help contextually about who Jesse may be. The word "Jesse" occurs only once more in Isaiah, several verses later in v. 10, but it also provides no further help as to the identification of Jesse. We do get some help in the verses immediately after v. 1, however, as the imagery of "shoot"/"branch" is unpacked and refers to a powerful ruler full of God's Spirit who executes justice on the earth (vv. 2–5). Nevertheless, without knowing to whom the allusion marker "Jesse" refers, we are left with an allusion whose riddle remains unsolved. We need to know the prior "text" that holds the key to unlocking the meaning of Isa. 11:1. Even though we've pieced together a partial understanding of the passage (recall Perri's "un-allusive" sense above), the author's *intended* meaning is not fully understood. Someone unfamiliar with the historical-canonical matrix of the early stages of monarchy in Israel will not be equipped to unlock the allusion.

Yet for those who know 1 Sam. 16 and/or the tradition that it reflects (cf. Ruth 4:17–22), the allusion to Jesse evokes an entire theme of massive significance for OT theology and, indeed, for all Christian Scripture. In 1 Sam. 16 we read that Jesse is the father of David, who eventually becomes king of Israel and with whom God makes an everlasting covenant, promising that David's descendants will rule over Israel forever (2 Sam. 7:12–16). Over time this theme developed (see Beetham, 102–8, for texts), and what was implicit in seed form grew into a towering tree: this lineage of royal Davidic sons would someday culminate in an ultimate king who would rule the entire world forever. Isaiah 11 taps into and contributes midstream to the development of this theme, adding that all creation will be transformed and renewed at the arrival of this ultimate son of Jesse, this second David (Isa. 11:6–9). These are Isaiah's *intended* associations that he invites his audience to remember and connect to the new context of Isa. 11:1. Isaiah's audience must *recognize* the sign of "Jesse," *realize* that it is deliberate, *remember* aspects of the original text to which the author is alluding (i.e., 1 Sam. 16 and/or the tradition it reflects), and *connect* one or more of these aspects with the alluding text in order to grasp the author's point. Though in Isaiah's oracle the tree of Jesse has been violently cut down (it is, after all, "the *stump* of Jesse"; cf. 10:33–34), God will faithfully fulfill his promise to David, and a scion will grow out of the wreckage to rule the nations, execute justice, and transform creation. By his rule the earth "will be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" (11:9).

NT example: 1 Pet. 5:13 and "Babylon." Our second example comes from the NT at 1 Pet. 5:13. The text reads:

> She who is in Babylon, chosen together with you, sends you her greetings.

Most Petrine specialists agree that, on the surface level, "Babylon" is a reference to the capital city of the powerful Neo-Babylonian Empire that stretched across Mesopotamia along the Euphrates River and that existed for about a century from ca. 626 to 539 BC (at which time the Persian king Cyrus conquered Babylon and brought its empire to an end). Yet in the immediate context of 1 Peter, a reference to the ancient (and all but extinct) capital city of Babylon makes little to no sense, and the author provides no other help in the immediate context as to what he means by this reference.

To make things more complex, most Petrine scholars also agree that "Babylon" is symbolic or figurative language for the city of Rome, the capital of the Roman Empire, in power at the time of writing and the likely place of the composition of the letter (Elliott, 131–32). This interpretation is probably on target and is helpful, but it still does not explain why the author chose the word “Babylon” for Rome. Why not “Nineveh” or “Athens” or “Jerusalem” or “Alexandria”? Why “Babylon”? Without knowing why Babylon was selected, we are left with not just figurative language but an allusion whose riddle remains unsolved. We need to know the prior “text” that holds the key to unlocking the meaning of 1 Pet. 5:13. Even though we have pieced together a partial understanding of the passage (recall Perri’s “un-allusive” sense above), the author’s fully intended meaning remains inaccessible.

