BROWN JUDAIC STUDIES

The Peri Pascha Attributed to Melito of Sardis

Setting, Purpose, Sources

LYNN H. COHICK

THE *PERI PASCHA* ATTRIBUTED TO MELITO OF SARDIS

Program in Judaic Studies
Brown University
Box 1826
Providence, RI 02912

BROWN JUDAIC STUDIES

Edited by
Shaye J. D. Cohen

Number 327

THE *PERI PASCHA* ATTRIBUTED TO MELITO OF SARDIS

Setting, Purpose, and Sources

by
Lynn H. Cohick

THE *PERI PASCHA* ATTRIBUTED TO MELITO OF SARDIS

Setting, Purpose, and Sources

by
Lynn H. Cohick

Brown Judaic Studies
Providence

THE PERI PASCHA ATTRIBUTED TO MELITO OF SARDIS

Setting, Purpose, and Sources

By
Lynn H. Cohick

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019953519

Open access edition funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities/Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Humanities Open Book Program.

Table of Contents

Publishers' Preface

Brown Judaic Studies has been publishing scholarly books in all areas of Judaic studies for forty years. Our books, many of which contain groundbreaking scholarship, were typically printed in small runs and are not easily accessible outside of major research libraries. We are delighted that with the support of a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities/Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Humanities Open Book Program, we are now able to make available, in digital, open-access, format, fifty titles from our backlist.

Lynne H. Cohick's, *The* Peri Pascha *Attributed to Melito of Sardis: Setting, Purpose, and Sources* (2000) remains one of the only major studies of this important text. The *Peri Pascha* was authored by Melito, the Christian bishop of Sardis in the second century CE, as a homily. It is notable for its early, extensive, and sharply anti-Judaic typological analysis of the paschal lamb described in Exodus 12. Cohick's study explores the purpose, sources, and especially the anti-Judaic elements of this homily. Since Cohick's study, a new translation of the homily, with other fragments and commentary, has been produced by Alistair C. Stewart, *On Pascha: With the Fragments of Melito and Other Material Related to the Quartodecimans* (2nd edition; New York: St. Vladimirs Press, 2016).

This edition incorporates typographical corrections of the original text. The abbreviations used in the footnotes can be found in *The SBL Handbook of Style*.

Michael L. Satlow
Managing Editor
October, 2019

Preface

The *Peri Pascha* (*PP*), attributed to Melito, late second century bishop of Sardis, has become an important catalyst in recent studies of Jewish Christian relations. But I was initially attracted to the homily by its few quotations from the Hebrew Bible and the possible patterns of quotations it might share with contemporary Christian works. As I explored the homily from that angle I became more frustrated with the general analyses on its background and usefulness in explaining Jewish Christian relations in the second century. Thus what started as a narrow focus on only one aspect of the homily grew quickly into a more comprehensive study of the text as a whole. In reflecting on the homily's argument, especially as it was supported by Jewish Scripture quotations, I was persuaded that this homily reveals less about Jewish Christian relations, and more about *Christian* Christian relations. That is, I became convinced that the homilist's rhetoric was focused on an intra-Christian debate centered on the person of Jesus. The following book is an attempt to explain and substantiate my ideas on the *Peri Pascha.* Unfortunately, a detailed analysis of the text by Alistair Stewart Sykes, *The Lamb's High Feast, Vigiliae Christianae,* Supp. 42, (Leiden: Brill, 1999), was unavailable to me at the time this manuscript went into production.

I am indebted to many people who, by contributing their support and knowledge, helped me complete this book. I would like to thank especially Ross S. Kraemer, whose insightful comments were most constructive. I also wish to thank Robert A. Kraft, my dissertation supervisor, for both his patience and his stimulating questions which clarified my arguments. My appreciation extends to my editor, Shaye Cohen, for his careful evaluation and encouragement.

In the middle of the project we moved to Kenya; I would like to thank Paul Njoroge and Benjamin Gachehu who helped our family settle and kept our house in order. I am grateful to my colleagues at Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology in Nairobi, Kenya, for their friendship and interest in my work.

This book would not have been possible without the support of my family. I owe so much to my husband, Jim, whose patience in handling computer problems and indexing kept me sane. I am grateful to my brother, Christopher Harrison, and his wife, Carla, who offered moral support as well as xeroxed material and then mailed it to me. Many thanks to my parents, Scott and Sally Harrison, for their unwavering belief in me. I am grateful to my children, Charles James and Sarah Bloom Cohick, who cheered me on, and so it is to them that this book is dedicated.

Introduction

Identifying the Issues

Stories

The streets were crowded with women busy shopping for their family's dinner, children playing in the dust, and men talking earnestly in small groups. Melito saw none of this as he made his way with single minded purpose to a pleasant home just off the busy commercial street. He called a short greeting at the doorway, then entered. The group was expecting him, and were waiting, though he was not late. He washed his dusty hands in the small bowl of water provided, and accepted the hot drink offered. The liquid felt good on his dry throat, but after just a few swallows, he faced his audience, and began to teach them earnestly. Within a few minutes, his passion grew and his voice rose. Gesturing with his arms, pacing up and down the room, he spoke of the terrible things that would happen to Jews across the Empire now that God had rejected them in favor of Christians. The group nodded in agreement, sometimes calling out an "Amen." After about one hour, Melito stopped preaching and sank into a pillow provided, exhausted. The group, however, was energized, and left the house with a new sense of purpose and calling—and a renewed hatred for their Jewish neighbors.

Meanwhile, across town, another Melito walked slowly and with some ambivalence down a small side street. Coming to the house he was looking for, he walked hesitatingly up to the door and after a pause, knocked. Within a minute, it was opened by one of the town's rabbis, who stood back to let Melito enter. But Melito shook his head, then said in a low voice, "I will need no more lessons, rabbi. I will do my own studying now. The festivals, the rituals, the scriptures, are better understood through Christian eyes, and as a Christian, I will best explain them." With that, he turned and walked down the street. Never again would he talk with the rabbi, nor watch the celebrations and services at the synagogue. He felt confident that he understood, perhaps better than

many of the local Jews, just what their festivals and scriptures meant, and he would teach Christians in the town how to understand Christian teachings fully.

The two reconstructions above are a brief attempt to highlight the very different pictures scholars have painted of Melito, bishop of Sardis. In the first story, we see a man violently opposed to Judaism, who incites his congregation against local Jews. In the second story, we see a scholar who learned about Judaism and his own Christianity by interpreting rabbinic tradition. Of course, those stories are my own distillation of various scholars' descriptions of the enigma called Melito, but it seems important to put "flesh" on these theories.

As I proceed to evaluate the various positions on our homily, its author and provenance, I will be drawing upon other second and third century writings and authors as they impact or illuminate our homily's context. A few of these ancient writings reveal contact between real Christians and Jews (see Chrysostom), while others are patently devised as inflammatory rhetoric against a caricature of the other. Most fall somewhere in the middle, and scholars debate where on the continuum each should be placed.

My purpose is to determine from an inductive look at the homily itself the likelihood that it reveals or even hints at actual encounters between contemporary Christians and Jews. In what follows, I will explain why I am persuaded that our homily reflects, not a historical struggle between some Christians against Jews, but rather a struggle within its own Christian community to define itself. I chose to tip my hand early to the reader so as to eliminate at the outset any possible misunderstandings of my motives or agenda. I am not trying to suggest that our homilist is somehow less guilty of offense against Jews when I say that the homily reflects an intra-Christian debate. I am not arguing that our author is somehow relieved of any charges of anti-Jewish sentiment when speaking of Jews symbolically. Though I do not believe that our text will answer whether its author (or any other member of this Christian community) acted viciously toward Jews, I would not excuse any such behavior if it happened. I am not hinting that the violent words composed by our homilist are more acceptable than physical harm or property damage. Simply put, in pursuing the evidence of the homily, I have concluded that it offers no firm information upon which to build a theory on contemporary Jewish Christian relations.

Brief Summary of the Homily

The homily's 105 passages (803 lines) speak of model and fulfillment, of the old order and the new way, of "Israel" (author's own term) and

the "church." The homily begins with a careful explanation of the "old," the Passover account in Ex. 12. Emphasizing both the slaughter of the lamb and the death of the first born, the author concludes that this biblical story foreshadows the Passion. Before explaining its significance, however, the author argues not only that humanity is utterly sinful (alluding to Gen. 2-3), but also that Jesus can take humanity to the "heights of heaven." Launching into a lengthy demonstration on how Jesus fulfills the prophets' promises, Jesus' salvific qualities are underscored, often in direct opposition to Israel's alleged responsibility for the Passion. God is said to have meted out Israel's punishment and with a final exultant description of Jesus, the author closes the homily.

Unless one endeavors to understand the author's view of Jesus, attempts at interpreting the homily will fall short.[1] Throughout the homily, our author communicates what is the "new," "immortal" "grace" of "Christ." This emphasis begins and ends the homily. It helps explain the author's antagonism against "Israel," as well as the apparent drive to define the "true" Christian faith.[2] It controls the choice and usage of scriptural material, as for example in *PP* 67-68, where our homilist uses lamb/sheep imagery to characterize Jesus, who exemplifies the true significance of the Passover.

In the middle of the homily (*PP* 56-72), the author maintains that humanity has sinned greatly, so as to deface the "Father's image" (BCG has *tou patros* [ΠΡΣ] *eikōn*, A has "the Spirit's [ΠΝΣ] image" *PP* 56). The mystery of the Pascha is the remedy for this human predicament. The author expounds on how the "mystery" was in one sense no "mystery" at all—it is foretold by the Law.

The homily addresses the reader's senses by offering a list of "the prophets" who allow the reader to *see* the mystery foretold in their example. One is to "look at Abel who is similarly murdered, at Isaac who

---

[1]Our author uses the name Jesus in two of his doxologies, in *PP* 10 and 45. In both places, Jesus is identified as the Christ. In *PP* 6, A reads "*Ch]n In*," (i.e. *Christon Iēsoun* abbreviated) and B reads, "*Chn*" overlined.

[2]Many scholars assume our author's orthodoxy, which leads to assumptions about the author's goals and enemies. While the term "orthodoxy" is anachronistic, the homily itself does exhibit similarities with other writers usually grouped in the emerging "orthodox" camp. Moreover, there seem to be significant differences between the homily's ideas and those of Marcion or of the gnostic groups. The homily does not seem to share with Jewish Christianity the latter's interest in the Law (circumcision and Sabbath observance) or the apostles Peter and/or James, nor is our homily particularly anti-Paul, as is the Ps. Clementine *Recognitions*, for example.

is similarly bound" (*PP* 59)[3] and so on[4] (this list is repeated with significant variations in *PP* 69). Next the reader is urged to *hear* the mystery proclaimed by "the prophets," as the author cites the catena of verses where Moses, David, Jeremiah, and Isaiah's voices are heard (*PP* 61-64). One could infer that the reader's sense of touch is targeted next, when the author claims that Jesus is *clothed* with the suffering one. The "Christ" was able to kill "death, the killer of men" (*PP* 66) through the body and its suffering.

History of the Text

Campbell Bonner identified the Greek text in 1940,[5] and equated its author with the Melito, bishop of Sardis, mentioned by Eusebius. After the 1962 discovery of a large, seemingly wealthy synagogue during the Sardis excavations,[6] theories were formulated to interpret the homily in the context of an apparently influential and extensive Jewish community.

The homily has played a determinant role in understanding social relationships among Jews and Christians in second century Asia Minor. It is to Eusebius that most scholars turn in formulating the background, authorship and provenance of our homily.[7] Based on his description, our homily's author is identified as Melito, second century CE bishop of Sardis, representing the Quartodeciman perspective. Enticed by this, some scholars have postulated a rather close tie with rabbinic Judaism.[8] Others posit that our author was Jewish, and thus the alleged "Jewishness" of the homily is accounted for "naturally."[9] A variation on

---

[3]In *PP* 59, the verb is *sumpodizomenon*, in *PP* 69, the verb is *detheis*. The possible ramifications of this difference are examined in Part One.

[4]After *PP* 59 is the phrase, "Look also at the sheep which is slain in the land of Egypt, which struck Egypt and saved Israel by its blood." It is interesting that here the sheep is the agent of destruction, a task elsewhere reserved for God (*PP* 14) or his angel (*PP* 15).

[5]Campbell Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis and some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel* (Phila.: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1940). Michel Testuz published a Greek text of the homily from the Bodmer collection. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII Meliton de Sardes Homilie sur la Paque* (Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1960). The English text for the homily used throughout this work unless otherwise stated is S. G. Hall, *Melito of Sardis on Pascha and Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

[6]George M. A. Hanfmann, *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983).

[7]Mention of Melito of Sardis is found in Eus. *EH* 4.26.3-11, 13-14; 5.24.2-6.

[8]Ingeborg Angerstorfer, "Melito und das Judentum," (Ph.D. diss., Universität Regensburg, Germany, 1985); Stuart G. Hall, "Melito in Light of the Passover Haggadah," *JTS* 22 (1971):29-46.

[9]Alistair Stewart-Sykes, "Melito's Anti-Judaism," *J. Early Christian St.* 5:2 (1977):271-283. I regret that his work, *The Lamb's High Feast*, was unavailable to

this theory put forth by a few suggests that Quartodecimans, the homilist included, drew indirectly from Jewish practices without necessarily acknowledging their debt. These scholars promote that our author used a Passover Haggadah model (perhaps unselfconsciously) in composing the homily.[10] Some scholars connect the Quartodeciman label with the homily's virulent anti-Judaism, explaining that the author wished to distance their brand of Christianity from Judaism, especially as their Christianity shared many similar practices and festival dates with Judaism.

The homily's provenance is likewise secured from Eusebius, as in almost every case, scholars have accepted a second century Sardis milieu and used it to explain the author's anti-Jewish rhetoric. The fact that the synagogue remains were initially dated to the time of Melito made a Sardis provenance attractive. This seemingly powerful Jewish community evidenced by the extravagant synagogue is contrasted with the vindictive accusations hurled by Melito. Some scholars emphasize the religious battle,[11] while others explain the conflict as stemming from social or political conflict between the "haves" (Jews) and the "have-nots" (Christians).[12]

Recently, some scholars have questioned whether the excavated building functioned as a synagogue in the late second century, thus raising reservations as to whether the Jewish community in Melito's time should be equated with the group who met in the excavated synagogue. Even when subscribing to a later dating of the synagogue, however, most scholars still consider a Sardis origin for the homily.

The various reconstructions of the homily's historical context, however, suffer from the debilitating flaw of equating our homilist with Eusebuis' Melito of Sardis. It is my purpose in this monograph to allow the Peri Pascha itself to judge Eusebius' material. Such an inductive approach reveals the fragility upon which most of the arguments concerning our homily are built.

---

me at the time of this writing. Sykes, *The Lamb's High Feast, Vigiliae Christianae,* Supp. 42 (Leiden, Brill: 1999).

[10]Stuart Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah."

[11]Miriam S. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity* (Leiden: Brill, 1995); D. F. Winslow, "The Polemical Christology of Melito of Sardis," *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982):765-776.

[12]A. T. Kraabel, "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis, Text and Context," *PP* 77-85 in *Studies Presented to George M. A. Hanfmann,* ed. D. G. Mitten (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971); Robert S. MacLennan, *Early Christian Texts on Jews and Judaism* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990); Stephen Wilson, *Related Strangers, Christians and Jews 70-170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).

Date of the Homily

The date of the homily can be best secured, not from Eusebius' information, but from an examination of the manuscript evidence. The homily in Greek was unknown until 1940, when Campbell Bonner identified it in the Chester Beatty/Univ. of Michigan papyrus codex [A], dated to the fourth century C.E.[13] Prior to this, fragments of the text were known only in the Coptic P. Oxy. 1600 and two Syriac versions, one attributed to Alexander of Alexandria.[14] In 1960, Michel Testuz edited the Bodmer papyrus codex [B], dated to the third or early fourth century C.E.[15] Recently, James E. Goehring published the Coptic (Sahidic) Crosby-Schoyen codex MS 193 [C-S], which is also part of the Bodmer collection, dated to the third or early fourth century C.E.[16] There are several other Coptic fragments[17] which are essentially similar to the C-S. The homily survives in a Georgian version and in a Latin epitome.[18]

The manuscript evidence allows that the homily could have been written in the late second century, during the time of Eusebius' Melito, bishop of Sardis. Suggestive of a mid to late second century date is the homily's rhetorical style, characteristic of the Second Sophistic movement. The absence of any direct citations from the New Testament (one does find several allusions to incidents also found in the NT) also indicates a second century date. The latest possible date for the homily is

---

[13]Campbell Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion.* Eric Turner agrees with the dating in *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Phila.: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1977):132.

[14]Henry Chadwick, "A Latin Epitome of Melito's Homily on the Pascha," *JTS* 11 (1960):76.

[15]M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII.* Turner tentatively dates the Bodmer Codex XIII to the fourth century. He has a brief discussion of the Bodmer composite codex in his *The Typology of the Early Codex,* pp. 79-80, 133.

[16]James E. Goehring, "Melito of Sardis on the Passover," in *The Crosby-Schoyen codex MS 193,* Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 521, ed. J. E. Goehring (Louvain: E. Peeters, 1990). According to Goehring, the Bodmer collection was probably from a Pachmonian monastery which was monophysite until Justinian changed it by force into a Chalcedonian monastery. Turner offers a third to fourth century CE dating, *The Typology of the Early Codex,* p. 137.

[17]The significant differences between the Coptic texts and the preserved Greek texts deserve special mention here. Goehring notes that, in general, the Coptic tends to harmonize the biblical phraseology to the OG. He concludes that C-S is based on a Greek *Vorlage* different from either of the preserved Greek texts, though he suggests that C-S is closer to A. Goehring goes on that behind the Greek used for the Coptic versions as well as behind the two Greek MS is a single Greek *Vorlage.* See pp. 5-7.

[18]Bonner's text is missing the last several lines (*PP* 104-105, lines 788-801), while the Bodmer Codex does not preserve the first six passages. The C-S is damaged until *PP* 49. The Latin epitome, not surprisingly shorter, shares some textual similarities with the Georgian against the preserved Greek.

sometime in the third century, perhaps early enough in that century to allow for three possible Greek recensions and a Coptic translation. Thus, we should consider our homily to be a second or early third century C.E. work.

Anti-Jewish Rhetoric in the Homily

A significant problem in understanding our homily remains, namely the author's anti-Jewish rhetoric. With the provenance of the homily questioned as the pertinence of Eusebius' information for our homily is challenged, we cannot make more than general assumptions about the author's contemporary Jewish neighbors. Moreover, scholars are increasingly aware that anti-Jewish sentiment in early Christian writings might be merely a foil for intra-Christian squabbles or attempts at self-definition. If such is the case, then any effort to recreate the homily's "Jews" might simply add another fictitious layer onto the homily's already a-historical presentation. Further complicating matters, the anti-Jewish rhetoric does not permeate the homily but appears primarily in the later sections, indicating perhaps that the author's anti-Jewish sentiments, while important to current questions about early Christianity, may not reveal a pervasive social situation of hostility by Christians against Jews.

Scriptural Quotations

We are left with the text itself, but within the text there may be ways to assess inductively both the homily's purpose as well as its social setting. One potentially valuable datum is the Jewish scriptural quotations and allusions. An analysis of these quotations and allusions may help clarify the homily's arguments, in part because these quotations seem to inform the homily's reasoning. Specifically, the homily seems to take its organization from the Passover account from Ex. 12 quoted in *PP* 12-14, and develops its Christology from a series of quotations in *PP* 61-64. Far from giving the impression of a last minute addition, the quotations are integral to the author's polemic, propelling its movement along specific lines.

Not only do the quotations and allusions seem to further define and establish the author's purpose, but a careful reading of the small group of explicit quotations reveals some intriguing textual similarities with quotations from other early writings. Moreover, they often feature variant readings from the preserved OG texts.

Method and Organization of this Study

The explicit quotations provide one avenue of exploration into the homily, as well as into early Christian thought and dialogue. In investigating the territory of scriptural quotations in early Christian writers and our homilist, scholars have suggested several maps: (1) the homilist was fluent in the scriptures, (2) biblical texts were at hand, (3) derivative-biblical materials were within reach or in memory.[19] It will be the task in the second half of this monograph to examine the various theories explaining the place of these quotations in the homily itself and in the life of the early church.

Before taking a close look at the scriptural quotations, however, an effort will be made toward greater understanding of the homily's setting and its purpose as it reveals something of Jewish Christian relations in the early centuries. Because Eusebius' evidence is enigmatic and problematic, a prudent place to begin the analysis of the homily itself is with his evidence. Thus I will tackle the complex problems surrounding Eusebius' evidence in Part One, including the label Quartodeciman and the Sardis provenance, to determine how helpful his material is in assessing the authorship and setting of our homily. Also useful in this pursuit, the Fragments attributed to Melito of Sardis will be examined to better establish the authorship question. Finally, this section will appraise the anti-Jewish section of the homily, assessing modern scholars' approaches to interpreting our author's vindictive language. The purpose behind our author's diatribe against "Israel" will be defined within the context of the author's overall argument illuminating the "real" (i.e. christological) meaning of the Passover.

Part Two, with its focus on the author's sources, begins with the use of the Passover account in Ex. 12 as decoded by our homilist. The homily will be compared with roughly contemporary writings in an effort to appreciate the homilist's intentions, as well as to highlight any similarities with other editions of the Passover story. Next a careful examination of the several quotations impacting the homily's Christology will be compared with similar quotations and their contexts found in early Jewish writings and Christian writings of the first three centuries CE. The homily's message encoded in these quotations will be

[19]I will use the qualifiers "biblical" and "derivative-biblical" to be more precise about the proposed sources. By "biblical" I suggest a complete biblical book (Job or Judges, for example) as one would find in the earliest preserved Bibles or Targums; "derivative-biblical" refers to those biblical texts in contexts outside their biblical book, found in school traditions, liturgies, commentaries, testimony books, anthologies or any other writing which might include parts of a biblical book outside of its setting in its particular biblical book. These works could also be described as "secondary-biblical."

analyzed for textual variants which may (or may not) find parallels in other contemporary sources.

The Conclusion consolidates information concerning our homilist's sources and suggests new approaches to the study of the Peri Pascha.

I struggled with how to present my research and ideas, fearing that I might place the cart before the horse in the reader's mind. In the initial stages of investigation, the quotations' textual variants as well as their place in the argument of the homily consumed me. As I reflected on other scholars' commentary, however, I noticed they were at variance with my own. Behind this difference lay Eusebius' evidence used to explain the homily. Thus to interact with the contemporary debate surrounding the homily, I left the inductive study for a critical analysis of Eusebius. I realized that my findings from the homily did not match Eusebius' description. This monograph developed in a pursuit to resolve or explain the incongruities. I have traced for the reader my exploration into Eusebuis' evidence. It is my hope that the interplay between my inductive study of the homily prior to coming to Eusebuis, who then forces me back into the text, will be helpful.