The outsider unfamiliar with the historical-canonical matrix of the Babylonian Empire’s subjugation of Judah, their destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, and their forced exile of its people to Babylonia in 587 BC will be unable to unlock the allusion. Yet Second Temple Jews knew this information all too well, as a significant portion of their Hebrew Bible records and is decisively shaped by these momentous historical events and was read regularly in their synagogues. (The historical event of this devastation was second in significance only to the exodus itself in terms of historical impact and memory.) Early gentile Christianity arose from such Jewish synagogues (see Acts) and therefore would likely have had at least some in its scattered communities who would have had rudimentary knowledge of Babylon’s decisive role in shaping Israel’s sacred history as recorded in the OT. The audience must *recognize* “Babylon” as an allusion marker, *realize* that it is deliberate, *remember* aspects of the original “text” to which the author is alluding (in this case, the “text” is a large thematic swath of OT material, where no one text is likely in view), and *connect* one or more of these aspects with the alluding text in order to grasp fully the author’s meaning.

For those who do know this tradition, the allusion to “Babylon” in 1 Pet. 5:13 evokes this whole historical-canonical web of imperial oppression and subjugation, destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and life in exile as God’s chosen people in a harsh, foreign, idolatrous land. This lattermost association is likely the most obvious essential interpretive link that the reader is to remember and connect. Earlier in the letter, the author had written in his epistolary prescript that he was writing to “God’s elect, *exiles* scattered throughout the provinces of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia” (1:1), and a bit later he urged them “as foreigners and *exiles*, to abstain from sinful desires, which wage war against your soul” (2:11). The author understands his gentile audience to be God’s chosen people in Christ who are living in exile, scattered across the Roman Empire and living amid an uncertain and potentially oppressive period of pagan imperial rule. Life for the Israelite exiles under Babylonian rule provides an analogy (or, perhaps more accurately, a pattern or type) to help Peter’s largely gentile audience grasp their own theological situation as Jesus-followers, as the new-covenant people of God.

Why allude? Yet why allude in the first place? Why not just communicate in a more direct mode of communication? Why risk an audience not recognizing an allusion or misconstruing its meaning? Irwin writes, “Allusions can be employed for several different purposes, including to instruct an audience, to generate an aesthetic experience in an audience, and to link or connect the author with a tradition by activating themes, motifs, and symbols” (“Aesthetics,” 521). Yet further he writes that sometimes an author can purposely shape an allusion so that the historical-canonical matrix necessary to grasp it is not readily available to every reader of the text. “Allusions can reveal and conceal selectively depending on the audience in a way that straightforward statements ordinarily cannot” (523). Allusions can be crafted to include certain ideal readers who should know the prior “text,” rendering them insiders when they successfully connect the essential interpretive link and unlock the allusion. But authors can also craft an allusion in such a way as to exclude certain readers, rendering them unknowing, alienated outsiders because they *don’t* know the prior text. When an audience does successfully unlock the allusion, meaning is obviously conveyed, but it also “strengthens the connection between the author and the audience, cultivating intimacy and forging a sense of community. . . . The author and the audience become, in effect, members of a club who know the secret handshake” (523).

Recall the example of “Babylon” in 1 Pet. 5:13 above. Both Jewish and gentile house churches reading 1 Peter would likely have someone in their group who would know the historical-canonical significance of a reference to Babylon because of how those events so decisively shaped the story of OT Scripture. But unknowing, unbelieving Roman imperial governors, magistrates, centurions, and citizens would be much less likely to know OT Scripture and thus be more likely to brush past or misconstrue the allusion marker. The allusion conveys something theologically profound to the insider but conceals its meaning from the outsider, who, in this case, may also be a potential persecutor of the fledgling Christian communities who make up the intended audience.

We conclude this section on allusion by offering the following definition for this literary mode of reference.

> **Allusion:** A literary device that an author intentionally employs to point a reader back to a single identifiable source, of which one or more components must be remembered and brought forward into the new context in order for the alluding text to be fully understood (Beetham, 20).

Echo

An echo is the least explicit mode of reference in the “rhetorical hierarchy” of quotation, allusion, and echo (Hollander, 44). What follows has literary echoes specifically in view. Like allusion, four essential items must be understood in order to grasp the nature of echo (what follows develops Beetham, 20–24).