Part One

Setting and Purpose of the Peri Pascha

Eusebius' information

Eusebius' information has been accepted with little reservation by most scholars. The consensus is that the author of our homily is Eusebius' Melito, bishop of Sardis, a Quartodeciman[1] who worked extensively with Jewish scriptural texts.

Eusebius preserves a letter allegedly written ca. 200 CE by Polycrates who identifies a Quartodeciman eunuch, Melito, waiting to rise from the dead in Sardis. Eusebius makes several claims about this late second century bishop of Sardis, including that he wrote an apology to Emperor Marcus Aurelius (161-180 CE) and traveled to Palestine to establish the definitive listing of "Old Testament" books. He is also said to have compiled six books of excerpts or quotations from scriptures. Among the books written by Melito are two paschal homilies (*ta peri tou pascha duo*).[2]

At the start, it must be stated that both A (Chester Beatty papyrus codex) and B (Bodmer papyrus codex XIII) as well as C-S (Crosby-Schoyen codex) ascribe the text to "Melito," while B and C-S add the title, "Peri Pascha." One finds three other "Melitos" in the canon lists on the TLG (*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*), Melito the tragedian, Melito the Historian and Melito the Medical author, all from the first or second century CE. This shows that the name "Melito" itself was not extremely rare.

[1]A Quartodeciman is one who celebrated Jesus' Passion on 14 Nisan.
[2]See Eusebius, *EH* 4.26.3-11, 13-14; 5.24,2-6.

Reliability of Eusebius' Information

One need not spend a great deal of time demonstrating that information in the *EH* can be historically questionable.[3] Often Eusebius uses secondary sources and fails to reference them. In commenting about the listing of the bishop of Sardis' books, Bauer rightly points out that it has every appearance of being pre-packaged, for the Apology does not begin the list but rather ends it, and the Extracts, which Eusebius appears to know directly, are not even on his list. Bauer claims that Eusebius "received the catalogue from tradition and it served the purpose of supplementing his own knowledge."[4] He concludes that though Eusebius often makes great claims about the vast literature preserved from second century authors and read extensively in his day, those claims are but empty boasts.

When looking at Eusebius, *EH* 4.26.5-11, where he cites the bishop Melito's Apology to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, written between 170-177, there are no similarities, textual or otherwise, between this work and the *PP*. The lack of any resemblances is often explained as understandable because of the differing genres.[5] But one might expect at least a sprinkling of similar terms or concepts, as the homily itself is a "defense" of the author's Christianity against alternative views of Jesus.

Authorship Question

Did the famous second century CE bishop of Sardis author the *PP*? Or were there at least two Melitos (one a bishop of Sardis) who lived and wrote in the second or third century CE? It is entirely possible that Eusebius' claim about Melito, bishop of Sardis, led to an identification of the homily's Melito with the bishop of Sardis in later writings. It is also possible that copyists of the homily attached the name "Melito" under the assumption that the homily must have been written by the bishop of Sardis who was "known" to have written such literature (though they

---

[3]See R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1980); Richard C. White, "Melito of Sardis—An Ancient Worthy Reappears," *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 2 (1979):10, n. 3, preserves a claim from Maximus to the effect that there were various works which had escaped Eusebius' notice. See also B. Gustafsson, "Eusebius' Principles in Handling his Sources, as found in his *Church History*, Books I-VII," *Studia Patristica* 4 (1961):429-441.

[4]Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (Tubingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1934; English trans. and ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel, Phila: Fortress Press, 1971):154.

[5]Hall writes, "The style [of the Apology] is more classical and formal than that of *PP*, but the differences are sufficiently accounted for by the difference between a written apologetic argument and a liturgical homily intended to be declaimed or even intoned." Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. xxix.

may have referred to another Melito who has not survived in our extant history). One could postulate that an author named Melito, but not the one identified by Eusebius, wrote a paschal homily, and Eusebius wrongly attributed it to Melito, bishop of Sardis. It is possible that an anonymous author wrote our homily, which was later attributed to Melito.

Several questions deserve attention: (1) did Eusebius know *any* homilies by a Melito? (2) did he know of two homilies? (3) did Eusebius have in front of him an actual copy of the *PP?* (4) did he receive second or third hand information about Melito and homilies allegedly written by him? (5) did he have a paschal homily written by Melito, bishop of Sardis, *that was different from* the *PP*?[6] A careful study of the various pieces of data will help answer these questions.

Polycrates' Evidence in Eusebius

As noted above, Eusebius preserves a letter by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, to Victor, bishop of Rome (189-199 CE) about Quartodeciman Christians. Polycrates mentions several "luminaries" including Melito, "the eunuch whose whole career was in the Holy Spirit, who lies at Sardis awaiting the visitation from heaven when he shall rise from the dead" (*EH* 5.24.2-6). The importance of Polycrates' identification of Melito as a Quartodeciman cannot be over-emphasized. It is from this and Eusebius' expansion of this designation that our homily (which is equated with the homily about which Eusebius speaks) has been labeled Quartodeciman by scholars. Though this classification of our homily is challenged below, I will anticipate my conclusions here by saying that nothing in our homily points unambiguously to a Quartodeciman position, given the limited evidence we have about the characteristics of Quartodeciman thought.

Interestingly, Polycrates does not make Melito equal to himself in office, but rather calls him a eunuch, most likely indicating Melito was

---

[6]W. Huber, *Passa und Ostern* (*BZNW* 35), Berlin: A. Topelmann, (1969):31-45. He claims that the work from which Eusebius quoted is not the same as the homily. Nautin, "L'homélie de 'Méliton' sur la passion," *RHE* 44 (1949):429- 38, maintains that our homily is not written by the Melito of Sardis about whom Eusebius writes. Hall suggests that Eusebius had access to our homily, and that it was written by Melito, bishop of Sardis, but that Eusebius was quoting from an introduction which was later dropped by copyists. Hall, *Melito of Sardis,* p. xx. Bonner gave to the untitled homily in the Chester Beatty MS the title "On the Passion," based on an apparent quotation of the work preserved by Anastasius Sinaiticus (frag. 7). Bonner claims that Eusebius does not mention the homily in the list of works by Melito of Sardis. Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion,* p. 4.

celibate.[7] Polycrates refers to others in the list by the title "bishop," indicating he was not reluctant to mention the office. Eusebius connects Polycrates' information with his own details about the bishop, Melito, but one cannot be certain that Polycrates' "Melito" is the same person that Eusebius described, though it is clear that Eusebius believed that he and Polycrates were speaking about the same person.

Alistair Stewart Sykes has proposed that Polycrates chose Melito and six other bishops (though Polycrates himself never identifies Melito as a bishop) to highlight the Quartodeciman position because they share with Polycrates a Jewish heritage; they were all Jews by birth.[8] He argues that the term used by Polycrates to describe the bishops (*sungeneis*) reflects extended familial or national connections. He claims that Paul uses the term in the same way in Rom. 9.3, when he refers to his Jewish roots, *sungeneia...kata sarka.*

Sykes' theory, however, is unconvincing, not because it is impossible, but because it lacks solid, persuasive evidence. First, it is entirely possible that Polycrates meant something other than Jewish heritage when using the term *sungeneis*. Paul qualifies the term for his readers, so it seems that the term itself does not need to imply extended familial relationships. In searching for a reason behind the use of that term, Sykes implies that the seven "luminaries" share with Polycrates something that no other bishop in Asia shares, but it may simply be that Polycrates chose these people because he knew them better or the recipient of the letter (bishop Victor) knew the people. In other words, Polycrates might not have implied with that term that *only* seven "luminaries" in Asia were related to him. Sykes assumes the list is very exclusive and defining, but that may not be the case at all.

Sykes further claims that Polycrates reveals his Jewishness by using exact terms for the Jewish Passover, by using the term *ho laos* (the people) for Jews,[9] and by noting that John wore the *petalon*. But what does "exact terms" about Judaism and Passover mean? Sykes does not expound. Additionally, the term *ho laos* in our homily does not indicate Jews only, but is a term used of Egyptians and Jews, anyone who is a type of something to come.[10] Thus precedence has been set for using that phrase without implying Jewish self-definition. In short, simply knowing about Judaism, even knowing some rituals and terms very well, does not necessarily mean that one is Jewish.

---

[7]Hall suggests that "eunuch" might refer to celibacy only here, based on Matt. 19.11-12, rather than imply a physical procedure. Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. xi.
[8]Sykes, "Melito's Anti-Judaism," pp. 276-79.
[9]See below, p. 54, for a detailed discussion on "the people."
[10]See below, p. 56.

It seems that a primary reason Sykes is drawn to this theory is his desire to connect Christian Paschal practices with Jewish Passover practices, and thus develop a hypothetical Quartodeciman liturgy.[11] A troubling ramification of his theory is that one can then evaluate our homilist's perspective as representing merely a family feud, thus minimizing the impact of the homily's rhetoric on contemporary Christianity. Sykes says as much, "The vituperation displayed is that of a family argument."[12] In essence, Sykes' explanation removes the long term threat of our author's anti-Judaism. But such an attractive solution to our author's anti-Judaism is achieved at the expense of careful consideration of the implications of our author's theology, and its possible normative or characteristic evaluation of Judaism.[13]

Also troubling is his assumption that a "convert" from Judaism to Christianity would necessarily be hostile to his/her former religion. One has only to think of the many Jewish Christians who lived in the second and third centuries, as well as the fascination many gentiles appeared to have towards aspects of Judaism, to recognize the weakness of that assumption. The Ps. Clementine literature is a case in point, as well as Chrysostom's congregation which apparently was attracted to the synagogue.

Sykes suggests that it was Melito's "Jewish instinct"[14] which led him to Palestine to research the "Old Testament." Aside from the baffling phrase "Jewish instinct," it is entirely possible that Melito (likely not our author) went to Palestine because Christianity, not Judaism, esteemed Jerusalem and the surrounding countryside as the birthplace of Jesus. A Christian did not need a "Jewish" reason to visit Jerusalem, any more than they needed a "Jewish" reason to write about the *Akedah* or the Passover, as Sykes suggests.[15] The argument remains unconvincing that the author of our homily (who I propose is not Eusebius' Melito) was a Jewish "convert;" in fact, little evidence exists within the homily itself to suggest an answer to that question.

---

[11]See his dissertation, Alistair Stewart Sykes, "The Quartodeciman Paschal Liturgy," Ph.D. Dissertation, Univ. of Birmingham, 1992.
[12]Sykes, "Melito's Anti-Judaism," p. 279.
[13]Wilson, *Related Strangers*, p. 299, says as much when he argues that the "[*intra/extra muros*] distinction...may not have meant much, if anything, to those engaged on the ground level in the first and second centuries." He points out that such a "distinction is overused, often with the curious implication that intramural abuse is more excusable and less damaging than that which comes from outside."
[14]Ibid., 278.
[15]Ibid., 278.

Eusebius' Preface to the Homily

In the letter quoted by Eusebius from Polycrates to Victor, Polycrates mentions that a bishop of Laodicea, Sagaris, was martyred. Polycrates points out that this bishop was a Quartodeciman, to stress the validity of this position against those who opposed it in Rome. It is possible that the name "Sagaris" is a link between Polycrates and Eusebius' "quotation" from the bishop of Sardis' work on the Pascha:

> In his work *Peri tou pascha,* he indicates as he begins the time at which he composed it as follows: 'In the time of Servillius (Rufinus reads Sergius) Paulus the proconsul of Asia, at the time when Sagaris bore witness, there was much dispute at Laodicea about the Pascha, which had coincided according to season (*kata kairon*) in those days, and these things were written.

Eusebius continues, "Clement of Alexandria mentions this work in his own work *On the Pascha,* which he says he composed because of (*ōs ex aitias*) Melito's writing." This introduction refers to a great dispute in Laodicea about the Pascha, giving the impression that the work addressed Quartodeciman concerns. At least Eusebius understands the preface to indicate as much. He suggests that the author of the homily composed this introduction.

Yet this quotation given by Eusebius allegedly from Melito's paschal homily is not found in the existing *PP.* Hall proposes that the alleged quotation is a "chronological note added to the MS by an early scribe, or even by the author himself."[16] Others have echoed independently Hall's claim with some modification, suggesting that Eusebius was quoting from an introduction or chronological header added by a copyist,[17] which is simply no longer attached to the text.[18] Walter Bauer agrees that the alleged introduction could not have come from the author's pen, for the situation imagined there is so "artificial."[19] He adds that Eusebius was using secondary material when speaking about the homily.

Whether or not one sees as important the fact that Eusebius' introduction is not found in any extant manuscripts of *PP* depends a great deal on what kinds of information one believes were preserved. If it

---

[16]Ibid., p. xx. Hall writes elsewhere, "If this really was the opening of Melito's work, it could not have been the *Peri Pascha* of the papyri. But it could have been a chronological note by the author or an editor." Hall, "The Origins of Easter," *Studia Patristic* 15 [*TU* 128] (1984): 560.

[17]A. Hansen, "The *Sitz im Leben* of the Paschal Homily of Melito of Sardis with special reference to the Paschal Festival in Early Christianity," (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1968), 174.

[18]O. Perler, *Méliton de Sardes, Sur la Pâque et Fragments, SC* 123 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966):19-20.

[19]Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity,* p. 153.

seems that such an introduction would hardly be relevant to those of, say, the fourth century CE, then its omission by a copyist in the Chester Beatty/University of Michigan manuscript would not suggest any discrepancy between Eusebius' information and the extant text. The Bodmer papyrus, however, is as early as the third century CE, and therefore is much closer to the Paschal controversy. As such, one would surmise that the introduction could hold great interest. Indeed, this seems to be Eusebius' intent as he connects the controversy to Clement's response to Melito's work (*EH* 4.26.3-4). It seems that at least to some Christians, Eusebius' introduction is just the kind of information which was carefully copied in third century manuscripts; its absence from the Bodmer papyrus is significant.

If the first possibility, that Eusebius cites a lost introduction of our *PP*, is dubious, perhaps further exploration of Hall's suggestion that Eusebius used a secondary source for his information on the homily will shed light on the problem. As noted above, it would not be out of character for Eusebius to use secondary evidence. But in order for this idea to be persuasive, one must decide *a priori* that the bishop of Sardis wrote the *PP*. Then, about all this option can tell us is that Eusebius may not have originated the connection between Melito, bishop of Sardis, and a work on the pascha, but rather used a source with the name "Melito bishop of Sardis" attached. The point to be driven home is that there is no citation of our *PP* in his work and thus no direct evidence that Eusebius knew of our homily.

It is not until the seventh or eighth century CE that a specific passage of our homily is cited in secondary literature as coming from Melito, bishop of Sardis, but even here, there are problems. An apparent "quotation" of *PP* 96, attributed to Melito the bishop of Sardis (frag. 7), is found in Anastasius Sinaiticus' *The Guide.* Fragment 7 reads, "Melito, bishop of Sardis, from his work *On the passion:* "God has suffered by an Israelite right hand." In *PP* 96, line 716, one reads, "the King of Israel has been put to death by an Israelite right hand." The term "suffering" in frag. 7 stands in the place of the term "death" in the *PP*. The phrase "King of Israel" in the *PP* is replaced by the term "God" in frag. 7, and if the copyist of the fragment had our homily available, it may be that the copyist moved the term "God" in the *PP's* previous line (line 715) down into the next line. Thus while the general flavor of the two sentences is similar, the wording is sufficiently different, cautioning against the conclusion that frag. 7 preserves a sentence from our homily. Moreover, the title *"eis to pathos"* (On the passion) is not found in B and C-S, which preserve the title *"peri pascha"* (C-S has the title in Greek). Robert Wilken

considers frag. 7 preserved by Anastasuis Sinaiticus to refer to a work different from our homily.[20]

If it is doubtful that Eusebius preserved an introduction written either by the author or a copyist, it may be that Eusebius got his information from Clement of Alexandria. Eusebius quotes Clement concerning the bishop's homily, "Clement of Alexandria mentions this work in his own work *On the Pascha,* which he says he composed because of Melito's writing."[21] This sentence has often been understood to indicate that Clement wrote a polemical piece in response to Melito's Quartodeciman stance. That may have been Eusebius' interpretation of the comment, though the statement itself from Clement as it stands in Eusebius is quite ambiguous. Several possible explanations suggest themselves. It could be that Clement had in hand a text by Melito, bishop of Sardis, different from our *PP,* which did deal with the Quartodeciman practices as we know them. Another possibility may be, however, that Eusebius misunderstood Clement's point entirely, that in fact Clement did not engage Melito on the Quartodeciman issue. Hall encourages caution when examining Clement's apparent reaction to the bishop's work, claiming that it has been misunderstood. The phrase "because of" (*ex aitias*) does not necessarily indicate disagreement. Even if it does, the quarrel may be liturgical, not exegetical.[22] It is only the context in Eusebius which creates the impression that Quartodeciman concerns were at the heart of the disagreement.

In evaluating this alleged introduction to a work on the Pascha, it seems that much depends not only on how one reconstructs Quartodeciman beliefs and practices but also whether one believes the homily discussed by Clement and Eusebius is the same as the *PP.* If one assumes that Eusebius is quoting from the *PP,* with Hall, Angerstorfer, Bonner, and most other scholars (Nautin questions the identification[23]), then it becomes very important to show that the *PP* is a Quartodeciman text, or that (Polycrates and) Eusebius misunderstood it to be such.

From another angle, it may be that Eusebius correctly understood Clement's references and correctly identified the work as our *PP,* which can then be said to represent Quartodeciman practices heretofore unknown and remarkably similar to "orthodox" practices. Yet another possibility is that Eusebius had a text by Melito, bishop of Sardis, which was very much a defense of Quartodeciman practices, and to which

---

[20]Wilken, "Melito, The Jewish Community at Sardis, and the Sacrifice of Issac," *TS* 37 (1976):57.

[21]Hall, *Melito of Sardis,* p. 69, n. 22. He notes that Clement may be the source for all of Eusebius' information.

[22]Ibid., pp. xx-xxi.

[23]P. Nautin, "L'homélie de `Méliton' sur la passion."

Clement responded, but which modern scholars have errantly identified with our *PP*. Unfortunately, we are left only to speculate on what might have been behind Clement's and Eusebius' statements.

Two Paschal Homilies

Eusebius claims that Melito wrote *two* paschal homilies. Hall suggests that, although at first reading this statement by Eusebius apparently refers to two distinct writings,[24] it may be that a single work by the same author circulated in two parts, *PP* 1-45 and *PP* 46-105. Hall is interested in connecting Jewish Passover Haggadah traditions with the *PP*, and postulates that the second half of the homily reflects the Passover Haggadah structure.[25] He points to the Georgian material as perhaps preserving the original, two-part structure (though in the Georgian, the first half of the homily is ascribed to Meletius the bishop,[26] while the latter half is preserved under the name John Chrysostom[27]).

Formidable manuscript evidence exists, however, that challenges this position—the two codices of *PP* from the third century CE and the one from the fourth century CE (Greek and Coptic) preserve the text as one unit. The Georgian of *PP* 1-45 is an inconsistent translation; at times it seems the translator struggles with the project. Birdsall remarks that in these difficult places, it is "almost impossible to decide what aspects of his aberrant wording derive from a variant Greek text, and what from his literary powers of composition."[28] Birdsall suggests that the problems in translation might be explained in part by dating the original translation early (fifth century CE), before a tradition of exact translation was established in Georgia. Yet he is careful to note that his intuition cannot

---

[24]Judith Lieu, *Image and Reality* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996):212, uses the terms "first book" and "second book" in speaking about the first half of the text (up to *PP* 45), and the second part (beginning at *PP* 46). She does not postulate that they initially circulated separately or were created initially as two, nor does she explain why Eusebius would see *PP* 45 and 46 as a dividing point between two books. She does note specifically that Eusebius likely did not read the homily or know of it first hand (p. 208). Thus her repeated use of the terms "first book" and "second book" are not especially helpful.

[25]Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah."

[26]J. N. Birdsall, "Melito of Sardis, Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα in a Georgian version," *Le Muséon* 80 (1967):121-138. The manuscript is part of the collection of Georgian texts at the Iveron monastery on Mount Athos; Ms. 11, folios 98-100, in Robert P. Blake's catalogue, 10th century. A second witness to this version is Ms. 1246 of the S collection at Tbilisi in the Kekelidze Institute of Mss, of the Georgian Academy, dated to the 17th century.

[27]M. Van Esbroeck, "Le traite sur la pâque de Méliton de Sardes en georgien," *Le Muséon* 84 (1971):373-94.

[28]Birdsall, p. 122.

be established from the evidence in the text, as even the scriptural references have almost no archaic idioms which might support an early translation date. In explaining why the translator stopped at *PP* 45, Birdsall remarks that, "labouring under these evident difficulties, he hailed the first doxology as a haven in the storm, and having made landfall, was content to rest his venture there for good."[29]

The Georgian of *PP* 46-105 several times follows the Armenian version over against the Greek, which suggests that the Georgian was at least in part dependent upon the Armenian version, which preserves the homily as a unit. Also, the placement of *PP* 46-105 in a liturgical homiliary could indicate that the editors had specific, limited interests in only part of the homily. It is possible that the homily was split into two parts for theological or sectarian reasons, or because the editor was interested in only one part of the *PP's* argument, or even because a manuscript tore in two.

Hall's analysis that the homily was written in two parts, while theoretically possible, does unnecessary damage to the full message of the text. The homily's arguments surrounding the Passover and the Passion are built one upon the other; both halves are seriously weakened when separated, both are that much stronger when read together. For example, "Israel's" behavior and reactions at the Passion are prefigured in unfaithful Egypt at the Passover. Miriam Taylor remarks that "Melito's argument is logical and consistent throughout."[30] She points to the supersessionary argument permeating the homily as evidence for its unity. T. Halton proposes an overarching organizational scheme of immolation and salvation, and notes how the details of Egypt's first-born slaughter are echoed in the next section of the homily dealing with humanity's sin. His suggestions help account for the generally negative assessment of humankind as well as the discussion of humanity's sin in the middle of the homily.[31] J. Smit Sibinga, in a rather unique approach to the homily, examines its number of syllables to determine the best textual emendations and reconstructions. Based on his research, he contends that the homily is a unit, with the middle section's concern for the condition of humanity central to the homily, framed by a discussion of typology on each end.[32]

---

[29]Ibid., p. 122.
[30]M. Taylor, p. 72.
[31]T. Halton, "The Death of Death in Melito, *Peri Pascha*," (*Irish Theological Quarterly* 36 (1969):169-173. See also Lieu, p. 237, n. 47.
[32]J. Smit Sibinga, "Melito of Sardis, the Artist and His Text," *VigChr* 24 (1970):99. Interestingly, Hall notes his work but states that his "analysis in terms of syllable count...would also confirm the importance of [*PP*] 46 as the middle point in the

Though Eusebius mentions *two* paschal texts and there is only *one* extant ascribed to a Melito, this could very well be an accident of history. After all, none of the other 16-18 titles Eusebius lists for Melito of Sardis has survived intact (*EH* 4.26.2).[33] But then, Eusebius himself seems to go from claiming there are two paschal homilies to speaking as if there is only one (compare *EH* 4.26.2 with 4.26.3-4). At a fundamental level, the discussion is moot, for I do not think the homily about which Eusebuis talks is our homily. But even granting that position for the moment, it would do great injustice to our homily to assume that it was composed in two parts and later joined.