Indeterminate intentionality. Unlike allusion, an echo may be an intentional or unintentional act. Intention implies a conscious activity, and echo can be but is not always or even often a considered choice. Echo is by nature a subtle reference, and it is difficult if not impossible to discern whether any given instance was intentionally generated. Hollander (64) writes that "in contrast with literary allusion, echo . . . does not depend on conscious intention. The referential nature of poetic echo, as of dreaming . . . may be unconscious or inadvertent."

Single identifiable source. Like allusion, echo has in each instance a single identifiable source (Hollander, 48). When the reference is a literary echo, the wording originates from a specific text that the author has read in the past. In theory the echo is "identifiable" since the nature of an echo is such that its wording derives from a prior text that the author has read or knows. (See further the corresponding discussion under "Allusion.")

Subtle nature. Unlike allusions, echoes are by nature faint and subtle. An author must render an allusion sufficiently explicit for the audience to recognize the allusion, but echoes are more like whispers, understated and elusive. Carlos Baker (8) quips that an echo is a "flash in the brainpan." Perri (304) writes concerning echo that "such subtle incorporations of markers may appear to be for the poet himself, something we 'overhear,' thereby contributing to a quality of lyrical privacy." Yet a reader deeply familiar with the literary canon prized by the author may overhear the author's otherwise private whispers and "flashes in the brainpan" with his or her well-attuned ear. An author typically generates echoes in a text because his or her mind is saturated with the source text(s). For the NT authors, the Scriptures of Israel, the OT, constituted such a sacred, prized canon.

No essential interpretive link. Unlike allusion, an echo can be understood independently of the original meaning of the echoed text. A reader can overlook the presence of an echo but still grasp the author's meaning. This is simply not true for allusion, where a reader must "recognize, remember, realize," and then "connect" the appropriate elements of the alluded text to the alluding text. Hollander (64) writes that "a pointing to, or figuration of, a text recognized by the audience is not the point" of echo. Unlike allusion, echo is a linking of texts without intention to highlight that another, prior text is in play.

Moreover, with echo, the original context may or may not have been taken into consideration. Baker (8) writes that echoes occur "with or without their original contexts" in mind. Therefore, again, a reader may miss an echo yet still grasp the author's meaning in the echoing text. "We cannot speak of a loss of intended-for-the-*public* authorial meaning" when a reader misses an echo. "The component intended as public communication is adequately conveyed apart from recognition of the echo" (Beetham, 22).

Despite this fact, significant reasons exist for why readers will want to explore the original context of an echoed text. Among the most important is that discovery of an echo can unveil a vast textual and symbolic world lying behind and suffusing the new context of the echoing text. Hollander shows repeatedly in *The Figure of Echo* how exploration of the original context of the echoed text uncovers unexpressed links of otherwise unnoticed insight that enhance and deepen a reader's understanding of the echoing text. Richard Hays (20), who builds on Hollander's work, writes that echo often "places the reader within a field of whispered or unstated correspondences." These evoked resonances are discovered only when the echoed and the echoing texts are compared and the original context of the echoed text explored. (For examples of echoes with discussion, see the works of Hollander, Hays, and Beetham in the bibliography.)

We conclude this section on echo by offering the following definition for this literary mode of reference.

> **Echo:** A subtle literary mode of reference that is not intended for public recognition yet derives from a single identifiable source and that an author generates either consciously or unconsciously and contextually or noncontextually (Beetham, 24).

Quotation, Allusion, Echo, and Biblical Theology

Quotations, allusions, and echoes of the OT in the NT play an essential role in constructing a canonical biblical theology of Christian Scripture because they provide the fundamental pillars on which a whole-Bible biblical theology can be built. They are explicit connections between the two Testaments and thus function as bridges that span and link them together. Apostolic interpretation of the OT is central to grasping how the NT relates to the OT. The NT authors' quotations, allusions, and echoes show how they interpreted hundreds of OT texts and thus how they understood those texts in light of the dawning of the new age in Christ. Those same references also often reveal both important unspoken *hermeneutical presuppositions* of the NT author concerning the OT text as well as clues as to how the NT author understood *the original OT context* of the referenced text (see Beetham, 23–24). For example, exploring all the OT quotations, allusions, and echoes in Rom. 9–11 reveals much about how the apostle Paul understood the OT realities of Israel, election, and the remnant in light of the arrival of Messiah Jesus. In my own work in *Echoes* I have tried to show how the theme of new creation quietly suffuses Colossians by virtue of its allusions to and echoes of Gen. 1, Isa. 11, and Prov. 8 (Beetham, passim; see table on 267).