Anonymous Work

How common was it in the ancient world to attribute to a famous churchman either anonymous works or those signed by a relatively unknown or local figure? P. Nautin gives several examples of assigning authors to anonymous works, noting that early in the fourth century, some Christians began to publish new homilies with names of ancient authors attached.[34] This observation helps interpret the information about the bishop of Sardis and the *PP*. The tendency of the fourth century CE authors toward "elevating" an anonymous work or one done by a relatively unknown person may be the first step down the road to concluding that the *PP* was authored by the bishop of Sardis.

The reasons for this practice might be similar to those behind pseudepigraphic works—to encourage the reading of the work.[35] If some "important" person wrote it, surely more people will look into it. A copyist might do so to identify useful material, to pay homage to an author's memory, or to make connections with known lists and references, an enterprise in which Eusebius was engaged.

Six Books of Extracts

In analyzing the quotations in the homily, some scholars refer to Eusebius' story about Melito editing six books of Extracts (*EH* 4.26.12-14) to explain the author's use of scriptural material. For example, Angerstorfer suggests that our author drew from memory of the LXX Ex. 12 passage (from a biblical manuscript) to quote as accurately as possible

---

structure of *PP*," allegedly supporting his claim that the homily falls into two parts. Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah," p. 36.

[33]See Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, pp. xiii-xvi, for a list of those titles.

[34]P. Nautin, "L'homelie de 'Méliton' sur la Passion," pp. 437-438.

[35]B. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," *JBL* 91 (1972):3-24.

the Ex. 12 story.[36] She claims her position is strengthened because the exact form of the homily's text is not found in any other ancient work. She concludes that as this bishop had written six books of biblical Extracts, this suggests that he was quite familiar with the biblical texts. Even if Angerstorfer's identification of the author is correct (I argue that it is not), that still does not explain the relationship between our homily and the biblical Extracts. Angerstorfer seems to assume that the Extracts were written before the homily, and then used when composing the homily. While it is historically possible for a late second century figure to create groupings of scriptural texts, our homily's relatively few explicit quotations, in contrast to the *Ep. of Barnabas* or Justin's *Dial.*, for example, mitigates against assuming that the author of our homily had already composed several books of Extracts.

Quartodeciman Position of the Homily

Left to be analyzed is the claim by Eusebius, accepted by most scholars, that our homily is Quartodeciman. The label "Quartodeciman" is attached especially to those second century CE Christians who celebrated a "Christian" Passover on the 14th of Nisan, as determined by the Jewish calendar, rather than on a set Sunday, as became Christian practice. Eusebius offers most of the meager evidence which has survived concerning this practice (*EH* 5.23, 24; *Vita Const.* 3.18), including the apparent preface to Melito of Sardis' *Peri Pascha* (*EH* 4.26.3-4) discussed above. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 70, PG 42.339-72) and Chrysostom (*Disc.* 3, PG 49.861- 72) also mention the Quartodeciman controversy. Issues which appear to be raised in these works include the length of the fast, the specific time the fast should end, the Sunday celebration of Jesus' resurrection, and the uniform practice of all Christians everywhere. The defining characteristic seems to be the dating of the Passover/Easter celebration in (Ps.) Hippolytus' *Peri Pascha* and the *Didascalia* (200-250 CE). The Council of Nicaea has been understood to argue against Quartodeciman practices. Hall notes with approval, however, Huber's and Cantalamessa's agreement that the council was not ruling against Quartodeciman practices, but was "chiefly concerned [over] a dispute on how one fixed Easter Sunday."[37]

---

[36]Angerstorfer, pp. 101-103, 114. She bases her argument in part on an unproven (and perhaps unprovable) assumption that the homilist read Jewish Scriptures often and thoroughly, a practice she claims was taken from rabbinic Judaism.

[37]Hall, "The Origins of Easter," p. 554. See also W. Huber, *Passa und Ostern (BZNW* 35), Berlin: A. Topelmann, 1969:61-84; R. Cantalamessa, *La pasqua della nostra salvezza, le tradizioni pasquali della bibbia e della primitiva chiesa* (Milan: Marietti, 1971):132-37.

Hall maintains that much of second century Christianity was Quartodeciman, and that within this large group were varying practices of fasting. He cites Eusebius' material allegedly from Irenaeus (*EH* 5.24.12-13) and concludes that Irenaeus wrote concerning conflict about the differing fasting habits of the Roman Christians and those visiting Rome from Asia. Hall argues, "Rome and Asia agreed on the date of the end of the paschal fast in the period before Soter [bishop of Rome, ca. 200 CE], though there were differences about the pattern of fasting....This must entail that Rome was at that period Quartodeciman."[38] Hall's conclusion, suggesting that the Quartodeciman position was much more widespread than previously thought, allows for Rome to have practiced some sort of Pascha remembrance prior to Bishop Soter. Yet as Hall himself admits, the material allegedly from Irenaeus in Eusebius is sketchy and ambiguous. Irenaeus' preserved letter does not explicitly define the controversy, nor does Irenaeus' solution, that "eucharist was sent to those who did observe," clarify the situation.

Often the assumption is made that because the Quartodecimans used the Jewish calendar date of 14th Nisan to determine Easter,[39] they followed the Johannine chronology wherein Jesus is crucified as the Passover lambs are sacrificed. For example, the presumed Quartodeciman Apollinaris of Hierapolis, in his *Peri tou Pascha*, champions a Johannine chronology and chastises those who say Jesus ate the Passover before the crucifixion (presumably drawing on the Synoptics).[40] However, there are Christian writers, Clement of Alexandria for example, who advocate a Johannine chronology, but are not considered Quartodeciman. I think Hall is correct that there might have been differing opinions among Quartodecimans about which gospel's chronology to follow.[41] He adds that our homily "is equally compatible with either Gospel chronology, as it would be with either Quartodeciman or Sunday Easter practice."[42]

---

[38]Hall, "The Origins of Easter," p. 559.

[39]A. Strobel divides the Quartodecimans into two camps, those who followed the lunar calendar, and those who followed the solar calendar. He claims our homily is part of the lunar calendar group, those who celebrate the Passover feast on 14 Nisan (which in Jewish calculations might be considered the beginning of the 15th Nisan). A. Strobel, *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterlikalenders, TU* 121 (Berlin: Akademie, 1977):24.

[40]Eusebius, *EH* 4.26.1; *Chronicon Pascale* (PG 92.80-81).

[41]Hall, "The Origins of Easter," pp. 561-3. He writes that "there was room in the middle of the second century for dispute between Quartodeciman groups who made eucharist in the early morning on 14 Nisan and those who made it at dawn on 15 Nisan."

[42]Hall, "The Origins of Easter," p. 563.

Our homily has no clear interest in stressing the date of the celebration or the period of fasting. Of course, while it is possible that the author either did not know or did not want his listeners to know about the controversies surrounding these issues, such an argument from silence is unconvincing. In the effort to find in the homily any mention of its community celebrating on the 14th of Nisan, and thus link it with Jewish and Quartodeciman practices, some point to *PP* 80, "and you ["Israel"] were making merry, while he was starving; you had wine to drink and bread to eat, he had vinegar and gall." This has been interpreted by Hall as alluding to John's Gospel in dating the crucifixion concurrent with the sacrifice of Passover lambs. *PP* 16 explains that the people were making merry at the Passover, which probably indicates that our author understood celebration to be part of the Jewish Passover, a picture found in Jubilees, Wisdom of Solomon and elsewhere.[43]

The assumed chronological correspondence, however, is better understood as a rhetorical device stressing the typological parallels between Passover celebration and Jesus' Passion. A precedent for this is probably found in Paul's claim that "Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed" (1 Cor. 5.7) and the various traditions and trajectories which sprung from such a claim. Our homilist is clearly preoccupied with presenting the Passover as a foreshadowing of the Passion, highlighting as many parallels as possible. Drawing on the mention of "making merry" at the Passover in *PP* 16, the author in *PP* 80 turns the image on its head by presenting "Israel's" behavior as merry while the sheep, that is, Jesus, is dying. T. Halton points out the author's concerted effort to typologize the Passover, "in pointed contrast to the lamentation and mourning at the death of Egypt's first-born, "Israel" fails to mourn the death of Christ."[44]

Judith Lieu nuances her interpretation of *PP* 80 by stating that though the author is juxtaposing the New Testament Jews' festivities at Passover with Jesus' sorrow at the crucifixion, our author's audience would have had contemporary Jewish celebrations in mind. The homilist was developing a "pointed contrast as the Christians of Sardis fasted and then gathered to hear the homily while their Jewish contemporaries were celebrating-particularly if those celebrations were the source of envious comparisons."[45] Though she admits that our author never makes an explicit connection between the Jews at Jesus' crucifixion and

---

[43]The *Didascalia* 5.14.22, which uses 14 Nisan as the beginning of the Pascha for Christians, also contrasts the joyous celebrating of the Jews with the somber, serious observance by Christians. For a discussion, see M. Taylor, pp. 37-40.
[44]T. Halton, "The Death of Death in Melito, *Peri Pascha*," p. 173.
[45]Lieu, p. 219.

contemporary Jews, "those who listened in that setting could hardly have avoided making the connection."[46]

While it is helpful to note that the author has not made the connection, I am less certain than she that the audience would have connected them. To make that correlation, one has to assume that the Christian community knew what went on in a Jewish home at Passover, for as far as we know, this celebration was not one done publicly in the synagogue. Certainly it is not impossible for Christians at this time to have a working knowledge of what went on during a Passover meal, but it is also plausible that this (mostly Gentile?) Christian congregation knew about the Jewish Passover primarily from New Testament traditions. It is only when one adds the Quartodeciman background with its presumed close ties with Judaism that one assumes the Christian congregation was very familiar with a contemporary Passover celebration. But I suggest that such assumptions can no longer be made for our homily.

Lieu rightly reminds us that the context of this homily is liturgy, and notes that liturgy draws the listener into the past or, said another way, brings the past into the present. But after that general statement, we have no way of guessing just how the listeners shaped their present; least of all can we conjecture that Christians were jealous of a private, home celebration. I suspect our homilist is painting a picture far different from the probable reality that the congregation would experience in their everyday lives. For example, though our homilist portrays Jews as defeated, abandoned by God, history teaches that Judaism was vibrant and active. Hence, it would be mere speculation as to how references to Passover celebrations would shape the listeners perception of their Jewish neighbors. It is critical to stress that our homilist does not include contemporary Jews in the discussion, and even the liturgical category of the text does not permit us to jump from the homilist' s clearly theological argument to a description of either contemporary Jews or the Christian community's picture of those Jews.

Angerstorfer suggests that a characteristic of Quartodeciman works is an interest in eschatology. She finds this interest as well in certain Jewish writings, for example, *Exodus Rabbah* 15.1 (referring to Ex. 12.2). William Petersen states, without providing specific evidence, that "in observing Passover at the time of Jesus, the Jews read and elaborated on Exodus 12, in anticipation of another miraculous event: the *eschatological* coming of the Messiah."[47] Angerstorfer points to *PP* 103, "I will raise you

[46]Lieu, Ibid.

[47]William L. Petersen, "Eusebius and the Paschal Controversy," p. 312 in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism* eds. Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Nata (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1992).

up by my right hand; I am leading you up to the heights of heaven; there I will show you the Father from ages past," as an eschatologically focused text, and suggests that the entire homily is pointed in a direction of the end times.

The reference in *PP* 103, however, is hardly filled with eschatological fervor; one senses no immediacy, no urgency behind the words. Even Angerstorfer seems to recognize this, for she backs down from a strong assertion of the homily's eschatological stance, to suggest instead that in such a homily one would not really expect much eschatological emphasis anyway.[48] Even less helpful is Petersen's implicit attempt to glean Jewish practices primarily from Christian writings.

Skarsaune postulates that a characteristic of the Quartodeciman position is an emphasis on the Paschal lamb typology: "Paschal lamb typology was no doubt of paramount importance in the quartodeciman [sic] Passover celebration—witness Melito's homily—but the motif may have been popular in other quarters also."[49] He concludes that Justin's *Dialogue* is not Quartodeciman, even though it may share the common emphasis of paschal lamb typology with Quartodeciman texts. My concern is to extend that logic to the homily and state that even if it shares an interest in paschal lamb typology, and even if it can be shown to use Johannine chronology,[50] that is not definitive proof that the homily reflects a Quartodeciman position any more than Justin does. Unfortunately, Skarsaune assumes without reflection that our homily is Quartodeciman, and this colors his comparison between Justin and our author.

Skarsaune goes on to discuss another alleged characteristic of Quartodecimans, their close contact with emerging rabbinic Judaism based on dating Jesus' Passion remembrance to 14th Nisan. He states that proof of Justin's Quartodeciman position would strengthen the claim that Quartodecimans drew heavily from developing rabbinic Judaism. While Skarsaune does not believe Justin reflects Quartodeciman views, he does state explicitly the assumed interdependence between Quartodecimans and emerging rabbinic halakah of the second century.[51]

---

[48]Angerstorfer, pp. 13-14, 25-27. She says the audience would have expected an imminent return, based on the "shared" Jewish thought that the Messiah would come.

[49]Skarsaune, p. 303, n. 143.

[50]Sykes, pp. 279-83, does not focus on Johannine chronology, but does list several similarities between John's Gospel and the homily, in an effort to trace a source of our homilist's anti-Jewish sentiments, pp. 279-283.

[51]Skarsaune, pp. 302-303, n. 143. He cites W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), as defending Justin Martyr as Quartodeciman.

Hall and Angerstorfer also link Quartodeciman practices directly with emerging rabbinic Judaism. Hall concurs with F. L. Cross' statement that our homily is "nothing else than a Christian Paschal Haggadah."[52] Following Cross, Hall sees in *PP* 68 "evidence for the theory that *PP* is a Christian Passover Haggadah, verbally reflecting Jewish tradition."[53] He modifies Cross' hypothesis to counter the charges that 1) Ex. 12 was not apparently part of the Haggadah and 2) the structure of *PP* is not that of the Haggadah, with his proposal that the homily was written in two parts. He speculates that the first half of the homily is an explanation of Ex. 12.1-20 stressing the importance of the Law in prefiguring the work of Jesus.[54] The second half of the homily includes specific similarities with the Passover Haggadah, such as the mention of *aphikomenos*[55] in *PP* 66 and 86 ("the one who comes"), "the recital of benefits in *Dayenu* style...in 81-90"[56], and the alleged verbal similarities in *PP* 68 with Mishnah *Pesahim* 10.5 (see also *Exodus Rabbah* 12.2).

This position is seriously flawed in its heavy reliance upon rabbinic texts, which have not been shown to be reliable historical sources for second century Diaspora Judaism.[57] Moreover, the alleged parallelism

---

[52]Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah," p. 29.
[53]Ibid., p. 34.
[54]Ibid., pp. 36-7.
[55]Mention of the *aphikomenos*, the term for the broken matzoh which is eaten at the conclusion of the meal, is found in *mPes*.10.8a and Tosefta 10.11a, "After [eating from] the Passover offering they do not end [with] *afiqomon*." Angerstorfer discusses the range of scholarly opinion on this term, including that it referred to a dessert, an ending of the meal, or the broken matzoh eaten at the end of the meal. Angerstorfer cautiously advances the view that the bread carried with it Messianic symbolism. Evidence includes the canonical gospels' record of Jesus' words at the Last Supper wherein he equated himself as Messiah with the bread. If there had not been a previous connection made between the two, she claims, then the disciples would not have understood the symbolism. Such an uncritical reading of the gospels, however, does not consider the continuing Christian reflection on the person of Jesus. She does admit that Jewish sources are not unanimous in their identification of the matzoh bread with the *aphikomenos*. Lieu notes that the term's meaning in *mPes*. 10.8 is debated, with some suggesting a Greek banqueting custom, others the dessert, and a few that it refers to the Messiah. Because there is no evidence of Messianic anticipation in the term in Talmudic material, she rightly concludes that "there is nothing to isolate this particular formula as peculiarly significant" p. 227.
[56]Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah," p. 38.
[57]For a discussion of the rise of rabbinic influence, and that of the Patriarch, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, "The Place of the Rabbi in Jewish Society of the Second Century," pp. 157-173 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (NY: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992). He writes that "many Jews were not committed to a rabbinic way of life and did not accept rabbinic authority" (p. 164), and "the [second century] rabbis were but a small part of Jewish society, an

between *PP* 68 and Mishnah *Pesahim* 10.5 is less pronounced than Hall allows:

***PP* 68**	***mPes.* 10.5d**
It is he that delivered us from slavery to liberty, from darkness to light, from death to life, from tyranny to eternal royalty	The one who leads us out of slavery to freedom from grief to happiness from sorrow to feasting from darkness to great light
	and from slavery to release
[A only] and made us a new priesthood and an eternal people personal to him.	

The similarities which Hall finds can be explained as well by pointing to other works. In our homily's context, "he" who delivers is Jesus, but "the one" in *mPes.* 10.5 is God, the Omnipresent (10.5c). The phrase "darkness to light," found in both lists, is also part of Jewish and Christian tradition, see for example Joseph's prayer in *Joseph and Aseneth* 8.10, 1 Pet. 2.9 and 1 Clem. 59.2. This latter passage shares a similar theme as in *PP* A concerning the new priesthood and eternal people, though the language is not exactly similar.[58] The themes of slavery and freedom abound in Paul's letters (Gal. 5.1, 1 Cor. 9.19), which I point out not to suggest any direct borrowing by our homilist, but rather to note that these ideas have been part of Christian thought from its earliest days. Perhaps even more damaging to Hall's thesis are the varying lists within the Mishnah texts themselves.[59] Baruch Bokser notes that the list's introductory phrase "the One who did for us all these miracles" varies between sources, with some including reference to "our ancestors."[60]

---

insular group which produced an insular literature. They were not synagogue leaders" (p. 173). With Judah the Patriarch began "the urbanization of the rabbinic movement" (p. 172) in Palestine. A. T. Kraabel, "The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions," *JJS* 33 (1982):454. Martin Goodman, *State and Society in Roman Galilee, AD 132-212* (Totowa, NJ: Rowan and Allanheld, 1983); Lee Levine, *The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity* (NY: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1989); Wilson, *Related Strangers*, p. 19.

[58]1 Pet. 2.9 has *basileion hierateuma* (royal priesthood) and *laos eis peripoiēsin* (a people for his own possession). *PP* 68 has *hierateuma kainon* (new priesthood) and *laon periousion aiōvion* (eternal people personal to him).

[59]Lieu notes the "variations of the formulae are found, with the Mishnah of the Jerusalem Talmud giving only the first line [of the Passover Haggadah]" p. 223-4.

[60]Bokser, *The Origins of the Seder, The Passover Rite and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1984): p. 31, n. 13.

Lieu advocates Hall's Passover Haggadah parallels, pointing to the homilist beginning with disgrace but ending with glory. Our author's approach, however, is very typical of Christian interpretation of Jesus' purpose—to save people from their sins; Romans is an example of how Paul presents sin and disobedience as part of human existence, but how Jesus' death and resurrection "saved" one from sin. Our homilist need not be following any Jewish pattern here, even if it was granted that Paul was using Jewish patterns of argument (and as Paul was a Jew, this would not be surprising). By the time of our text, it is most reasonable that our homilist is developing what is considered conventional Christian exegesis. Thus one need not postulate any direct knowledge of Jewish tradition.

Quartodeciman Position and the Charge of Judaizing

Stephen Wilson, assuming the Quartodeciman position of our author, suggests that our author "would have been under considerable pressure to distinguish the Christian from the Jewish festival and to avoid the charge of judaizing."[61] This position, reflected and assumed by many scholars, argues that at least some of the motivation for our homilist's vindictive attack upon Jews was a determination to define that Christian community over against the (apparently rather similar) Jewish one. Lieu says as much when she suggests that the author was attempting to create distance between the Christian community and contemporary Jews because of the charge of judaizing.[62] It is interesting to line up Hall's argument with Wilson's and Lieu's: he argues that Quartodeciman practices were very widespread in Asia Minor in the second century, and they suggest that the author is defending the congregation against the charge of judaizing. But if so many were Quartodeciman, then it must have been Christians from the outside (Rome?) who brought the charge, and one wonders if the congregation was even aware of the accusation? In other words, if Quartodeciman practices were as widespread as Hall believes, then at the local level, how aware would the congregation be of other positions? If the charge of judaizing was a big problem, the author might have been more explicit in defending their practice. In fact, Lieu herself notes that "there is no suggestion that in the second century controversies the charge of judaising was ever raised, neither does anti-Jewish polemic reach quite the same peak in other Quartodeciman writers as in Melito."[63] It is, then,

---

[61]Wilson, "Passover, Easter, and Anti-Judaism," in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985):350.
[62]Lieu, p. 232.
[63]Lieu, p. 232.

a tenuous argument at many levels which links our homilist's Quartodeciman position with charges of judaizing to explain the anti-Judaism in the homily.

Though Lieu is cautious in her analysis about how much influence the Passover Haggadah played in the homilist's analysis, she does finally conclude that "echoes and polemics" of the Passover Haggadah do not mean that our homilist simply imitated the themes found there. She recommends that our homilist offered a new interpretation of the Passover Haggadah, and therefore the text should be regarded as a "competitive or polemical act" because it sought to challenge a tradition. She concludes that such a defiant act "both owed something to and coloured Christian-Jewish encounters in Sardis."[64] However, no unambiguous evidence can be garnered that our homily contains "echoes and polemics" of the Jewish Passover Haggadah. As such, our author is hardly presenting a new interpretation on the Passover Haggadah. All the alleged similarities can be explained as part of Christian traditional exegesis and explanation of Jesus' death. Jewish tradition is not being challenged here, but rather a Christian tradition is interpreted for the congregation.

Summary of Evidence for the Quartodeciman label

The evidence, then, to support the label "Quartodeciman" for our homily is at best circumstantial. The alleged defining characteristics of Quartodeciman thought—Johannine chronology, paschal lamb typology, interest in fasting dates, ties with Jewish tradition—all can be found in works that few, if any, scholars would identify as Quartodeciman (unless that label is viewed as characteristic of early Christianity to about 200 CE). As noted above, Clement of Alexandria seems to follow Johannine chronology, while Paul, the Gospel of John and Justin use paschal lamb typology, and Origen clearly is in contact with Jews about religious questions; yet none of these authors are labeled Quartodeciman. Moreover, no evidence exists that our homilist was interested in dating the fast or paschal celebration. The parallel between *mPes.* 10 and *PP* 68 is inadequate to establish some direct or unique relationship, as is the claim that our homilist structured the homily on a Jewish Passover Haggadah model. No compelling reason, then, can be found to label our homilist Quartodeciman.

The problems with Eusebius' information and other external evidence, then, cautions against equating the Melito of the *PP* with the bishop of Sardis. Nothing from Eusebius can be verified in our homily;

---

[64]Lieu, p. 228.

the Quartodeciman claim, the possible second paschal homily, the dubious introduction, all fail to support any identification of our homily with the work to which Eusebius referred. Clement's recorded response to Melito's homily is ambiguous and offers no insights into identifying our homily. This is not to deny outright that Melito, bishop of Sardis, wrote the *PP*, but is to say that if he did, the evidence to support such a contention is not in Eusebius.

Sardis Provenance

That being the case, this also calls into question the provenance of our homily. We cannot assume a Sardis locale; and nothing in the homily itself points unequivocally to Sardis. But modern scholars reconstructing the Christian and Jewish past have much to gain by securing the homily's provenance in Sardis[65] as it could then be juxtaposed to the remains of an outstanding Jewish synagogue recently excavated there. Recently, some scholars who accept the Sardis provenance of the homily, are questioning the early dating (late second century) of the synagogue. I will outline the current arguments, but the reader should bear in mind that I do not consider the Sardis milieu a given for our homily.

The synagogue was discovered by G. M. A. Hanfmann from the Harvard-Cornell team.[66] It was originally on the southeast side of a larger Roman gymnasium and bath complex in the middle of the city. Shops were attached to its outer wall, while it shared an inner wall with the palaestra of the gymnasium. When first built, the space now occupied by the synagogue consisted of three rooms; the same configuration has remained on the northern side of the complex. Stage One was never completed, and instead, Stage Two divided the space into an apse at the eastern end and a long basilican hall at the western end. Andrew Seager labels this second stage a Roman civil basilica. Stage Three is problematic, for there were only minor changes done to the building, offering few clues as to its function. Nothing suggests that it was used as a synagogue at this point, though one cannot rule it out. The synagogue in its final form is represented in Stage Four. In this stage, new floors and walls were added, a forecourt created and wall niches or

---

[65]For example, Peter Richardson, in his 1993 SBL paper, "Barnabas' Anti-Judaism in its Socio-Historical Perspective," promotes an Asia Minor provenance for *Ps. Barn.* based largely on the assumed Sardis provenance of our homily and the alleged similarities between the two works.

[66]George M. A. Hanfmann, *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times.* Note especially the contributed articles "The Synagogue and the Jewish Community," by Andrew R. Seager and "Impact of the Discovery of the Sardis Synagogue, by A. T. Kraabel, pp. 168-190.

shrines installed at the east end of the hall.[67] Its function prior to becoming a synagogue is not clear, though its one long room with an apse at the west end and a vestibule at the east end may have "served as adjuncts to the physical, and perhaps also the intellectual, activities of the palaestra."[68]

The synagogue is dated by A. T. Kraabel to the late second or early third century CE, and this dating has been unquestioned until recently.[69] He notes that "this building, originally a public structure, came under their [the Jews] control and was turned into a synagogue in the third century, if not before."[70] Kraabel proposes that the building might have been under Jewish ownership already in the late second century, during the time of Melito of Sardis (who wrote our homily, according to Kraabel), though the transfer into Jewish hands might be as late as the mid third century. The difference of fifty or one hundred years does not alter Kraabel's position that our homily was written against Sardian Jews, however, because he contends that the Jewish community's long history of importance in Sardis, based in part on Josephus' remarks about the Jewish community in the first century BCE and first century CE (*AJ* 12.119-120, 14.235, 14.259, 16.171, 19.285-291)[71] will have continued uninterrupted into the second and third centuries CE and beyond. Josephus cites a decree by Lucius Antonius (49-50 BCE) which reads in part, "from the earliest times they have had an association (*sunodon*) of their own in accordance with their native laws and a place (*topos*) of their own, in which they decide their affairs and controversies with one another" (*AJ* 14.235). From this quotation at least three points can be made: (1) the Jews claim a long history in Sardis, (2) they have been able to meet together (3) in a particular place. Unfortunately, Josephus' evidence will not provide direct access into the second century Jewish

---

[67]For a description of the synagogue excavations and of the dating of the various stages, see Andrew Seager, "The Synagogue and the Jewish Community," in *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times*, pp. 168-178.

[68]Bonz, "Differing Approaches to Religious Benefaction: The Late Third-Century Acquisition of the Sardis Synagogue," *HTR* 86:2 (1993):141.

[69]Bonz, "Differing Approaches." This article critiques the late second/early third century CE dating of the synagogue by Kraabel. See also Sykes, pp. 271-2.

[70]Kraabel, "Impact of the Discovery of the Sardis Synagogue," in *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times*, p. 179.

[71]Kraabel, "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis," p. 77, n. 4, draws on Josephus' information about the long standing and positive position Jews held in Sardis. He stresses the likelihood of community continuity, such that the prosperous first century BCE Sardian Jewish community continued to grow more established, resulting in a rather consistent or increasingly influential position within the city from the first century BCE through the fifth and sixth centuries CE as evidenced by the synagogue.

community of Sardis.[72] The value of his information is calculated in part by how unchanging one imagines the Sardis community to be.

Paul Trebilco theorizes a "significant degree of continuity" in the influential Sardian Jewish community from the first century BCE to the seventh century CE, and therefore projects information from the first century BCE into the second century CE. Kraabel's analysis runs along similar lines; he continues that the Jewish community's visible and impressive status in Sardis (with or without the synagogue) could have angered Melito. Kraabel points to Melito's *Apology* to Marcus Aurelius as listed by Eusebius, wherein he states that Christians should receive special treatment because as Christianity grew, the Roman Empire prospered. These factors likely goaded Melito to write the vicious attack against Judaism as found in our homily, claims Kraabel.

The dating of these stages is debated, however, with Andrew Seager suggesting that Stage One, the initial building of the complex, continued "well into the second century."[73] Stage Two might be dated to the early third century, while Stage Three can be dated to about fifty years later (ca. 270 CE). Stage Four should be located in the early part of the fourth century, about 320-340 CE. Hanfmann[74] and Seager suggest that the synagogue came into the Jews' possession about the middle of the fourth century, about 320-340 CE.[75] Furthermore, Marianne Bonz has convincingly challenged Kraabel's assumption that Jews in Sardis held significant political power in the first and second centuries CE.[76] Following Seager, she makes the important point that the stages of development in the Sardis bath-gymnasium complex must be kept distinct, and continues that no evidence supports the contention that the south wing of the structure came into Jewish hands before 270 CE.[77] She

---

[72]Another piece of literary evidence about Sardis is found in Rev. 3.1-6. The Sardis church is described quite negatively: the author charges that most in the community were dead in their failure to live as Christians. Much has been written on the Johannine traditions' impact on Asia Minor, and even on its possible impact on the homily. Hall, "Melito's Paschal Homily and the Acts of John," *JTS*, n.s. 17 (1966):95-98 and Sykes, pp. 279-281.

[73]Seager, p. 172.

[74]George M. A. Hanfmann, *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times*, p. 194. He notes that the first Christian church building also dates from the mid-fourth century, and it was built in a new section of the city developed during Constantine's rule.

[75]Seager, "The Synagogue and the Jewish Community," p. 173.

[76]Bonz, "The Jewish Community of Ancient Sardis: A Reassessment of its Rise to Prominence," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 93 (1990):343-58. See also "Differing Approaches to Religious Benefaction."

[77]Bonz, "The Jewish Community of Ancient Sardis," pp. 346-47. See also Seager, "The Synagogue and the Jewish Community," *Sardis: From Prehistoric to Roman Times*, p. 173.

stresses that Josephus' material likely indicates that Jews in Asia Minor during the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods had little political power over their gentile neighbors, as the Jews had to call upon Rome to protect their rights.[78] Bonz postulates that it was following the detrimental policies of Septimius Severus (193-211) and the opulent excesses of his son, Caracalla, that significant social and political changes occurred in Asia Minor cities. Caracalla's *Constitutio Antoniniana* broadened the tax base, in part by allowing Jews to hold civic office (often an expensive proposition) without imposing upon them any obligation which would impinge on their religious practices. Subsequent emperors continued to debase the coinage, leading to a monetary crisis in the last quarter of the third century. Bonz notes that Sardis appeared to have been in an economic crisis between 260-290 CE, and that social upheaval was presumably present as well. "The Jewish community of Sardis appears to have achieved its prominent status only in the late third century, as the result of a severe economic crisis brought about by the greed and ineptitude of the third-century Roman emperors."[79] No direct evidence, then, suggests that the Jewish community in Sardis had political clout or social influence among its neighbors prior to the late third century CE.

Trebilco focuses on the inscriptions (dated third or fourth century CE) which identify at least nine synagogue donors as a *bouleutēs* (a member of the city council), thereby emphasizing the donors' place in the larger Sardian community, not simply their status in the local Jewish community.[80] Martin Goodman cautions that the inscription evidence can be interpreted to read that the entire "synagogue" was made up of "God-fearers,"[81] with no Jews as part of the group, though most scholars understand the donors to be Jews.

Given the enormous weight assigned to the synagogue evidence when reconstructing a milieu for the homily's attitude toward Jews/Judaism, it is imperative to re-assess the archaeological data when attempting to draw a picture of Jews contemporary to our homilist. It

---

[78]The information from Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 12.119-120.

[79]Bonz, "The Jewish Community of Ancient Sardis," p. 356.

[80]For a summary of the inscriptional evidence, see Paul R. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (NY: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991):43-52. For a list of the inscriptions found at Sardis, see Louis Robert, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Sardes* (Paris: Libraire d'Amerique et d'Orient, 1964).

[81]The topic of "God-fearers" is hotly debated. For a discussion of the issues, see *ABD:* "Devout" (Paul F. Stuehrenberg); see also Thomas M. Finn, "The God-Fearers Reconsidered," *CBQ* 47 (1985):75-84; Robert S. MacLennan and A. Thomas Kraabel, "The God-Fearers—a Literary and Theological Invention," *BAR* (1986):47-53; Robert E. Tannenbaum, "Jews and God-Fearers in the Holy City of Aphrodite," *BAR* (1986):54-69; Trebilco, pp. 145-66.

seems unlikely that our author knew the Jews of the Sardis synagogue (assuming for the moment the author wrote from Sardis). Thus it may be that the second century or early third century Jewish community's meeting place was a private home converted for communal needs, or a building not yet excavated or no longer recoverable. That there was a meeting place of the Jews in Sardis seems fairly certain, based on an early third century CE fountain inscription identifying it as the fountain of the synagogue.[82]

It may be that the second century Sardian Jewish community resembled two contemporary assemblies, the neighboring one in Priene (second century CE) or the much more distant one in Dura-Europos (ca. 150-200 CE). In both cities, the excavated meeting places were in a house with a re-designed interior space. This may indicate a tendency toward using private homes for communal gatherings that was empire wide, rather than simply a regional practice. The excavated Diaspora synagogues of Stobi, Delos, and Ostia were also probably built originally as family dwellings. In fact, Michael White has noted that of the synagogues excavated in the Diaspora, all but the Sardis synagogue were converted domestic space.[83] It may be that during the second century in Sardis an adapted private home suited the needs of the community.

The above argument, presupposing a Sardis milieu, challenges the hypothesis that the excavated synagogue can help reconstruct the Jewish community during the time of bishop Melito. But I wish to go a step further to note that the information in Eusebius, on which the Sardis provenance is based, cannot determine the setting for the homily. The archeological information about second century synagogues in the Diapora suggests a general picture of Jewish communities as meeting in converted home space.

Possible Palestine Provenance

The homily itself does not preclude the Sardis locale, but neither does it encourage it. But if not Sardis, is there any other area or city which suggests itself? G. Zuntz proposes Palestine, based both on

---

[82]W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson, *Sardis. Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis*, vol. 7, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*. Part 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1932):37-40, no. 17, line 7. The inscription is dated to ca. 200 CE by Buckler and Robinson, "the presence of the name 'Aurelia' (l. 20), and the fact that the other individuals mentioned do not have 'Aur.' as a first name, indicated that the date of the document is about 200 AD." Though unlikely, some scholars have suggested that the inscription refers to the large fountain found at the excavated synagogue.

[83]L. Michael White, *Building God's House in the Roman World* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1990):62.

Eusebius' reference that "Melito" traveled to Palestine and on his reading of the first line of the homily, wherein the term "Hebrew" is interpreted by Zuntz to refer to the language in which the text was read. His suggestion of Palestine as the homily's provenance is as possible a candidate for the homily's provenance as any other region (though not necessarily for the reasons Zuntz offers). Hebrew was spoken by some Jews in Palestine in the second and third centuries. If the opening lines do indicate that Hebrew was part of the service and was heard prior to our homily, then the most likely place for that to occur is in Palestine. As I will show below, however, there are other, perhaps better, ways of understanding the homily's opening line.

If the homily was written in Palestine, then it is possible that our author had contact with rabbinic communities. While I think some scholars, such as Hall and Angerstorfer, can place too much emphasis on the rather vague hints in the homily that remind one of the Passover Haggadah, still, the slight similarities are there. It is possible that some contact or interaction occurred between our homilist and rabbis, which could have had some impact on the shape of the homily; however, the alleged similarities can be adequately explained without reference to emerging rabbinic Judaism.

Another item of evidence drawn into this debate is the phrase in *PP* 94 which speaks of Jesus dying in the midst of Jerusalem (*en mesō Ierousalēm*). The canonical gospels agree that Jesus was killed outside the city, but by the second or third century, the city had enveloped that outlying area into itself. If our author was writing from Jerusalem, or knew Jerusalem well, it may be that this phrase denotes a personal observation.[84] However, it is also possible that the phrase is meant in a poetic sense, that all could see the terrible deed done by "Israel," because it was done "in the midst of" the people or in full view of the people.

Certain scholars, beginning with Kraabel,[85] have suggested that our author's community might be made up in part of Jews who converted to Christianity.[86] Such a claim would work in Palestine, but could apply just as well to about anywhere in the Roman world. As such, it does not impact the argument for a Palestine milieu. In summary, I am not

---

[84]The homilist notes in *PP* 72 that "it is he that has been murdered. And where has he been murdered? In the middle of Jerusalem." See A. E. Harvey, "Melito and Jerusalem," *JTS*, 17 (1966):401-404. Eusebius says that Melito of Sardis traveled "back to the east and reaching the place where it was proclaimed and done," he established the proper listing of "Old Testament" books and wrote six books of Extracts from them (*EH* 4.26.13-14).

[85]Kraabel, "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis: Text and Context," p. 84.

[86]Sykes suggests that Melito himself was Jewish, pp. 276-279.

recommending a Palestine provenance, nor am I arguing for Sardis. I advocate that, because of the lack of evidence from within the homily itself, or from variant textual similarities among ancient authors and our homily, the homily's provenance must remain undetermined.

Interpretations of the Homily's First Line

"Hē men graphē tēs hebraikēs exodou anegnōstai." Zuntz, followed by Angerstorfer and others,[87] suggests that this phrase indicates that the story of the Exodus was read in the Hebrew language. He espouses that some second century Christian communities used Hebrew in liturgy, adding that these communities were following contemporary Jewish practices. Zuntz and Angerstorfer reconstruct the worship setting as follows: the book of Exodus was read to the community in Hebrew, next the text was paraphrased in Greek, and then our author read the homily. Angerstorfer, shifting Zuntz's provenance from Palestine to Sardis, believes that if it can be shown that a Christian community in Sardis read from the book of Exodus in Hebrew, then this (presumed) Jewish custom would further demonstrate the *PP's* Quartodeciman stance[88] and the influence of rabbinic thought on our homilist.

Yet Angerstorfer's proposal must be challenged, in large part because almost no extant evidence suggests that Diaspora Jews themselves used Hebrew. Even in Palestine, Greek was widely used by Jews.[89] While its non-usage by Jews would not rule out its use by Christians, there is no unambiguous evidence that Christians included Hebrew in their liturgy survives.

Moreover, while it is tempting to assume a standard of practice among Jews in this early period of the Common Era,[90] and thus interpret

---

[87]G. Zuntz, "On the Opening Sentence of Melito's Paschal Homily," *HTR* 36 (1943):298-315. See also Angerstorfer, pp. 37-47.

[88]Angerstorfer, p. 37.

[89]Kurt Treu, "Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die Juden im Römishen Reich," *Kairos* 15 (1973):123-144. Eng. trans. William Adler, "The Significance of Greek for Jews in the Roman Empire" IOUDAIOS-L server, 1991. Shaye Cohen remarks that the Mishnah itself contains many Greek and Latin words and is indebted to the Greek form of expression, the commentary. Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Phila.: Westminster Press, 1987):216. See also Saul Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (NY: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1942; reprint, NY: Feldheim, 1965) and *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 2nd ed. (NY: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962).

[90]White writes that, "no artificial distinction should be made between 'Hellenistic' and 'Palestinian' Judaism, as there is ample evidence (literary, linguistic, and archaeological) that the Jewish population of Eretz Israel, even in early Rabbinic times, was thoroughly familiar with things Greek and Roman." Michael White, "The Delos Synagogue Revisited, Recent Fieldwork in the

inscriptions or remains as affirming rabbinic activity, other interpretations of the data might work better. Such an example of promoting a theory of rabbinic influence is the explanation given by Reynolds and Tannenbaum on the Aphrodisias inscription as a rabbinic soup kitchen, an interpretation which has come under scrutiny for its (unwarranted) assumptions of rabbinic authority.[91]

Still remaining is the matter of Origen's second column in the Hexapla, which is a transliteration of the Hebrew into Greek characters. Does this indicate that some Christian communities, while not knowing how to speak Hebrew, were interested enough in the Hebrew text to have it read in their worship? Angerstorfer cites T. W. Manson as stating that the only reasonable explanation one can make for the second column is as a tool for liturgical readings.[92] Yet the overall format of the Hexapla can also be understood as a study aid for Scripture analysis. The columns as collected and arranged by Origen (in Alexandria and/or Caesarea, early to mid-third century CE) do not appear to have circulated independently (though clearly the Greek texts used by Origen continued to have a life of their own apart from Origen's work with them in the Hexapla). This reduces the likelihood that a single column would have been available for a second (or third) century Christian community. The transliterated column can also be viewed as a private teaching aide for students of the Scriptures.[93] Speculation on Origen's Hexapla does not

---

Graeco-Roman Diaspora," *HTR* 80 (1987):135, n. 10. See also Kurt Treu, "The Significance of Greek for Jews in the Roman Empire." For a general discussion of Early Judaism, see *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters,* ed. R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) and Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism,* trans. J. Bowden (Phila: Fortress Press, 1974).

[91]M. Williams, "The Jews and Godfearers Inscription from Aphrodisias—a Case of Patriarchal Interference in early Third Century Caria?" *Historia* 41 (1992):297-310. There is a Talmudic story (Tosefta, *Megillah* 2) of Rabbi Meir, a second century figure, arriving at Sardis for Purim. Alarmed at finding no Hebrew text of Esther, he recited the book from memory in Hebrew. There is no other indication that Sardian Jews celebrated Purim, or were interested in using Hebrew in their worship. It may be that here, as in other cases, the Talmudic editors anachronistically read back into history their values and ideas on the importance of the Hebrew language. The story is cited in A. R. R. Shepard, "Pagan Cults of Angels in Roman Asia Minor," *Talanta* 12-13 (1980):97.

[92]Angerstorfer, p. 45, citing T. W. Manson, "The Cairo Geniza," *Dom. St.* 2 (1949):192.

[93]For a brief description of various positions, see John Wright, "Origen in the Scholar's Den: A Rationale for the Hexapla," p. 48-62 in *Origen of Alexandria, His World and His Legacy.* Wright argues that "Origen's rationale for the Hexapla was to obtain a compilation of biblical texts for comparative analysis that would increase his understanding of the various versions and would provide an exegetical resource for a wide range of applications," pp. 61-2.

alter the important fact that very little evidence for the use of Hebrew in Jewish and Christian writings and inscriptions exists outside Palestine.[94]

Connecting the term *hebraikēs* in the first line of the homily to its only other occurrence in the homily (*PP* 94) may offer some clues to interpretation. The relevant part of *PP* 94 reads, "in the city of the law, in the city of the Hebrews, in the city of the prophets." If *hebraikēs* connotes an ancestral or ethnic designation, it may signal that line one of our homily also identifies a people-group. Again, perhaps its direct association with the Jewish scriptures or the law in both contexts accounts for the choice. Our author decided against using (for whatever reason) the term "Jew," and with that decision, eliminated one possible way to open the homily—"the Jewish Exodus." Because the term "Israel" is later used in a derogatory way, and because "the people" has been replaced by the church, it may be that the term "Hebrew" was seen as the best alternative.

Summary of Eusebius' Evidence

This section has been more deleterious to existing theories than constructive in creating a provenance and author for our homily. But the ground has been cleared, so to speak, and ready now for careful building. Any new design will not have the benefit of Eusebius' material, because of its tenuous reliability and applicability to our homily. However, a discussion of the fragments attributed to Melito will be examined in hopes of creating a clearer picture of our author.

Fragments attributed to Melito of Sardis

Fragments of writings and alleged sayings of or about Melito of Sardis number about twenty. Some are found in Eusebius, and were noted above. Most do not impact the discussion of our homily's authorship greatly, but along with the information given in Eusebius, there are a few fragments, specifically frags. 9, 10, 11, 13 and 15 which must be evaluated.

Authorship Claims Among the Fragments

Eusebius is not alone in his attribution of the title "bishop" to Melito of Sardis. An early reference is also found in frag. 8b (from Cod. Vatic. 2.22 fo. 238), probably from the fourth century CE ("Melito Bishop of Sardis, *On Baptism*). In the next century, the Syriac florilegium (frag. 13 and frag. 15) uses the title "bishop." Frag. 13 reads, "Melito, Bishop of Sardis, from his treatise *On Soul and Body*," and frag. 15 reads, "Melito

[94]See Lieu for support, p. 221.

the bishop, *On Faith.*" In the seventh or eighth century CE there are two works which pronounce Melito a "bishop," the *Chronicon Pascale* and *The Guide*[95] by Anastasius. Interestingly, in this latter work, one also finds a citation about Melito (frag. 6), where he is not identified as a bishop but is called "the divine and all-wise among teachers." Perhaps this is due to different sources used. While the information is not contradictory, nevertheless it is puzzling why, if the editor knew Melito was a bishop, he did not include that title. Origen, one of the earliest references, identifies Melito as "of Asia."[96] In frag. 9 he is called the "blessed Melito of Sardis," and in frag. 10 he is simply identified as "Melito of Sardis." Both of these fragments are from a catena on Genesis.