Conclusion

This article has explored the three literary modes of reference known as quotation, allusion, and echo. Their nature has been discussed, some examples have been presented—especially for allusion, the most misunderstood of the three—and definitions have been provided. The article also briefly touched on these modes of reference and their significance for biblical theology. Before beginning our discussion of quotation, allusion, and echo, we first situated them within the broader literary concept known as *intertextuality*. (For an introduction to the study of Scripture's use of prior Scripture that is often called *inner-biblical interpretation* or *inner-biblical exegesis*, see Lester.)

See also Method

Bibliography. Adams, S. A., and S. M. Ehorn, eds., *Composite Citations in Antiquity*, 2 vols., LNTS 525, 593 (T&T Clark, 2016, 2018); Allen, G., *Intertextuality*, 2nd ed. (Routledge, 2011); Alter, R., "Allusion," in *The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age* (Norton, 1996), 111–40; Baker, C., *The Echoing Green* (Princeton University Press, 1984); Barthes, R., "The Death of the Author," in *Image-Text-Music*, trans. S. Heath (1967; repr., Hill & Wang, 1977), 42–48; Beetham, C. A., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, BIS 96 (Brill, 2009); Ben-Porat, Z., "The Poetics of Literary Allusion," *Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976): 105–28; Campbell, J., "Allusions and Illusions," *French Studies Bulletin* 15, no. 53 (1994): 18–20; Chandler, J. K., "Romantic Allusiveness," *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 3 (1982): 461–87; Coombs, J., "Allusion Defined and Explained," *Poetics* 13 (1984): 475–88; Elliott, J., *1 Peter*, AB (Doubleday, 2000); Finnegan, R., *Why Do We Quote?* (Open Book, 2011); Hay, D., *Glory at the Right Hand*, SBLMS 18 (Abingdon, 1973); Hays, R., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (Yale University Press, 1989); Hermerén, G., "Allusions and Intentions," in *Intention and Interpretation*, ed. G. Iseminger (Temple University Press, 1992), 203–20; Hollander, J., *The Figure of Echo* (University of California Press, 1981); Irwin, W., "The Aesthetics of Allusion," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, no. 4 (2002): 521–32; Irwin, "Against Intertextuality," *Philosophy and Literature* 28, no. 2 (2004): 227–42; Irwin, "What Is an Allusion?," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59, no. 3 (2001): 287–97; Kilbride, L., "Byatt: Intertextuality," Cambridge Authors, accessed May 20, 2022, www.english.cam.ac.uk/cambridgeauthors/byatt-intertextuality; Kristeva, J., *Desire in Language* (Columbia University Press, 1980); Kristeva, *Sēmeiōtikē* (Editions du Seuil, 1969); Leddy, M., "The Limits of Allusion," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 32, no. 2 (1992): 110–22; Lester, G. B., "Inner-biblical Interpretation," in *Oxford Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Stephen L. McKenzie, 2 vols. (Oxford University Press, 2013), 1:444–53; Miner, E., "Allusion," in *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, ed. A. Preminger and T. Brogan (Princeton University Press, 1993), 38–40; Orr, M., *Intertextuality* (Polity, 2003); Perri, C., "On Alluding," *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289–307; Ross, S., "Art and Allusion," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 40, no. 1 (1981): 59–70; Silk, M. S., "Plagiarism," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed., ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (Oxford University Press, 1996), 1188; Thompson, M., *Clothed with Christ*, JSNTSup 59 (JSOT Press, 1991).

Christopher A. Beetham