In conclusion, then, there are five other references besides Eusebius to a bishop Melito of Sardis, found in fragments 2, 7, 8b, 13, and 15. In the remaining fragments and references preserved, no consensus emerges on his title. This may indicate confusion surrounding a figure named Melito from Asia Minor (probably Sardis) generated by an steadily expanding tradition. It may also be that another "Melito" was mistook for a bishop from this region. Both the inclusion of more elevated titles as well as the combining of two (or more) historical figures into one occurs as tradition develops. A summary follows:

Titles	**Sources**
Melito, bishop of Sardis	frag. 2, Chronicon pascale [7th century]
Melito of Asia	frag. 5, Origen's *Selecta in Psalmos,* Ps. 3 [3rd century]
The divine and all-wise among teachers, Melito	frag. 6, Athanasius Sinaiticus' *The Guide* [7-8th century]
Melito bishop of Sardis	frag. 7, Athanasius Sinaiticus
Melito bishop of Sardis	frag. 8b, Cod. Vatic. 2.22 fo. 238 [4th century?]

[95]Frag. 7 = *Hodegus* 12, *PG* 89.197A.
[96]Frag. 5 equals Origen, *Sel. Pss.* ad Psalm 3, *PG* 12.1120A.

Of blessed Melito of Sardis	frag. 9, several MSS of a catena on Genesis[97] [5th century]
Of Melito of Sardis	frag. 10, see frag. 9
Melito, bishop of Sardis	frag. 13, Syriac florilegium (Brit.Lib. Syr. 729, addit. 12156) [5th century?]
Melito the bishop	frag. 15, see frag. 13
Of Melito, bishop of Sardis	frag. 16b, Cod. Ochrid. Musée nat. 86, p. 145[98]

It should be pointed out that one cannot assume that these attributions were made by the original writers of the individual fragments. It is possible that later copyists of these fragments, when they read the name "Melito" attached to the material, added to it the provenance of Sardis and the title of bishop. It may also be that an anonymous fragment was given the name and title, "Melito, bishop of Sardis." The recognition that copyists may have altered or expanded upon the attribution of a fragment cautions against a heavy reliance upon them as representing the original attribution of the fragments. It should also be remembered that some of the same fragments attributed to Melito in one source are attributed to another figure, such as Irenaeus or Athanasius, in other sources.

Fragment Variants: *eis sphagēn* (to the slaughter)

If the ascriptions to the fragments give us little useful information concerning our homily's author, perhaps specific variants shared between our homily and certain fragments will prove more helpful. One important variant that plays a part in analyzing the fragments is *PP* 64, the Is. 53.7 quotation, "He was led as a sheep *to slaughter*." The variant *eis sphagēn* (to the/for slaughter) is reconstructed by Bonner in A, though the A text reads *eisphagēn*. Kraft rightly points out that Bonner's hypothesis is not the only one possible, and instead postulates that the

[97]For a detailed description, see R. L. Wilken, "Melito, the Jewish Community at Sardis and the Sacrifice of Isaac," pp. 53-69.
[98]For a detailed description, see M. Richard, "Témoins grecs des fragments XIII et XV de Méliton de Sardes," *Le Muséon* 85 (1972):324.

copyist might have accidentally dropped the "*p*" in *epi sphagēn*.[99] This is B's reading (though B does not include the final *n*), which reflects the OG.

Hall, however, in examining the Greek texts as they compare to each other and to the Coptic, Latin and Georgian evidence preserved, concludes that, "When A is correctly read, many of the discrepancies [between it and B] disappear, and A's variants appear in a more favorable light."[100] Hall notes that *PP* 71 has *eis sphagēn* in both A and B, but he does not connect *PP* 64 with A's reading of *PP* 71 (though he does follow Bonner's reconstruction), primarily because *PP* 64 is a self-conscious quotation but, he argues, *PP* 71 is not.[101] Hall notes that the Latin is not a help here, as "*ad*" can be used for both *epi* and *eis*. Thus he concludes that no answer can be given with the present textual information.[102] It is unclear to me why Hall evaluates *PP* 71 as irrelevant to solving the puzzle in *PP* 64 but then proceeds to use a similar reading in his edition at *PP* 64. I contend, however, that the evidence from *PP* 71, added to evidence from fragments 9, 10 and 11 and Justin (to be discussed below), support *eis* in A.

Turning to fragments 9, 10 and 11, they read as follows:

Fragment 9:

Of blessed Melito of Sardis:
For as a ram he was bound
(he says concerning our Lord Jesus Christ), and as a lamb he was shorn, and as a sheep he was led to slaughter (*eis sphagēn*), and as a lamb he was crucified; and he carried the wood on his shoulders as he was led up to be slain like Isaac by his Father.
But Christ suffered, whereas Isaac did not suffer; for he was a model of the Christ who was going to suffer.
But by being merely the model of Christ he caused astonishment and fear among men.
For it was a strange mystery to behold, a son led by his father to a mountain for slaughter (*eis sphagēn*), whose feet he bound (*sumpodisas*) and whom he put on the wood of the offering. preparing with zeal the things for his slaughter.
But Isaac was silent, bound (*pepedēmenos*) like a ram, not opening his mouth nor uttering a sound.
For not frightened by the sword nor alarmed at the fire nor sorrowful at the suffering, he carried with fortitude the model of the Lord.

---

[99]Kraft, "Barnabas' Isaiah Test and Melito's *Paschal Homily*," *JBL* 80 (1961):372, n. 6.
[100]Hall, "The Melito Papyri," *JTS* 19 (1968):504.
[101]One could argue just the opposite here, that B probably preserves a copyist's emendation, which moved the reading closer to the OG text.
[102]Hall, "The Melito Papyri," p. 479.

Thus Isaac was offered in the midst foot-bound like a ram, and Abraham stood by and held the sword unsheathed, not ashamed to put to death his son.

Fragment 10:

Of Melito of Sardis:
On behalf of Isaac the righteous one, a ram appeared for slaughter (*eis sphagēn*), so that Isaac might be released from bonds.
That ram, slain, ransomed Isaac; so also the Lord, slain, saved us, and bound (*detheis*), released us, and sacrificed, ransomed us.

Fragment 11:

And a little further on:
For the Lord was a lamb like the ram which Abraham saw caught in a Sabek-tree.
But the tree displayed the cross, and that place, Jerusalem, and the lamb, the Lord fettered (*empepodismenon*) for slaughter (*eis sphagēn*).

These fragments,[103] along with frag. 12 (Hall considers it inauthentic), are preserved under the name "Melito of Sardis" in several manuscripts of a catena on Genesis. The catena manuscripts also ascribe the fragments to Eusebius of Emesa (twice) or omit a name altogether (once). Frag. 9 includes the phrase *eis sphagēn* twice, once in what appears to be a citation from Is. 53.7 ("and as a sheep he was led to slaughter"), and again in reference to Abraham taking his son up the mountain for slaughter. Frag. 10 uses the phrase in its discussion of the ram substituted for Isaac (frag. 11 uses ram/lamb imagery to highlight the "Lord's" slaughter). These occurrences of Is. 53.7 may be dependent, and if so, they preserve one example of our homily's unusual phrase, and in relation to Is. 53.7. This uncommon phrase found in these works might indicate that the same author is behind them, or that our homily and the author(s) of these fragments had access to a similar tradition.

One other text includes this variant, Justin's *Dial.* 13, a lengthy quotation of Is. 52.10-54.6. Only in this passage in Justin does one find *eis sphagēn* for the phrase "to the slaughter." In his seven or so other Is. 53.7-8 quotations scattered throughout the *Dial.* and *Apol.*, Justin uses the OG phrase, *epi sphagēn*. Justin's quotation in *Dial.* 13 has no close contextual

[103]Robert L. Wilken agrees that these three fragments are by the same author as our homily, identifying the author as Melito of Sardis. "Melito, the Jewish Community at Sardis, and the Sacrifice of Isaac"; see also "The Authenticity of the Fragments of Melito of Sardis on the Sacrifice of Isaac (Genesis 22): Comments on Perler's Edition," *TU* 125 (1981):605-608, wherein he notes that in the early 13th century MS, Sinai 4 (a catena of the Greek fathers on Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus), fragments 9 and 10 appear in their entirety and are attributed to Melito.

parallels in his writings, which may indicate that for this quotation, Justin used a source different from his other sources for Isaiah. Because the quotation is so lengthy, however, one cannot rule out the possibility that Justin copied directly from a biblical manuscript. The shared variant between Justin, our homily and the fragments 9, 10 and 11 suggests the possibility that our homilist used a source preserving the *eis sphagēn* variant in Is. 53.7.

Fragment Variants and Lists in *PP* 59 and *PP* 69

Fragments 9 and 10 also share verbs with the two lists of prophets found in *PP* 59 and *PP* 69 used by our author to frame the series quotation (*PP* 61-64) and its exposition. Because the two lists share much in common, their differences are all the more interesting. One specific difference is that in *PP* 59, the prophets are cited as examples of the proclaimed mystery, while in *PP* 69, the claim is made that "Christ" is *in* these prophets. Again, there are two different verbs used in two similar pairs: "Isaac bound" and "prophets suffered/dishonored." In *PP* 69, moreover, there are two additional phrases: "in Jacob exiled" and "in the lamb slain." The two passages read as follows:

***PP* 59**	***PP* 69**
Therefore if you wish to see the mystery of the Lord,	He is the Pascha of our salvation.
	It is he who in many endured many things:
look at Abel who is similarly murdered	it is he that was in Abel murdered
at Isaac who is similarly bound	and in Isaac bound
	and in Jacob exiled
at Joseph who is similarly sold	and in Joseph sold
at Moses who is similarly exposed	and in Moses exposed
	and in the lamb slain
at David who is similarly persecuted	and in David persecuted
at the prophets who similarly suffer for the sake of Christ	and in the prophets dishonored

A comparison of the two lists looks like this:

***PP* 59**	***PP* 69**
Abel—murdered (see *PP* 72, 75)	Abel—murdered
Isaac—*bound* (*sumpodizomenon*)	Isaac—*bound* (*detheis*)
	Jacob—exiled (not in B)
Joseph—sold	Joseph—sold
Moses—exposed	Moses—exposed
	lamb—slain (not in B)
David—persecuted	David—persecuted

prophets—*suffer* (*paschontas*) prophets—*dishonored* (*atimastheis*)

The two verb dissimilarities between the lists are intriguing. The first pair focuses on the phrase, "Isaac bound." *PP* 59 uses *sumpodizomenon* (bound), also found in LXX Gen. 22.9 in the story of Abraham and Isaac at the altar (*Akedah*). *PP* 69, however, has *detheis* (bound), used in Matt. 27.2 describing Jesus being bound and taken to Pilate.[104] The verb choice does not appear arbitrary, as each of these verbs seems better suited to the immediate context of each list, for in *PP* 59 the Passover and Jewish history is highlighted, while in *PP* 69 the emphasis is on the Passion.[105] Comparisons with other Greek texts having similar lists would be useful here, but unfortunately no other Greek text is preserved except a reconstructed text attributed to John Chrysostom.[106]

The questions arise whether our author modified one or both of the lists in the homily, and whether one or both verbs are original to the tradition received by our homilist. In frag. 9, *sumpodisas* (as in LXX Gen. 22.9) is used discussing the "mystery" that was enacted by Abraham and Isaac, while frag. 10 has *desmōn/detheis* twice (see *PP* 69) in speaking about Jesus as the ram that saved Isaac .[107]

If these fragments were written by our homilist, one could conclude that the author consistently used the different verbs in the specific contexts noted above, though such usage might have been taken from tradition. If these fragments are not from our homilist's pen, then the data might suggest the two verbs played specific roles in developing traditions.[108] Adding to this similarity the almost unique use of *eis*

---

[104]Refer to the discussion concerning the Is. 3.10 quotation below in Part II which in the OG and in our homily has the *deō* verb, but which is also preserved in several writers (no extant biblical manuscripts) with a variant *airō* reading.

[105]The other verb difference occurs in the mention of the prophets. In *PP* 59, our homilist writes that the prophets suffer for Jesus' sake, portraying the suffering of "Christ" in their sufferings. In *PP* 69, however, the prophets are dishonored, perhaps drawing on Jesus' claim to be without honor in his own town (Matt. 13.57). Both frag. 15 and the "Irenaeus" form read, "who in David and in the prophets predicted his sufferings."

[106]See M. Richard, "Témoins grecs des fragments 13 et 15 de Méliton de Sardes." As noted above, it is unfortunate that the preserved sections of Ps. Epiphanius' *De resurrectione* do not include a list.

[107]The *deō* verb is used in several places: 1) *PP* 11 referring to binding Pharaoh; 2) *PP* 68 in A only, referring to binding the devil in grief (BL has *stēsas*, CG has *fecit*); 3) *PP* 72 in the quotation from Is. 3.10; 4) *PP* 79, referring to binding Jesus' hands; and 5) *PP* 100, where the reference reads, "and ['the Lord' when he had] been bound because of him that was held fast."

[108]In frag. 11, the term *empepodismenon* is used in the phrase, "and the lamb, the Lord fettered for slaughter." The context is a typological explanation of the *Akedah* in Gen. 22, noting the significance of the ram caught in the thicket.

sphagēn in the Is. 53.7 passage, it seems very possible that our homilist is the author of these fragments.

That said, I do not think the fragments can link our homilist to Eusebius' Melito conclusively for at least two reasons. First, the homily is so different from what Eusebius would lead us to believe. Second, the fragments themselves are ambiguous on the authorship question, offering Melito of Sardis, Eusebius of Emesa, and anonymity as options.

It may be helpful here to pull into the discussion frags. 13 and 15. In asking whether our author composed both lists in the homily, some scholars point to the similarity of the lists to the fifth century Syriac frag. 15 attributed to "Melito the bishop." To bolster their claim, they recommend that frag. 15 would be a fitting conclusion to Melito of Sardis' *Extracts* noted in Eusebius.[109] This latter conjecture is based on the phrase in the fragment's opening sentences, "from the law and the prophets we have collected these things."[110]

Several points caution against that assumption, however, including the various forms in which this list circulated and the several persons[111] to whom the list is attributed.[112] Frag. 15 is found in the same Syraic florilegium as frag. 13, also attributed to Melito of Sardis, from his treatise *On Body and Soul*.[113] Nautin asserts that both the "Melito" form (frag. 15) and the "Irenaeus" material are pseudonymous. Noting similarities between frag. 15 and Hippolytus' writings, he suggests that

---

[109]See Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. xxxvii, who writes, "Because the introduction refers to these Christological truths being gathered 'from the law and the prophets,' it has been repeatedly suggested that it forms the conclusion of Melito's *Extracts*."

[110]See Appendix A: Fragment 15 and the "Irenaeus" form (found in the florilegium of Timothy Ailuros) of the text.

[111]Other similar lists include several attributed to Irenaeus preserved most fully in the Armenian manuscripts of the florilegium of Timothy Ailuros, a prayer attributed to John Chrysostom (Greek), and a tenth century homiliary fragment attributed to Athanasius (Georgian). The "Athanasius" material, which includes a form of the list and much more, might preserve some traditional material used by our homilist, inasmuch as the similarities are found in the context of our homily's quotations.

[112]Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, pp. xxxvii-viii, provides a convenient summary of the evidence in his edition.

[113]Frag. 13 has been preserved in various forms in Syriac under the name Alexander, Bishop of Alex., as well as in a work titled by its first editor the *Additamentum*, and in Ps. Epiphanius *De resurrectione* (in Greek). Parts of both frags. 13 and 15 have been preserved in the same Georgian homiliary which contains parallels with Ps. Epiphanius' *De resurrectione* noted above. Thus there is a Greek parallel for parts of frags. 13 and 15, though unfortunately no list is preserved in the Greek.

frag. 15 drew from Hippolytus' works as well as from our *PP*.[114] H. Jordan, who edited the "Irenaeus" material, believes Irenaeus to be the original author, and judges the "Melito" material to be secondary.[115] Hall and Bonner suggest the fragment's attribution to Melito is probably correct, though Hall points out the possibility that "the resemblances [of frag. 15] to *PP* are due to imitation."[116]

I submit that the evidence points to an early, developing homiletic tradition. Our homily is the earliest and briefest preserved attestation to this tradition; the forms characterized by frag. 15 and "Irenaeus" help trace the tradition's trajectories. The similarities between *PP* and frag. 15 or the "Irenaeus" material are best explained as additions and emendations to the developing homiletic thought expressed in the lists. Moreover, the differences between our homily, the "Irenaeus" material and frag. 15 caution against concluding that our homily's author also wrote frag. 15. For example, in frag. 15, David and the prophets predict Jesus' sufferings, but in the homily, the prophets suffer for the sake of "Christ" (*PP* 59), or "Christ" in the prophets is dishonored (*PP* 69). In both of the homily's lists, David is persecuted. Again, in frag. 15, Moses is a captain, but in the homily, Moses is exposed. One finds no mention in frag. 15 of Abel (*PP* 59, 69) or of the lamb slain (*PP* 69).

Hall points to phrases found in list form in frag. 15 which are scattered throughout the homily as evidence for the same author composing both.[117] Frag. 15 mentions Jesus' death, and a phrase is found: "who was taken up to the heavens." In the homily, however, a favorite expression of the author appears to be "the heights of heaven," (*PP* 46, 70, 99, 102, 103). Even more, frag. 15 presents the Father and the Son as separate beings, while our homilist can be less specific about it. For example, in *PP* 105 one reads, "he carries the Father and is carried by the Father." *PP* 9 includes the phrase, "inasmuch as he begets, Father; inasmuch as he is begotten, Son." In frag. 15, however, the author writes, "in the Father a Son," and "God from God, Son from the Father." These important differences in thought mitigate against the claim that frag. 15 and the homily's lists are by the same author, unless one posits that frag. 15 has been significantly altered by a subsequent editor, reflecting more "orthodox" language describing the "Father" and the "Son."

If our homilist was responsible for producing the original list which subsequently developed in several forms, one must imagine that our

---

[114]P. Nautin, *Le Dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1953):64-72.
[115]H. Jordan, pp. 56-99. See also P. Nautin, ibid., pp. 64-5.
[116]Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. xxxviii.
[117]Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. xxxviii.

homily quickly became very influential, or perhaps that *PP* 59 and/or 69 were widely disseminated. While possible, this is hard to demonstrate because the homily's influence in later works is difficult to determine.[118] More likely is that our homilist drew from a tradition circulating and influencing several ancient authors. This hypothesis can account for both the similarities among the lists (they spring from a single source or tradition), as well as their differences (they are edited by authors and community traditions).

Bonner hints at this conclusion in his edition of the homily:

> It would not be strange if, even among phrases and ideas that are found elsewhere, some should be the creations of a man endowed with an imagination so vivid and poetical as Melito evidently possessed; yet on the other hand nothing is more likely than that Melito should now and then have incorporated older liturgical matter in his own more emotional passages, just as Paul did.[119]

I propose that in the case of the lists in *PP* 59 and *PP* 69, a strong possibility exists that our homilist did incorporate a traditional source, thus becoming one more piece of evidence in that tradition's developing history. I think it likely that a single tradition is behind the lists in *PP* 59 and *PP* 69 because of their numerous similarities.[120] The author's modifications can be studied by an analysis of the additional phrases in *PP* 69.

The phrase "Jacob exiled," found only in *PP* 69, is puzzling. Hall raises the question of its typological significance for our homilist: to what in Jesus' life does this "exile" refer? He postulates either Jesus' travel to Egypt as a boy (Matt. 2.13-23), or his rejection by people in his hometown (Luke 4.23-9 and perhaps John 1.11).[121] Hall's suggestion is plausible, but the homily offers no hints to explain the "Jacob exiled" phrase. The answer to this problem might lie outside the homily in the other lists. The "Jacob exiled" phrase occurs in every other list—in frag. 15, in the "Athanasius" material, and in the "Irenaeus" form. This might suggest that the phrase was part of the tradition received by our homilist, who

---

[118]Some authors are recorded as commenting on Melito of Sardis, for example, Jerome claims Tertullian refers to Melito's prophetic nature (*De Viris Ill.* 24), Eusebius writes a comment from Clement of Alex. about "Melito's" work on the Pascha (*EH* 4.26.4), and Origen asks "who does not know the books of Irenaeus and Melito and the rest, which proclaim Christ as God and Man?" (Frag. 8a; *Sel. in Gen.* 1.26). None of these writers (including Eusebius) quote a passage from our homily; moreover, because we are treating the homily as anonymous, references to "Melito" cannot be assumed to refer to our homilist.

[119]Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion*, p. 23.

[120]One might also hypothesize that the received list was modified by the author in both *PP* 59 and 69, but determining this possibility is much more difficult.

[121]Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. 37, n. 36.

chose to remove it from the list in *PP* 59. It is possible that subsequent copyists of *PP* dropped the phrase, though the probability that both A and B would independently do so is not high. If the phrase's absence is the result of a copyist, it seems more likely that it was a copyist of the archetype for both A and B. It may also be that the Greek copyists knew of the tradition which included the "Jacob exiled" phrase and chose to insert it only in *PP* 69, though nothing in the homily itself suggests why it might be inserted only in *PP* 69.

Interestingly, the other additional phrase in *PP* 69, "the lamb slain," is found only in A and L, not in B. The Georgian version of the homily places it after the phrase, "in David persecuted." The reference to Jesus being "in the lamb slain" may be tied to the immediately preceding discussion of the Passover where, in *PP* 67, Jesus is associated with the Passover lamb/sheep. In light of its relevance to the immediate context, as well as its absence in any of the other listings, one is tempted to argue that our homilist added "in the lamb slain" to the list in *PP* 69.

Several significant points, however, caution against the conclusion that our author is responsible for the phrase "lamb slain." First, the wording *amnō sphageis* represents a unique combination of noun and verb in the homily, for in almost every case where one has the verb *sphagō*, it is coupled with the term *probaton* (sheep).[122] In the Is. 53.7-8 quotation, as well as in *PP* 3, 4, 8, 16, 30, 31, 33, 44 and 59, the sheep/slain combination is found. It is not impossible for our author to have broken from the existing pattern here, as the phrase works well in the context and the two-syllable word *amnos* (lamb) fits with the poetic meter of the list. Yet the unique combination of terms, coupled with the phrase's absence in B, and its different placement in the Georgian, all seem to suggest that this phrase is an interpolation by a later copyist of A or perhaps a marginal insertion that became included at different places in A and the Georgian.

Before leaving this examination of the lists in *PP* 59 and 69, and the other material which include similar listings, it seems constructive to discuss the possible relationship between our homily, the "Athanasius" material in the Georgian homiliary, and the fragmentary Greek of Ps. Epiphanius (that, at times, shares similar readings with "Athansius,") thereby demonstrating a possible trajectory of traditional sources used by our homilist. Not only do these writings include parts of the lists in *PP* 59 and 69, but also short phrases found as well in our homily. An example of this evolving tradition is the phrase in *PP* 90, "repaying him with ungrateful acts, evil for good, and affliction for joy, and death for

[122]In *PP* 71, the phrase reads *houtos estin ho amnos ho phoneuomenos* (he is the lamb being slain).

life." Ps. Epiphanius, *De resurrectione* 3 is only slightly different in the first line,[123] while the "Athanasius" material includes the same three "ungrateful acts" in a similar context.

In a second example, *PP* 72 includes a list of acts Jesus is said to have done; a similar list of deeds is found in the "Athanasius" material, though in a different order:

***PP* 72**	**"Athanasius"**
healed the lame,	raised the dead,
cleansed the leper,	healed the lame,
given light to the blind,	cleansed the lepers,
and raised the dead.	restored sight to the blind

The Greek of Ps. Epiphanius is similar to the *PP*, but follows the order of the "Athanasius" material, omitting the phrase about the cleansed lepers.

Third, "Athanasius" includes a more explicit explanation of material found in *PP* 100, though the topics of "judge" and "bound" are reversed in the two writings, and the placement of the subject of suffering is different in each writer's discussion.

> *PP* 100: "The Lord, when he had clothed himself with man and suffered because of him that was suffering and been bound because of him that was held fast and been judged because of him that was condemned and been buried because of him that was buried,"
>
> *"Athanasius" material:* "And the Lord was born a man and was judged in order to pity man and was bound in order to loose and was flogged in order to pardon, he suffered passion for you by the cross to free you from passions, he died by the cross to make you alive by the cross, he was buried to raise you."

I am persuaded that our homilist is drawing from a source or tradition, because the shared material between the *PP* and "Athanasius" is connected with what I have proposed are derivative-biblical quotations or allusions. In *PP* 90, the phrase "repaid me evil for good," is also found in *PP* 72, a variant rendering of Ps. 35.12. In *PP* 72, the homilist records the composite quotation and then offers a string of deeds which Jesus did but "Israel" ignored. The description of Jesus (suffered, bound, judged, buried) in *PP* 100 is concluded with a quotation from Is. 50.8. In each case, the shared material in the homily is closely connected with a quotation that I suggest comes from a derivative-biblical source.

The tradition used by our homilist may have been loosely organized around scriptural phrases, to which were added descriptive

---

[123]Note here the use of *ponēra* for "evils," contrasted with our homilist's choice of *kaka*.

characterizations of God or Jesus that were seen to develop the sense of the scriptural material. Again, it is possible that headings or topics were collected, and in some cases scriptural references were added. I suspect that the latter is the case in our homily, primarily because it is only in the homily that the various phrases seem intimately connected with blocks of scriptural material. In the "Athanasius" material and in the "Irenaeus" form, those lists might be best categorized as a group of headings or topics, with short phrases found also in biblical material scattered lightly throughout. It may be that only our homilist chose to include scriptural material, and that the other authors chose only the headings, but this argument from silence should not be pushed too far. From the evidence preserved, it seems that a fluid tradition of headings and proof-texts circulated in several forms (perhaps both written and oral), and that the lists extant in various writings highlight the developing tradition.

Summary of the Fragment Evidence

Do these fragments help answer the authorship question? The similarities suggest that one author was behind fragments 9, 10 and 11 and the homily. Or perhaps more cautiously, our homilist shares with the fragments certain textual similarities from the biblical tradition behind Is. 53 and Gen. 22. I am willing to admit that our homilist and the fragments' author are one and the same, but given the fragments' late date, it is entirely plausible that one of the catena's copyist attached the name "Melito" to these fragments. It seems prudent to proceed circumspectly here, as no name is attached to the sections in one copy of the catena, and in two other copies, the name associated is Eusebius of Emesa, so the tradition itself is not unanimous in its attribution. If the name Melito is accurate, and reflects the "Melito" found on two of the three early MSS of the homily, it is still possible that our catena copyist attached the provenance of Sardis because of the tradition encouraged by Eusebius which places a bishop Melito in Sardis.

The fragments, then, did not establish the author of our homily, though they did demonstrate how our homily shares in the developing traditions of scriptural usage and interpretation. As we turn to examine the homily itself, it is with an eye to the most urgent questions asked of it today.

Anti-Judaism in the Homily

Eric Werner has bestowed upon our homilist the dubious distinction of being the "first poet of Deicide."[124] While not all scholars would agree with that characterization, the homily has played an important role in the interpretation of early Christian sentiments towards Jews and Judaism.

It may be helpful here to discuss briefly G. Langmuir's thesis on anti-Judaism and antisemitism. He defines anti-Judaism as the "total or partial opposition to Judaism—and to Jews as adherents of it—by people who accept a competing system of beliefs and practices and consider certain genuine Judaic beliefs and practices as inferior."[125] This attitude and behavior is not limited to Christians, by his definition, though he does recognize that Christians had more to lose in their fight against Judaism as its continued existence called into question of the veracity of Christian truth claims.

Antisemitism is the attribution to Jews of bizarre, cruel, physically definable deeds that, incongruously, no one has ever seen nor will because the deeds were to have been done in secret. Thus, it is irrational hostility or "chimeria," a term Langmuir coined from the Greek mythological monster to imply a fantasy or figment of the imagination.[126] He makes it clear that the basis for arguing beliefs in an anti-Jewish system are non-rational, while the antisemitic arguments are irrational. This distinction is important to him, for he wants to avoid the erroneous conclusion that there was no difference "in fundamental nature, only in intensity and the technology applied, from the riots in ancient Alexandria in the first century of the Common Era or from any other hostility Jews have ever had to face...nothing uniquely evil in quality about the Final Solution, only a quantitative difference."[127]

In fact there were significant, fundamental shifts in mental processes which led to antisemitism. These are ignored or overlooked, Langmuir alleges, because of the underlying assumption "that there has always been something uniquely valuable in Jewishness, because Jews have always incorporated and preserved uniquely superior values."[128] As such, it was only "natural" that non-Jews would meet such uniqueness

---

[124]Eric Warner, "Melito of Sardis, the First Poet of Deicide," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 37 (1966):191-210.

[125]Gavin I. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (CA: Univ. of California Press, 1990):57. See also John Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1983) and Judith Lieu, "History and Theology in Christian Views of Judaism," in *The Jews among Pagans and Christians*, ed. by Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak (NY: Routledge, 1992):79-92.

[126]Ibid., p. 334.

[127]Ibid., p. 314.

[128]Ibid., p. 315.

with a correspondingly idiosyncratic hostility. But a shift did occur, in which prejudices or "chimeria" were asserted, "monsters that, although dressed syntactically in the clothes of real humans, have never been seen and are projections of mental processes unconnected with the real people of the outgroup."[129] Because there was no truth to these claims, they produce a hostility very different in source from that hostility shown by early Christians who did argue about verifiable historic events, such as the crucifixion or the Fall of Jerusalem.

In the early centuries, the charges leveled against Jews were not provable by empirical data or methods, but by nonrational or symbolic thinking patterns. In that time, for example, Christians attacked Jews for disbelieving the "truth" about Jesus (that he was the Messiah), but did not accuse them of irrational behavior, such as ritual killing. In fact, what they accused the Jews of was "true"; Jews did not believe Jesus was the Messiah. Of course, Christians then applied a nonrational religious evaluation to that perspective, which denigrated and condemned Jews, charging them with (willfully?) failing to use their nonrational thinking patterns. These interpretations were very defensive, as boundaries were being drawn between the groups. Langmuir defines this type of anti-Judaism as "doctrinal" because the Christians set out to "prove that Christians were the true Israel and that most adherents of Judaism before Jesus and all of its adherents thereafter were at the least inferior to Christians and, at the strongest, the polar enemies of Christianity."[130]

When empirical, rational argument became part of nonrational religious debate during the eleventh century, however, Jews were now viewed not only as unbelieving in a nonrational sense, but now as incapable of rational thought (irrational behavior). They were not defined as human because they did not have the capacity for rational thought. The influx of rational empiricism into the religious dialogue also created a new sort of doubt among ordinary and learned Christians (for example, discussions concerning the literal bodily presence of the first century Jesus in the Eucharist). "Christians who were seriously troubled by their own doubts were therefore predisposed to believe any charges that buttressed their own beliefs by depicting contemporary Jews as eternally deficient and evil, not only Christ-killers but also an immediate, if camouflaged, danger to contemporary Christians."[131] Once empirical verification became part of Christians' attempt to understand

[129]Ibid., p. 334. What is so insidious about antisemitism is the inability to argue against it, as "it is remarkably difficult to establish the negative proposition [ie. Jews do not perform ritual murder] that physically possible conduct has never occurred," p. 335.
[130]Ibid., p. 58.
[131]Ibid., p. 133.

their faith and their doubts, it created the possibility that the Jews, always seen as unbelievers (and in fact that is "true") were now charged with (supposedly) empirically verifiable fiendish, irrational behavior. This latter shift in belief is commonly called "antisemitism."

This careful distinction between anti-Judaism and antisemitism and the underlying shift in thought processes occurring (primarily) in the eleventh century helps us understand just how our homilist and others in the early centuries dealt with their arguments against Judaism and Jews. Significantly, it shows that Christians were very interested in nonrational debate with Jews, and that this dialogue was carried on at an intellectual level. Christians placed religious interpretations on verifiable and agreed upon events (though Christians might exaggerate the event), such as the Fall of Jerusalem. Both Jews and Christians agreed that Rome destroyed Jerusalem, but then Christians interpreted the event as signifying God's rejection of Judaism (not a position shared by Jews). Again, both agreed that the Hebrew Bible was from God, but then there grew disparate interpretations of that text. This involved predominately intellectual debate, and did not necessarily prevent the average Jew and Christian from shopping together, or working side by side. The doubts and defenses of Christians were nonrational, and could be handled by nonrational arguments. Langmuir's careful argument illuminates how our homilist could write virulently against Jews of the Bible and New Testament period, and yet see contemporary Jews as non-threatening in a social or cultural sense.

Scholars have grown increasingly interested in discovering what drove our author to such apparent excesses against "Israel." Coupled with the first pursuit is the attempt by scholars to sketch just who the author had in mind when ranting against "Israel." Is it referring to biblical Jews of the scriptures or contemporary Jews or both? Some suggest that the term might be a foil against which Christian beliefs are highlighted, making "Israel" merely a caricature of Judaism. A review and evaluation of the various positions will be based largely on the information from the homily itself.

Ho laos and "Israel" in the Homily

Exploring the use of the term "the people" (*ho laos*, 18 occurrences) in the homily (the terms "Jews" or "Judaism" are absent from the homily), one finds that throughout the homily in every case but two the term "the people" refers to (1) ancient Hebrews of the Ex. 12 passage, (2) those who serve as a model or type fulfilled by the church, or (3) those present at the crucifixion (*PP* 98) who did not tremble, tear their clothes or lament.

The two exceptions include *PP* 19, where *ho laos* refers to the Egyptians mourning the loss of their firstborn. The other exception is more interesting. Found in *PP* 68, the phrase *kai laon* refers to the church. On the one hand, K. W. Noakes points out that this reference seems uncharacteristic of the homily, and suggests that the clause "[he] made us a new priesthood and an eternal people personal to him" is an interpolation. He cites as textual support the fact that B does not include this clause.[132] Moreover, the characterization of the church as a new priesthood appears to be a new, if not foreign, idea in the homily.[133]

On the other hand, the phrase could be understood as a scriptural echo from Ex. 19.5-6, 23.22, or from 1 Pet. 2.9 and resounded in Justin's *Dial.* 116. Our author might be alluding to the phrase from either the Jewish scriptures or NT writings, or perhaps a Christian tradition which incorporated the concept. The fact that only the word *laon* is used, with a modifying adjective and without the article, might suggest that the entire clause was part of a tradition that in our author's mind was separate from *ho laos* as used throughout the rest of the homily. While Noakes' position has textual backing from the homily, the phrase itself has a traditional ring, cautioning against any conclusive answers on whether the clause is an interpolation.

Judith Lieu suggests that because the term "the people" was used as a self-designation by contemporary Jews, our homilist must have had in mind both this group and biblical Jews. She points out that our homilist never denies contemporary Jews the use of this term. But her argument works only if one assumes, as she does, that the term refers to both groups. The homily does not unequivocally do so. Even if we grant her argument, she herself recognizes its limits, for she appraises that "he simply empties it [*ho laos*] of present value."[134] In fact, I would argue that it is precisely because it is used by contemporary Jews that our homilist chooses to "re-define" it and "control" the term, relegating its meaning to the past.

It also appears to be the case that "Israel" can be used synonymously in some places with *ho laos*. In *PP* 16, 30, and 31, they seem to be used interchangeably. The differences in nuance seem to lie in the following directions: when contrasting the church to the Hebrews of the first Passover, "the people" is used (*PP* 40, 41, 43); however, when the Passion is discussed, then "Israel" is blamed for Jesus' death (*PP* 73, 74, 76, 77, 81, 87, 96). Our author develops the supersessionary stance by speaking of

---

[132]Unfortunately, the Latin has a lacuna at this point.
[133]K. W. Noakes, "Melito of Sardis and the Jews," *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975):249.
[134]Lieu, p. 215.

"the people" as model and the church as fulfillment.[135] The group designated "Israel" is not a model for the later church; our author boldly asserts it was never "Israel," for it never "saw God" (*PP* 82).[136]

The homilist presents a well developed and tightly organized discussion against "Israel," beginning essentially with *PP* 72, the composite quotation. The passage opens with the statement that "it is he [the lamb] that has been murdered" in the middle of Jerusalem. Then follows a question found only in C-S, Syriac, Latin and Georgian: "By whom? By Israel." It is unfortunate that A has a lacuna at this section of text; Bonner does not leave room in his reconstruction of A for this phrase, but Hall argues for the possibility that A could have included the phrase.[137] The more continuous text in B has no such phrase.

In the homily, "Israel's" behavior and attitude are contrasted to Jesus' character and deeds. The benefactions given by Jesus allude to episodes mentioned in canonical and non-canonical gospels and in the canonical Acts. For example, in *PP* 72 our author claims that Jesus healed the blind and lame (Mk. 8.22-26, Matt. 9.1-8), cleansed the lepers (Mk. 2.40-44), and raised the dead (presumably referring to the raising of Lazarus, John 11). Again, in *PP* 86 a brief reference is made to Jesus healing the "suffering ones," and raising the dead. This passage accuses "Israel" of wronging and killing Jesus and, surprisingly, ends with the claim that "Israel" "extorted money, demanding from him [Jesus] his two-drachma poll-tax." This may be a reference to Matt. 17.24-27, where Jesus supplies money for Roman taxes by asking Peter to catch a fish, which holds in its mouth the tax money. Jesus then asks Peter a general question about who is to pay taxes, the son or "foreigners" (*allotriōn*)? In both the gospel story and our homily, the focus is on identifying the "true" children of God. The homily argues that because "Israel" killed Jesus, they "had to die" (*PP* 90). Our author is likely arguing here that, with "Israel" dead, only a Christian can be a child of God.

There are also references to biblical "Israel's" experiences in *PP* 83-85 (which echos faintly Stephen's speech in Acts 7.1-53). Bonner suspects there were traditions circulating which listed various allegations against "Israel." He claims that *PP* 83-85 and *Apost. Const.* 6.3.1 and 6.20.6 reflect a common Jewish liturgical source, emended by Christians. To support his contention, he cites the unusual term, *mannadatēsas* (manna), found

---

[135]A case could be made that our author sees the "people" as the model's material (*hulē*), which becomes obsolete with the final product. The model itself, on the other hand, is fulfilled with the completion of the final project. "Just so also the law was fulfilled when the gospel was elucidated, and the people was made void when the church arose" (*PP* 43).

[136]This etymology of "Israel" is found also in Philo, *De mutatione nominum* 81.

[137]Hall, "The Melito Papyri," pp. 491-92.

only in the homily and the *Apost. Const.*[138] Hall, however, discredits the notion by observing that all of Bonner's other alleged similarities arise from the Jewish Scriptures, thus one need not postulate a liturgical source.[139] Yet Hall assumes that our homilist used biblical manuscripts directly, a position challenged in the present study. Moreover, *PP* 59 and *PP* 69 likely reflect a traditional list of ancient worthies originating from Jewish hands. Another possible use of traditional material is the list of sexual sins in *PP* 53, which includes a phrase from Jer. 5.8. Bonner's point has some merit, then, considering the probable role of traditional material in our homily.

The characteristics of "Israel" in the homily's anti-Jewish section seem to define the group as those Jews who participated in the Passion as presented in canonical and non-canonical gospel accounts. One is struck with the overwhelming number of biblical comparisons and the absence of examples of second or third century CE Jewish practices. Whereas in Chrysostom's sermons against the Judaizers there are numerous examples of specific interactions between Christians and Jews in fourth century Antioch,[140] our homily offers only characteristics or incidents from biblical accounts. "Israel's" crime is that it did not recognize the miracles of Jesus or the person of Jesus as the Messiah (*PP* 84-90).

Stephen Wilson argues that the lack of specific details about contemporary Jews is only natural given that the topic of the homily revolves around the Passion. He adds that the boundaries between past and present might be blurred at a few places, such as in *PP* 12 ("and towards evening you shall slay it with the sons of Israel, and in the night you shall eat it with haste"); *PP* 73-74 ("What strange crime, Israel, have you committed?"); *PP* 87 ("Ungrateful Israel, come and take issue with me about your ingratitude. How much did you value being formed by him?"); and *PP* 89, which includes details of a restored withered hand, light given to the blind, and a dead person raised. In each case, however, it seems to me that Jews involved with the Passion or as part of Jewish history are the focus. The reference to Ex. 12 in *PP* 12 does not necessarily indicate that Jews our author might have known celebrated Passover; no unambiguous evidence remains in the homily or in the archaeological evidence for Diaspora Judaism to make an assessment. *PP* 73- 4 further explains the charge in *PP* 72 that Jesus has been murdered by "Israel." Both *PP* 87 and 89 have a similar theme, the failure of "Israel" to "value"

---

[138]Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion*, pp. 25-27 and 147.
[139]Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. 47, n. 52.
[140]For example, see Chrysostom, *Hom. in Rom.* 12.20.3 on Sabbath practices, see *Disc.* 1.2, 5 on festival practices, and see *Disc.* 1.3 on oath taking.

what Jesus has done for them, using incidents also found in Jewish scripture stories and canonical gospels. Thus the examples provided by Wilson can be better understood as referring to historical Jews from the biblical traditions and especially the life and death of Jesus. "Israel" does not point to a contemporary Jewish community against which our author was writing, but rather to an abstract ideal used as a foil for the homilist's definition of Christianity.

Wilson protests that within the position taken here, which identifies "Israel" as a stylized group taken from biblical scriptures and traditions, one finds a fundamental flaw, namely, that it does not ask what our author's audience might have thought when "Israel" was denounced. Wilson petitions, "Is it likely that he [our author] and his audience would in these moments have thought solely of the Jews of the first century who killed Jesus and not of their Jewish contemporaries? This is possible, but, I think, unlikely."[141] The important point to be made here is that scholars, working with the available evidence, can only speculate on possible reactions and draw analogies from other points in history where it seems that rhetoric against "biblical Jews" fomented attacks against contemporary Jews.

Wilson, assuming that the *PP* represents Sardis in the later second century CE,[142] is right that our homily might have incited some in the Christian community, but no unequivocal evidence can be assembled to say whether this occurred or not. Accepting for the sake of argument his Sardis provenance for the homily, one could point to the later evidence of Jewish and Christian shops lined up together on the outer wall of the excavated Sardis synagogue as evidence that our homily had little negative effect on relations between the two groups. The close working conditions could imply that some Christians did not necessarily connect the Jews of the Passion with their Jewish neighbors. Frankly, this positive perspective by Christians of Jews might have angered our homilist. It may be that in Sardis (and other cities), Christians did not look upon their Jewish neighbors primarily as "religious folk" but as fellow Sardians (citizens) or, more negatively, as a privileged ethnic group. It may be that the homily piqued the curiosity of its listeners, resulting in some visiting the synagogue. Chrysostom seems to lament as much when he complains that one should not talk too much about the Jews and their synagogue because some Christians are thereby encouraged to

---

[141]Wilson, "Melito and Israel," p. 94.

[142]I have argued above that the Sardis provenance is based on evidence which is at best precarious, and thus it seems prudent to proceed without assuming such. Yet to dialogue with others about the homily, I will at times assume with them a Sardis provenance to address their argument.

go and see for themselves. In fact, there may be several possible reactions among our homilist's listeners/readers; but nothing points to a particular response.

Lieu suggests that although the second century CE dating of the synagogue is unsupportable, and thus the confident group represented by the fourth century CE Sardian Jews of the excavated synagogue cannot serve as the backdrop for our homilist, she does believe that this synagogue projects an *image* which can be set beside our homily to explore the relationship between *image* and *reality.* She persists, despite her own reservations about an early synagogue date, that the characteristics of the Jews represented by the fourth century synagogue, specifically their adaptation to Sardis without assimilation, are likely true of the Jews concurrent with our author. But she observes that from the fourth to the fifth century, rabbinic Judaism took hold and grew. I wonder, then, how sure we can be about the picture of Judaism 100 years or more *before* the synagogue remains, if 100 years after its handing over to the Jews significant changes occurred in the community. In fact, I am persuaded that the synagogue remains cannot provide any reliable information about Judaism during the time of our author. Even more, I advocate caution in assigning a Sardis milieu to the homily. To know what our author might have faced, we need to look generally at late second or early third century (Diaspora) Judaism.[143]

Lieu continues that *PP* 90 specifically, in using the perfect tense, brings "Israel" into the present. That "Israel" deserves to die intimates that they are still around; they are the "implied defendant"[144] who is called to account. Yet the picture painted by our homilist is of a defeated, destroyed, despondent Judaism. Clearly this is not an accurate historical likeness, but a carefully crafted theological substitute.

Kraabel poses another question to the position that the homily does not reveal information about contemporary Jews, namely its consistency in handling the New Testament authors' relationship to Jews. He points out that most scholars believe that Matthew or John, for example, reveal in their discussion of Jesus their own communities' relationship with other Jews. Yet most scholars also note the developing typological or non-historical use of Jews/Judaism in Revelation or Hebrews, for example. Thus he concludes that even within the New Testament itself, one can have a typological discussion about Judaism and actual conflict

[143]Such a picture is very difficult to create, given the paucity of information from firmly datable Jewish sources. See Claudia Setzer, *Jewish Responses to Early Christians* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1994); see also *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire,* ed. Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak.

[144]Lieu, p. 217.

with Jews. He postulates the same is true with the homily, namely that the typological or idealized portrayal of Judaism ("Israel") in the homily also reflects actual interaction with Jews.

One cannot underestimate the importance, however, of the fact that the New Testament itself is first and foremost a collection, not a single work. Within that collection one finds both an "historical" or living and a "non-historical" or idealized portrait of Jews and Judaism, sometimes within the same text (Romans, Matthew, John). For example, scholars have identified the use of rhetoric in Romans, and determined that Paul has created in Rom. 2.16f a stylized Jewish teacher against whom Paul can argue his own theology.[145] Yet he also refers to Jews of his day in Rom. 10.1f. The burden upon modern scholarship is to distinguish the two, and not assume that any historical data can be gleaned from the idealized characterization.

David Efroymson notes that perhaps later Christian authors used the New Testament heritage in ways the New Testament authors could not have imagined. For example, some later writers, stylizing what is plausibly an actual conflict in Matthew or John, perpetuated the anger of those authors, but also expanded it rhetorically.[146] Thus what began as an actual conflict in Matthew's community,[147] for instance, continued in church history as stylized, formalized rhetoric against a caricature of Judaism. It may be that our author expanded the accusations in the gospel traditions, drew upon the anger reflected there, and even was angry at those very same Jews mentioned in the gospel stories. That is, both our author and Matthew, for example, were angry at the same people, based on a similar view of God and Jesus. Efroymson's observation is helpful as one possible way of interpreting some Christian authors' anti-Judaism. Miriam Taylor cautions, "To the extent that the Judaism portrayed by the church fathers is recognized as a figurative entity which emerges out of Christian theorizing about Christianity, it cannot simultaneously be interpreted as referring to a living Judaism

---

[145]Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994):144-153.

[146]Hans von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible,* trans. J. A. Baker (Phila., Fortress Press, 1972):68, writes, "But even where Judaism is directly in mind, as in Hebrews or Barnabas, the result of the confrontation is not so much a piece of straight polemic as of Christian introspection on the basis of their own belief, an exercise in intellectual reflection—one might almost say, of 'theology.'"

[147]For a discussion on Matthew's community, see Anthony Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1994); J. A. Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).

from which useful information can be gleaned about Jewish-Christian interaction."[148]

The consistent use of "Israel" in the latter part of the homily, coupled with the absence of the term "Jews," deserves comment.[149] In dealing with the Passion, many early Christian writers prefer the term "Jews" when casting blame for Jesus' death.[150] This suggests that our homilist had a particular reason for using only "Israel," which may be found in *PP* 82, where "Israel" is defined etymologically as to "see God." Those who were called "Israel" previously cannot be designated so now, because they did not recognize Jesus, who is understood in modalistic terms (see *PP* 7-9, 82-5, 96, 104). The battle between Christians and Jews over who has rights to the name "Israel" goes back to earliest days; for example, Paul closes his letter to the Galatians with the phrase, "to the Israel of God" (Gal. 6.16). Trypho asks in *Dial.* 123, "What then? Are you Israel?" to which Justin offers a lengthy reply in which he never claims directly that Christians are "Israel" but rather are "true sons of God." It may be that our author hoped to create tension by using "Israel" in a sarcastic way; some identify themselves as "Israel," but they have forfeited all rights to that name.

The term "Israel" is used in a singular way regarding Jesus' crucifixion in *PP* 96, which reads, "The king of Israel has been put to death by an Israelite right hand." The phrase "king of Israel" is not found in the canonical gospels, which instead use the phrase, "king of the Jews." Hall notes that the Gospel of Peter, however, reads "king of Israel" and suggests possible influence.[151]

Positing a symbolic use of the term "Israel" helps make sense of the triumphalism in the homily, as found in phrases like "So you quaked at

---

[148]M. Taylor, p. 141.

[149]One can only speculate as to why the term "Jew" is not found in the homily. The term itself seems to have carried several nuances. Wilson comments that Barnabas does not use the term "Jew" but rather "them" to distinguish from the author's group, "us." Wilson, *Related Strangers.* p. 129. Ross S. Kraemer, "On the Meaning of the Term 'Jew' in Greco-Roman Inscriptions," *HTR* 82 (1989):35-53 and "Jewish Tuna and Christian Fish: Identifying Religious Affiliation in Epigraphic Sources," *HTR* 84 (1991):141-62. See also Shaye J. D. Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," *HTR* 82 (1989):13-33, and Kraabel, "The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions," p. 455, who writes, "The terms [*ioudaioi* and *judaei*] will be found to denominate a religious group in some instances, but in others to mean something much closer to 'inhabitants of Judaea,' that is, persons of a particular country."

[150]For example, Justin, *Apol.* 38, 47, 49; Hippolytus uses the term "Jew" throughout his *Expository Treatise against the Jews* and in *Refutation Haer.* 13; and Tertullian refers to "Jews" in *Ad. Marc.* 3.6.1-10, 5.15.1-2, *Cult. Fem.* 1.3.3, *Fuga* 6.1-6.

[151]Hall, *Melito of Sardis,* p. 53, n. 57.

the assault of foes...you lamented over your first born...you tore [your clothes] over those who were slain...you were dashed to the ground...and you lie dead, but he has risen from the dead and gone up to the heights of heaven" (*PP* 99). Taylor rightly recommends that these words might echo the plight of the Egyptians mourning for their lost firstborn declared earlier in the homily.[152]

Egypt Foreshadowing Both Jesus and "Israel"

In *PP* 14 our author seems interested in describing the death of the firstborn[153] as occurring at night, in a "darkness that could be felt." It is with this darkness that the Pharaoh is clothed. One cannot underestimate the importance of this image for the homilist. Pharaoh is also clothed with grief, with all of Egypt mourning (*PP* 17), while Jesus is clothed with the "suffering one" (*PP* 46). The Egyptians tear their clothing, symbolizing their grief (*PP* 18). Later in the homily, the angel tears his own clothes (the Temple veil), lamenting the death of the Lord (*PP* 98). Even as the Egyptian parents lament over their firstborn's death, so too does "Israel" lament the dying of its firstborn (*PP* 99). Just as the Egyptians tore their clothes over those who died, so too did "Israel" tear its clothes over those slain (*PP* 99). The homilist announces to "Israel" that "you lie dead" (*PP* 99). "Israel's" behavior of making merry during the Passover comes back to haunt them, when they are charged with making merry while "he (Jesus) was starving" (*PP* 80). Connecting these parallels made by the homilist reinforces the impression that the episode of the tenth plague, the death of the Egyptian firstborn, prophesies the fate of "Israel."

Influence of the Temple's Destruction upon Christianity

Some early Christians pointed to the Temple's destruction as judgment by God upon Jews for the Passion.[154] The past tense of the verb used in *PP* 99 might indicate that our author is referring to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE and the banishment from Jerusalem of

---

[152]M. Taylor, p. 70.

[153]Our author, in *PP* 14, refers to the Lord "striking Egypt," a phrase from Ex. 12.23. Yet in *PP* 16, it is the angel who strikes Egypt. The emphasis on the angel is intriguing in that an angel also plays a role in the crucifixion story, *PP* 98. See Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion,* pp. 41-5 and "Two Problems in Melito's Homily on the Passion," pp. 182-190.

[154]See Justin, *Dial.* 52; Origin, *De Prin.* 4.1.3. For a discussion of the Temple's destruction in Christian thought in general and Chrysostom's in particular, see R. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews* (Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1983):128-160.

all Jews in 135 CE.[155] Justin writes that the Gen. 49.8-12 prophecy was fulfilled after the coming of Jesus, that a ruler shall not depart from Judah until that which is laid up in store for him shall come. Justin concludes "but after the manifestation and death of our Jesus Christ in your nation, there was and is nowhere any prophet...your land was laid waste and forsaken like a lodge in a vineyard" (*Dial.* 52, cf. Origen, *De Princ.* 4.1.3; Athanasius, *De incarn.* 39-40). These events fueled Christian convictions of the superiority of Christianity, and seem to be tied more to Christian attempts at self-definition than to attacks on Jews of the second to fourth century CE.

Chrysostom uses the Temple's destruction as proof of Judaism's illegitimacy in his apologetic works on Christianity and Hellenism. This seems to indicate that for Chrysostom, the Temple's destruction was a clear message to the Roman world that Judaism was defeated.[156] Many Christians held their breath when Emperor Julian began plans to rebuild the Jerusalem Temple in the fourth century CE. When those efforts failed, Chrysostom could claim that "Christ built the Church and no one is able to destroy it; he destroyed the Temple and no one is able to rebuild it" (*Jud. et gent.* 16, 48.835). Wilken writes that "in the Christian mind, the attempt to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem was a profound attack on the truth of Christianity."[157] Jews proximate to any Christian writers holding this position might have been prosperous, upstanding members of the community, but the Christian's theology was not so much interested in individual contemporary Jewish communities as in a theological position built in part on the interpretation of the Temple's destruction and on "proof-texting" from the Jewish scriptures.

Initial Perspectives on the Anti-Judaism in the Homily

One of the first scholars to examine the Greek text was Campbell Bonner. His treatment of our author's anti-Judaism in his edition is best characterized as minimal; he only has roughly a page on the idea. While classifying the homily as *adversus Judaeos* literature, he asserts that the text is primarily rhetorical, that our author is not arguing against contemporary Jews directly, but is describing and disparaging the ungrateful Jews of the gospel stories.[158] Bonner is not alone in his rather

---

[155]Noakes, p. 247, claims "the phrase 'you...were dashed to the ground,' recalls the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem in Luke 19.44, 'and (your enemies) shall dash you to the ground and your children within you.'"

[156]Yet note Hippolytus' claim in the early third century CE that the Temple's possible rebuilding signals the end times. *Ep. Barn.* 16 (second century CE) also comments on a threatened rebuilding of the Temple.

[157]Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*, p. 130.

[158]Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion*, p. 19-20.

brief description of the homily's anti-Judaism.[159] Most scholars, prior to the Sardis synagogue excavations, were interested primarily in the homily's Christology[160] or placement within the developing "orthodoxy."[161]

Though it is one option which has some support (including my own), Bonner's suggestion that the homily is written primarily about those Jews found in the biblical accounts is not the only, or even the predominant, interpretation of our author's violent language against "Israel." With the excavation of the Sardis synagogue in 1962, a fresh look was taken at the homily's anti-Judaism. Attention was given to possible social or political motivations for the attack on "Israel." As noted above, the synagogue was discovered by Hanfmann from the Harvard-Cornell team,[162] and was dated by Kraabel to the late second or early third century CE, and this dating has been unquestioned until recently.[163] Scholars have proposed possible impetuses behind the homily's rancor which can be loosely categorized into three main groups—a social/political motive, a religious/theological motive, and a self-definition motive.

Social/Political Roots of Anti-Judaism

Among scholars who have examined our homily, Kraabel is responsible for the much needed movement toward understanding the Jews of the early centuries of the Common Era as vibrant, interactive,

---

[159]For example, M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII*, mentions nothing about anti-Judaism. See also Robert Wilde, *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries* (Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1949):132-134. M. Simon does not include this homily in his *Verus Israel: a Study of Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425)*, trans. H. McKeating (Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1986), primarily because his work was almost complete by W.W.II, and it was two years later that Testuz's critical edition of the *PP* was published.

[160]For example, see R. Cantalamessa, "Méliton de Sardes: Une christologie antignostique du II siècle," *RevSR* 37 (1963):1-26. See also T. Halton, "The Death of Death in Melito, *Peri Pascha*," pp. 163-173.

[161]Hall might be placed in this category. He spends little if any time in his works discussing the anti-Jewish element in the homily, instead focusing primarily on the homily's possible relationship with emerging Jewish (rabbinic) and Christian liturgies surrounding Passover and Easter. Stephen Wilson comments upon this "omission" in "Melito and Israel," pp. 81-82 in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity* 2, ed. Stephen G. Wilson (Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 1986).

[162]George M. A. Hanfmann, *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times*. Note especially the contributed article "The Synagogue and the Jewish Community," by Andrew R. Seager, pp. 168-177.

[163]See above for a detailed critique of this early dating, and a general brief description of the Sardis synagogue.

contributing members of their local communities.[164] He suggests a picture of second century Sardian Jews as numerous, wealthy, influential, and as angered by Melito's *Apology* to Marcus Aurelius, wherein he states that Christians should receive special treatment because as Christianity grew, the Roman Empire prospered. Kraabel then extrapolates that our homilist was in a sense jealous of the very size, affluence and social prestige of the Jewish community as evidenced by their enormous synagogue and their long history in Sardis. Our author's anathema against them was fueled by the desire for more social or political influence by Christians.

Subsequent scholars have used this picture in a variety of ways.[165] Angerstorfer suggests that the synagogue building was transferred from Roman hands to Jewish ones in 166-167 CE, when Lucius Verus, on his way home from the Parthian wars, gave the building to the Jews.[166] She claims that the Hebrew inscription *BYRS* (often read *Beros*[167] for Verus the co-Emperor) is evidence that the synagogue paid tribute to the Emperor for this gesture.[168] She does not explain why Hebrew would be used to honor the Emperor, but I suggest it has to do with her position

---

[164]A. T. Kraabel, "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis: Text and Context," pp. 83-85. M. Simon, *Verus Israel,* p. 232, is often credited as being the first scholar to make this important claim about the vitality of Judaism in the Roman Empire.

[165]See Andrew M. Manis, "Melito of Sardis: Hermeneutic and Context," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 32 (1987):387-401; Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor,* pp. 31, 54; R. Wilken, "Melito, the Jewish Community at Sardis and the Sacrifice of Isaac," p. 53-69. As evidence that Kraabel's thesis has gained widespread influence, Judith Lieu writes, "Melito of Sardis has been labeled the 'first poet of deicide'; the virulence of his attack against Judaism may well owe more than a little to the vitality of Judaism in his home city as now attested by archaeology (Kraabel 1971)." Judith Lieu, "History and Theology in Christian Views of Judaism," p. 81 in *The Jews among Pagans and Christians.*

[166]Angerstorfer, 213.

[167]G. M. A. Hanfmann, "The Ninth Campaign at Sardis (1966)," *BASOR* 187 (1967):25. The only Hebrew word found at the synagogue site to date is *Shalom.*

[168]Trebilco writes, "One may have read 'Beros' ie 'Verus' and point to Lucius Verus, Co-Emperor with Marcus Aurelius (161-9 CE)." He adds the tentative suggestion, "The wall from which the fragment probably fell was built a century and a half after Verus' death, but the plaque may have been cut away from a larger stone and re-used in a second location. Hence it is possible that an earlier inscription was reinstalled in this later wall." Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor,* p. 44. Citing Kraabel's work "The Diaspora Synagogue" pp. 483-88, Wilken writes, "On the occasion of the emperor's visit, the Jews of Sardis, like other residents, may have presented a tribute to him." Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews,* p. 48. Wilken assumes Kraabel's second century CE dating of the synagogue.

(unsupportable, I maintain) that Hebrew was viewed as a special, holy language, a worthy vehicle perhaps for an inscription to the Emperor.[169]

Angerstorfer's position that Lucius Verus "gave" the building to the Jews rests on a very shaky foundation.[170] One has to assume that the reconstructed Hebrew inscription actually refers to the ruler, next that the inscription is in response to a donation made, and finally that the donation is the building itself. Again, no direct evidence can be mustered that Lucius Verus visited Sardis; only his visit to Ephesus can be verified.[171]

In her reconstruction of Sardian Jewish life, Angerstorfer makes the interesting comment that the gift of the building allowed the Jews to practice their religion publicly, but does not explain further.[172] Adding to the early dating of the synagogue Josephus' claims about the Jews at Sardis having Roman citizenship, she suggests that Jews, as members of the local leadership, were part of the persecution against Christians mentioned in Melito's *Apology*.[173] Finally, she cites Kraabel directly in postulating a Christian community made up, at least in part, of "converted" Jews, and suggests that this created even more tension between the communities.[174] Thus for Angerstorfer, Melito's polemic is driven by social-political motives.[175]

---

[169]See above, p. 37, where I challenge her argument that the homilist's community used Hebrew in their paschal celebration.

[170]Kraabel cites A. H. Detweiler's theory that the building was turned over to the Jews by the city of Sardis in the second century because of their assistance in rebuilding the city after the earthquake of 17 CE. See A. H. Detweiler, *BASOR* 187 (1967):23, 25; Kraabel, "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis, p. 83, n. 31, (and the synagogue at Sardis," *GRBS* 10 (1969):87, n. 25.

[171]David G. Mitten, "A New Look at Ancient Sardis," *BA* 29, 2 (1966):62. He notes that in the Sardis gymnasium (building B) there is a statue base dedicated to Lucius Verus by Claudius Antonius Lepidus, who claims to be a priest of Asia and to have taken care of the gymnasium.

[172]Angerstorfer, p. 215. This is a curious note, since Josephus claims that in the first century BCE, the Jews already had a "topos" of their own (*Antiquities* 14:259-261). Whether that still existed in Melito's day is unclear. In M. Richard's published collection of inscriptions from Sardis, one finds a third century inscription listing fountains in Sardis, which includes the phrase, "the fountain of the synagogue." The reference need not be to a fountain outside the excavated synagogue; indeed, the early dating of the inscription suggests that another synagogue is the target. M. Richard, pp. 37-40.

[173]Angerstorfer, pp. 218-20.

[174]Angerstorfer, p. 219. But Kraabel is merely alerting readers to the possibility that some converts were from the ranks of Jews. Thus it is not impossible that the Sardian (or any) Christian community included converted Jews or that their community's history included converted Jews. Nothing, however, in the homily itself points explicitly in that direction. His idea is picked up by Wilson, *Related Strangers*, p. 253, who writes, "it is not improbable that some of the Christians

Lee Martin McDonald inflates the archaeological evidence all out of proportion, saying that the Jews "had built not only the largest synagogue known in ancient times, but also owned and operated one of the largest and most impressive gymnasiums."[176] It is this considerable Jewish presence in Sardis, as well as their influential missionary activity, that provokes our author's bitterness against them. McDonald suggests in a footnote that the Jews played an active role in fostering the Christian polemic. He claims that there can be "Jewish responsibility and obligation regarding the problem."[177] For McDonald, then, there seems to have been mutual animosity between the two groups.

The assumption that Jews proselytized pagans and Christians is influential for some scholars in determining the social background for the homily. Andrew Manis postulates that our author's hermeneutic was created to handle the envisioned Jewish menace. He submits that the author chose the typological approach both to maintain the validity of the "Christian" interpretation of the Jewish Bible, and to write "Israel out of salvation history."[178] He postulates three influences on the author from his Sardian milieu: (1) persecution (which the author felt was coming from Jews), (2) "competition with the synagogue and a Judaizing tendency in the area",[179] and (3) the homily's Quartodeciman stance.

Robert MacLennan pursues the idea that Melito's rhetoric reveals the author's basic insecurity in the face of the powerful Jewish community. Unable to converse openly and forthrightly with the Jews in his town, Melito resorts to rhetorical flourish. MacLennan suggests that "this 'insecurity' could have been due to the fact that there was a strong and vital Judaism in Sardis."[180] He goes on to postulate that this dominant Jewish community may have appealed to Christians in Melito's day, thereby weakening the Christian presence there, at least numerically, until the third century.[181] Furthermore, the "liveliness of Judaism...would make it difficult for 'outsiders' to respond to the call of the Christian

---

were converts from Judaism or descendants of such." Sykes postulates that the author, identified as Melito of Sardis, "converted" from Judaism, p. 276-279.

[175]Angerstorfer, pp. 187-89.

[176]Lee Martin McDonald, "Anti-Judaism in the Early Church Fathers," p. 241 in *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Donald A. Hagner (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1993).

[177]McDonald, p. 241, n. 141.

[178]Andrew Manis, "Melito of Sardis: Hermeneutic and Context," p. 400.

[179]Ibid., 401.

[180]Robert MacLennan, *Early Christian Texts on Jews and Judaism* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990):108, 111.

[181]Ibid., p. 108.

gospel."[182] The picture thus created is of a fledgling Christian group overwhelmed by and yet drawn to the Jewish community.

Important presumptions underlie several of the studies above, including that (1) Jews were actively missionary[183] (with the corollary that Christians were in competition with Jews for gentile converts), (2) the Jewish way of life was so appealing and the Christian life correspondingly dull that our author was overcome with feelings of inferiority (3) Jews were part of local persecution against Christians and (4) Judaism in Sardis was unique in its makeup such that it stoked a fire of resentment in our homilist, with the resulting invective extraordinary and idiosyncratic for its time.

Alleged Jewish Missionary Activity

The assumption of Jewish missionary activity in the early centuries of the Common Era is challenged by solid evidence. What seems to be alleged by some early Christian authors (for example, Ignatius of Antioch or Chrysostom) is that, in their community, some Christians showed an interest in Jewish synagogue worship. This does not necessarily mean that Jews were actively pursuing Christians. In fact, Chrysostom seems to say that Christians are drawn to the synagogue by their own misunderstandings about Christianity.[184]

Wilson notes that our homilist may have feared that some in his congregation were attracted to Judaism. Although he acknowledges that he has no firm support for this, Wilson cites as possible evidence of this during our homilist's time Ignatius' *Philadelphians* 6.1, *Ep. Barn.* 4.6 and Chrysostom's sermons against Judaizing. He admits, however, that "there is no firm evidence that Melito faced the problem of Judaizers, but

---

[182]Ibid., p. 109.

[183]Neither Kraabel nor Wilson believes that Jews were missionary in their outlook. Kraabel, "The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions," p. 451-2. For a counter argument, see Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993).

[184]Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*, pp. 118-19, writes, "the opening passages from the fourth homily on the Judaizers suggests that the Jews were actively seeking out Christians so as to snatch them from the Church and bring them to the synagogue. Yet...it is not likely that the Jews were pursuing the Christians; indeed, it was the Christians who were willingly seeking out the Jews." Wilken, examining the art of rhetorical speech in the second sophistic movement (second to fourth century CE), claims that one must take into account the author's rhetoric, which is "not intended to provide a description of Jewish behavior; it is intended to picture the Jews in the worst possible light to frighten Christians so that they will not attend the synagogue."

if he did, it would go a long way towards explaining the content and tone of the homily."[185]

Taylor challenges the interpretation of these passages; "it becomes evident that Ignatius' anti-Jewish passages are not injunctions against judaizing, but rather illustrative arguments directed at the dissenters [identified by Taylor as Docetic Christians] to whom Ignatius addresses his main appeal."[186] And I would add that the example from Chrysostom is not parallel to our homilist's situation as evidenced in the homily. Chrysostom offers explicit and detailed contemporary incidents describing those who would venture too close to the synagogue, unlike our homilist's vague references to New Testament incidents. Barnabas's enigmatic phrase "heaping up your sins and saying that the covenant is both theirs and ours" (4.6) focuses on a specific debate over the possession of Scripture, a debate which need not include the presence of Judaizers. A comparable phrase in 13.1 ("now let us see whether this people or the former people is the heir") supports this contention in its identification of the true possessors of the covenant.[187]

The evidence from Jewish or pagan sources is at best ambiguous concerning missionary activity by Jews. Scot McKnight suggests that Judaism of the first centuries CE was not a "missionizing" religion, for little conclusive evidence exists that Jews thought of themselves as proselytizing the gentiles.[188] And while Martin Goodman notes that many Jews in the Roman Empire looked favorably upon proselytes, he cautions that "passive acceptance is quite different from active mission."[189] Although a synagogue might be open for any non-Jew to observe the service, and while Jews were often enjoined to behave in an upright and moral manner so as to cause gentiles to think positively of Judaism, the evangelizing which appears to be characteristic of certain

---

[185]Stephen G. Wilson, "Passover, Easter, and Anti- Judaism," p. 351.

[186]M. Taylor, pp. 26-37.

[187]See Setzer, *Jewish Responses to Early Christians*, p. 178. However, Wilson, *Related Strangers*, p. 136-7, claims that Barnabas' community of gentile Christians were threatened by gentile Judaizers, and perhaps behind that, Judaism as well. It may be, however, that Barnabas simply knew of such people, and was merely warning his community. The threat perceived by the author, then, is in defining covenant incorrectly, not in practicing Judaism.

[188]Scot McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Phila: Fortress, 1991).

[189]Martin Goodman, "Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century," p. 55 in *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians*. In his 1989 article on rabbinic Judaism and proselytizing, Goodman does note that some rabbis seem to advocate an active missionary zeal, with the hope to win proselytes. But this occurred in the fourth century and later. Martin Goodman, "Proselytizing in Rabbinic Judaism," *JJS* 38 (1989):175-185.

forms of Christianity is absent from Judaism at this time. Again, pagan interest in Jewish festivals or practices need not be interpreted as resulting from a concerted effort to missionize on the part of the Jews. Thus the suggestion that our homilist feared the Jewish threat of gaining more converts rests on shaky foundations.[190]

Popularity of Judaism

Tied closely with the above position is the tacit assumption that Judaism must have been temptingly exciting, while Christianity was so insipid that Christians had to hang on to any converts tightly. In truth, no scholar ever describes Christianity quite in those terms, but in emphasizing just how inviting Early Judaism was, one senses that their opinion of contemporary Christianity is quite low in comparison. But surely such a reconstruction of both Judaism and Christianity is exaggerated and groundless. And though it is absolutely imperative that scholars reverse the centuries of Western scholarship's (willful) ignorance of the vitality of Judaism in the early centuries, it is equally important not to overcompensate and draw a picture of Christianity as impotent and colorless.

Jews' Alleged Persecution of Christians

Challenging Judaism's missionary activity in the early centuries also delivers a serious blow to the assumption that our author was battling the local Jewish community for converts. Theories that speculate on Jewish involvement in persecuting Christians as they contend with each other to win proselytes, with the underlying presumption that Jews had political power over Christians, are at best overstatements. Marianne Bonz has shown how limited Jewish political power was in Sardis in the late second century,[191] and even the spontaneous outbursts mentioned in Christian literature were apparently localized, sporadic crises, or perhaps Christian polemical rhetoric.[192] Setzer notes that "the few identifiable claims of Jewish *actions* against Christians before 150 CE seem to be intra-communal, Jews acting against other Jews who professed Jesus."[193] Douglas Hare notes that "it is clear to even the most bias students that

---

[190]Scot McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles.*

[191]Marianne Bonz, "The Jewish Community of Ancient Sardis: A Reassessment of its Rise to Prominence," pp. 343- 58.

[192]See Taylor, pp. 90-114. However, Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*, p. 29, argues that the Martyrdom of Polycarp, written in the mid or late second century CE, does preserve reliable information about Jewish involvement in Christian persecution.

[193]Setzer, *Jewish Responses to Early Christians*, p. 172.

the severest persecutions suffered by Christians in the early centuries were imposed not by Jews but by the Roman government."[194] Miriam Taylor sees a connection between the view that hostility existed between the Jews and Christians and the alleged missionary activity of Jews-the latter provides the motive for the former. "Underlying the view that Jews were antagonistic to the Christians, and supplying the motive for this antagonism, is the belief that Jews and Christians were in competition for the same prize, that they were rivals in their active missions for pagan converts."[195]

One step beyond the presumption that Jews battled with Christians for proselytes is the allegation that Jews would use political maneuvers or outright force to secure their community in the face of a growing enemy, Christianity. Yet the sources for such a position have important limitations. The various *Acts* on the Christian martyrs speak only rarely of Jewish participation.[196] As Taylor writes, "it is nevertheless telling that the Christians did not choose to exploit what would have been a golden opportunity to lay blame on the Jews for inflicting suffering on the church's martyrs."[197]

Early Christian writers who mention Jewish persecution seem to refer to biblical Jews, not contemporary Jews. For example, Tertullian's *Scorp.* (ca. 200 CE), which honors martyrdom in the face of Gnostic critique, includes the phrase "synagogues of the Jews, founts of persecution—before which the apostles endured the scourge," which has been interpreted as evidence that Jews were attacking Christians. On close examination, however, it seems that Tertullian was pointing to Christians and Jews from the NT period.[198]

Taylor remarks:

> Tertullian's argument is not with the Jews, but with the Gnostic heretics who downplayed the importance of the confession of faith.

---

[194]Douglas R. A. Hare, "The Relationship between Jewish and Gentile Persecution of Christians," *JES* 4 (1967):446.

[195]M. Taylor, p. 87.

[196]The Martyrdom of Polycarp (mid to late second century CE) and the Martyrdom of Pionius (ca. 300 CE) are two places where Jewish participation is alleged.

[197]M. Taylor, p. 92. A full discussion of the Martyrdom of Polycarp is found on pp. 102-104 and of the Martyrdom of Pionius on pp. 105-110. See also Douglas R. A. Hare, "The Relationship between Jewish and Gentile Persecution of Christians," *JES* 4 (1967):446-56.

[198]Tertullian, *Scorp* 10. Efroymson writes, "the allusion to the disciples being whipped in synagogues, in the same passage, certainly suggests that its primary reference is to the time of the disciples, and not to Tertullian's own time." D. Efroymson, "Tertullian's Anti- Judaism and its Role in his Theology," (Ph.D. diss., Temple University, 1976):62, n. 41.

> His reference to the Jews is not intended to reflect Christian experience in Carthage in a literal sense, but...it testifies to the sense in which a theological role was ascribed to Jews and Judaism.[199]

A similar charge by Apollinaris of Hierapolis (ca. 180 CE) to the Montanists concerning the test of a true prophet is preserved in Eusebius (*EH* 5.16.12f):

> Since therefore they called us slayers of the prophets, because we did not receive their loquacious prophets, who, they say, are those that the Lord promised to send to the people, let them answer as in God's presence: Who is there, O friends, of these who began to talk, from Montanus and the women down, that was persecuted by the Jews, or slain by lawless men? None. Or has any of them been seized and crucified for the Name? Truly not. Or has one of these women ever been scourged in the synagogues of the Jews, or stoned? No, never anywhere.

Apollinaris' point is not that he or his contemporaries are being "crucified for the Name," or scourged or stoned; he is claiming that such treatment done in the past to prophets and apostles in his "camp" is a sign that his position is "true." Because the Montantists never received such treatment from Jews, their position is discredited in Apollinaris' eyes. It is clear, then, that suggestions which favor the goading of Christians by Jews, thereby "justifying" or explaining the former's anti-Jewish response, fail to handle the evidence carefully. The arguments for suggesting Jewish persecution of Christians in our homilist's time are at best inconclusive.

It is critical to recognize the potential difference between what is likely to have happened in history, and what an ancient writer might *perceive* as reality. Therefore, just because it can be argued effectively that Judaism was not a missionary religion does not necessarily rule out an individual Christian characterizing Judaism as missionary. A Christian could interpret pagan interest in Judaism as resulting from Jewish efforts, which might then be framed in the Christian's mind as competition. But this invented rivalry would lack any concrete Jewish participation, though it might serve to explain pagan interest in what the Christian views as unacceptable.

In the case of our homily, it may be that while Jews in the general locale presented no *real* threat to a Christian's property or livelihood, our author *perceived* them to be a threat.[200] Testing this hypothesis is quite

---

[199]M. Taylor, p. 97.

[200]This is not the same thing as Lieu's position that "Melito" creates an *image* of a Jew, but that image reflects contemporary *reality*, even if dimly. My contention is that our author created or modified from tradition a picture of Judaism which

complicated because it involves investigating the psychology and motivation of our author. In an effort not to go beyond the homily's information, I think it is important to note that "Israel" is characterized with biblical language and imagery. This suggests to me that our author's animosity might not be directed to a contemporary Jewish community. Even should one conclude that our author perceived a threat, that does little to enhance the picture of Jews and Christians relating socially. It merely offers a window into one Christian's mind.

Before concluding the discussion on whether Jews were involved in persecuting Christians in the late second or early third century, Jack T. Sanders' theory on boundary maintenance should be mentioned.[201] Sanders points out that Judaism in Palestine before 135 CE was under severe pressure to maintain itself. It was bombarded by Rome's military and political interventions, and strapped with severe economic hardships. With its very existence threatened, Sanders argues, it lashed out at Jewish Christians, those who were blurring the boundary line and tearing down the dividing wall between Jew and gentile (Eph. 2.14 celebrates as much). The instinct for self-preservation took hold, and "mainstream" (Sanders' term) Jews drove (Jewish) Christians out of their midst. The fire of conflict lit, its intensity was fanned by ideology.[202]

Sanders is careful to limit his inquiry to Palestine before 135 CE. After that, he claims, Judaism and Christianity were "separate and distinct religions."[203] As such, boundary maintenance by Jews against Christians in Diaspora cities in the late second or early third century cannot be assumed to follow a pattern similar to that noted a century earlier in Palestine.

Wilson, however, challenges Sanders' position as theoretically possible, but historically unlikely. Instead, Wilson suggests that in many cases, ideological positions (Sanders calls this "attitude") lead to or result in particular actions ("relations"). While Sanders is careful to distinguish between attitude and relation, Wilson counsels that if we know a

---

was quite real theologically in the author's mind, and had little value in *reality* to recreate a likeness of second or third century Diaspora (or Palestinian) Judaism.

[201]Jack T. Sanders, *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants. The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1993).

[202]See John Gager's work on conflict theory, *Kingdom and Community, The Social World of Early Christianity* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1975). Sanders discusses how it illuminates the first century relationship between Jews and Christians in Palestine, p. 125-127.

[203]Sanders, p. 149. He is likely overstating the case here a bit, as a study of the first few centuries CE reveals attempts by Christians at defining boundaries over against those Christians who apparently saw little reason to distinguish between the two groups or who disagreed with the definitions delineating Jews and gentiles.

person's viewpoint on a specific group, we could from there extrapolate their likely behavior towards that group.

But, of course, this is precisely the issue in contention in this study. Wilson argues that Melito's rhetoric reveals likely behaviors and responses to theorized Jews living in close proximity to him. I suggest that the rhetoric is unable to tell us much more beyond that our author was educated and interested in teaching the Christian community the value of Christianity over against the now defunct and useless Judaism.

Tensions in Sardis

Wilson posits that because our author was so close to a large population of Jews, there must have been incredible tensions. But specifically at this point, we need to step back from the presumed Sardis milieu, and consider that the homily could have any number of backgrounds (though in any place, there likely was a Jewish presence). Again, I have challenged the assumption that the proximity between our homilist's Christians and a Jewish group would be very close because the former were Quartodeciman. The alleged intimacy cannot be maintained at these two critical points and as such, the apparent intensity of emotion created by the alleged critical circumstances is simply not supported by attendant facts.

Additional Social Impetuses behind the Anti-Judaism

Though the Sardis provenance has been assumed by almost all scholars examining the homily (this study, however, has challenged that assumption), a case for social or political motives generating our author's hostility has been attempted without using a second or early third century dating of the Sardis synagogue, or for that matter, considering a Sardis milieu at all. For example, F. W. Norris explores our author's possible educational background as a window into the anti-Judaism.[204] While he accepts more of Eusebius' information than I am prepared to do, an analysis of the homily's rhetoric clearly indicates an educated person. Norris asks whether our homilist came from a well-to-do family which sought to educate their son for a political future in the city. If that is true, the author's apparent anger at the Jews' favored status might have more to do with his own expectations based on his wealth and family background, and less with his status as a Christian. Norris also notes that the author might be an educated slave or freedman; presumably expectations would then be different. This type of

---

[204]F. W. Norris, "Melito's Motivation," *ATR* 68 (1986):16- 24.

speculation is helpful because it recognizes that people in the ancient world were not simply identified by their religious affiliation.[205]

A Jewish community could be sponsored by wealthy Jewish and pagan benefactors, given our knowledge of guilds and *thiasoi* in the Roman world during the early centuries CE.[206] The inscription evidence from the Sardis synagogue suggests a significant level of non-Jewish interest in the synagogue. Michael White writes, "competition for honors by both Jewish and non-Jewish donors resulted in the placement of the mosaic pavements in the [synagogue] hall and the forecourt."[207] The Aphrodisias inscription may offer a similar example of Jewish and non-Jewish interaction and cooperation in civic duties.[208] Often cited as evidence of non-Jewish interest or patronage is the Julia Severa inscription from Acmonia (C. & B. 559; C.I.I. 766; M.A.M.A. 6, 264).[209] While she is credited only with building (*kataskeuasthu[n]ta*) the structure (*o[i]kon*), and while no direct mention is made of her turning it over to the Jewish community, one might suggest some relationship between Julia[210] and the synagogue to explain why the community would take the trouble to mention her name. Tessa Rajak's conclusion, "it was Julia Severa who built the synagogue in Acmonia,"[211] might go beyond the evidence; at the very least one can say that a non-Jew is recognized in a synagogue inscription. It is certainly possible that in our author's day, there were wealthy, generous non-Jews who supported their Jewish

---

[205]Norris assumes Melito of Sardis wrote the text, hence the male pronouns in referring to the author. On the issue of identifying Jews in the ancient world, see Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew"; Kraemer, "Jewish Tuna and Christian Fish: Identifying Religious Affiliation in Epigraphic Sources"; Lieu, "Circumcision, Women, and Salvation," *NTS* 40 (1994):358-370.

[206]For a brief summary of associations in the Greco- Roman world, see Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament,* vol. 1 (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1982):65-67.

[207]White, p. 84.

[208]J. Reyolds and R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias: Greek Inscriptions with Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1987); Pieter W. van der Horst, "Jews and Christians in Aphrodisias in the Light of Their Relations in Other Cities of Asia Minor," pp. 166-181 in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht: 1990). A rejoiner to Reynolds' and Tannenbaum's argument is M. Williams, "The Jews and Godfearers Inscription from Aphrodisias."

[209]The critical lines read, *"ton kataskeuasthu[n]ta o[i]kon hupo Ioulias Seouēras P. Turrōvios klados ho dia Biou archisunagōgos...."*

[210]Her status as either "pagan" or "Jewish" has been debated, though most scholars today would categorize her as "non-Jewish."

[211]Tessa Rajak, "The Jewish Community and its Boundaries," in *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire,* p. 24.

clients with gifts to their meeting place.[212] The author, perhaps competing for donors, may have resented such endorsement.[213]

In sum, the position which examines or reconstructs the social setting in Sardis as a means to understand our homilist's behavior toward local Jews takes the homily's rhetoric as indicative of social realities. Judaism was allegedly a threat for several possible reasons:(1) it was a force itself, (2) it was too similar to the homily's Quartodeciman beliefs, (3) our homilist was Jewish or (4) some in the congregation were Jewish. The social and political theories which hold general assumptions grounded in conflict theory, with its beliefs that the relative similarity between two groups exacerbates their hostility and that ideology increases tension, have concluded that our author and the community were fighting a group not too different, except in size, from their own. I have noted that some of their points can be argued without relying upon a Sardis milieu (as in the case of wealthy patrons of Jewish communities), and some positions are inaccurate in any setting (Jewish missionary activity, for example).

Self-Definition Roots of Anti-Judaism

MacLennan understands the Jews of the homily to be "Israel of the Bible,"[214] not the Jews who lived in Melito's day;[215] but rather than focus on the supersessionary bent of our author, he asks whether our author's community might be experiencing a self-definition crisis similar to that of the second century rabbinic communities in Palestine. He contends that the latter were defining themselves over against the *minim*, a term which, he claims, should not be understood negatively in all references, but also was a convenient foil. He suggests that the *PP* was intended for the "struggling"[216] church outside of Sardis (he claims the community was just outside the city limits), and hence the supersessionary claims

---

[212]Against this, MacLennan argues (unconvincingly I think) that Judaism at this time was too local, too provincial, too focused on their land, while Christianity was universal in outlook. MacLennan, p. 115.

[213]For a brief, general description of synagogues in Palestine and the Diaspora, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, pp. 108-116. See also Lee Levine, *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987).

[214]R. MacLennan, p. 112.

[215]This conclusion may reveal MacLennan's admirable desire to promote dialogue between twentieth century Christians and Jews. He writes about Melito's rhetoric, "this 'over-againstness' created the impression that all Jews were to be condemned by Christians, which was not necessarily the case." MacLennan, p. 112.

[216]Ibid., p. 113.

made were intended primarily to encourage believers, not to condemn Jews.

As a possible historical example of MacLennan's point that our homilist might be interested in encouraging the local community, Origen, in his preface to Celsus, states that Christian literature is written in large measure to benefit "weak" Christians. He writes that "since in the multitude of those who are considered believers some such persons might be found as would have their faith shaken and overthrown by the writings of Celsus, but who might be preserved by a reply to them," Origen hesitatingly decides to write a response to Celsus' treatise.[217] Origen is preaching to the (weak) choir. More than that, he is instructing Christians on how to combat pagan charges against Christianity in part by invoking what is aptly named by Efroymson "the anti-Judaic myth."[218] By this he means the degrading of Jews and Judaism both as a defense of Christianity against charges by pagans, and as a component of intra-Christian dialogue concerning Christian identity.

It certainly seems our author is differentiating the Christian community over against the Jewish one. I agree with MacLennan that the language of our homilist is not directed at contemporary local Jews but rather at Christians to sharpen their sense of distinctiveness. Because, however, I do not leave it simply as a self-definition issue, but think it was an attempt at formulating theology, I cannot relegate the language to an individual case of Christian discomfort. Instead, the language, building on traditional exegesis, highlights theological positions which are anti-Jewish in their attempt to be pro-Christian.

Theological Roots of Anti-Judaism

MacLennan's "self-definition" approach, then, does not go far enough in handling the potential endemic nature of our author's approach and conclusion. My concern centers around the suspicion that the focus on the historicity question deflects scholars' attention from the possibility that anti-Judaism might be endemic to Christian thought.

---

[217]Origen also notes a bit further on in the Preface that he composed the text as well for those who are completely unaware of Christianity.

[218]D. Efroymson, "The Patristic Connection," p. 101 in *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity*, ed. Alan T. Davies (NY: Paulist Press, 1979), who writes that the anti-Judaic myth may be described as follows: "the (admitted) 'inferiority' of God's 'old' law and/or cult cannot be due to any inferiority on God's part, but must be accounted for by the 'inferiority' of the people with whom God was working at that time."

Rosemary Reuther has explored this possibility,[219] as has Miriam Taylor, who writes that "if Melito's accusations against the Jews fit in with a whole tradition of Christian theological thinking then we have to recognize [that] the continued significance of his anti-Judaism...presents us with a moral and theological dilemma that must be addressed by modern Christians today."[220]

The question then becomes whether (and if so, how) one can take our homilist's virulent attack upon "Israel" as a reflection of the community's situation with neighboring Jews. Some of the social-historical, political and psychological studies discussed above seem to have taken as their maxim "where there's smoke, there's fire," without perhaps proper reflection on our author's specific argument and claims. A few scholars, however, emphasize the theological content of our homilist's charges and claims, concluding that the homily neither reveals historical information about a second or third century local Jewish community, nor about the relationship between our author's community and Jews. Instead, the "Israel" of the homily is most helpfully understood as that which is opposite Christianity, as defined by our author.[221]

"Israel's" portrayal in a uniformly negative light in the latter sections of the homily goes hand in hand with its positive role in the beginning. Our author must allow for some positive press to be given to those who "murdered God," because they represent the anti-type that was to come.[222] In *PP* 37 one reads, "What once was precious becomes worthless when what is truly precious has been revealed." Again in *PP* 41, "The model then was precious before the reality, and the parable was marvelous before the interpretation; that is, the people was precious before the church arose, and the law was marvelous before the gospel was elucidated."

Much the same thing happens in other early Christian writings, for example in Origen, when he states that Christians should emulate the Jews who had "endured countless sufferings to avoid renouncing Judaism and their law" (*Contra Celsum* 3.3). Irenaeus writes, "in regard to the position of the Jews as seen in Scripture, we ought not to be their prosecutors, but rather look at that of which they are a symbol" (*Ad.*

---

[219]Rosemary R. Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* pp. 117-182.

[220]M. Taylor, pp. 66-7.

[221]M. Taylor, p. 65-74. She lists some scholars who consider theological motives behind the homily, but claims that they do not go far enough in attributing theological underpinnings to our homilist's arguments.

[222]One might point to Hebrews as an early example of a supersessionary treatise, though its focus seems to be on Jesus replacing the system of priesthood and sacrifice as described in the Jewish Scriptures.

Haer. 4.3.1). In our case, in order for the homilist to maintain or strengthen the connection between the Passover in Ex. 12 and the Christian Pascha, the author stresses that *ho laos* (the people) of the Passover is a type or symbol of the church, even as the sheep slaughtered on Passover are a type or symbol of "the Lord" (*PP* 44). Taylor concludes that "the few positive references to Judaism in the Christian writings refer to those aspects of Jewish tradition which the orthodox church identified as belonging to its *own* past."[223]

Most would agree that Christians who wanted to keep the "Old Testament" and Jewish roots of their faith (Marcion being a well known exception here) have qualified positive comments for some aspects of Judaism and/or Jews. If, however, our homilist is arguing from a supersessionary stance,[224] a theological position defining Christian self-identity over against a stylized Judaism,[225] it may not be surprising to find the same "symbolic Jews" in later sections of the homily. The theories noted above which postulate possible social settings behind the homily's text need to be more specific about how one knows, at any particular point in the homily, whether "Israel" or "the people" refers to a group from the past or to present-day Jews. Those positing a theological argument suggest a consistency in our homilist, who portrays idealized Jews as symbolizing proper and improper characteristics and attitudes toward God.

The positive adjectives attached to "the people" are conditional; they belong in the past. They once were precious, but now the church has become the *alētheia* or "reality" (*PP* 42, 43). This dichotomy of old and new is not unique to our homily's structuring of Christianity's relationship to Judaism. The language of old and new is found in Paul's letters (2 Cor. 3) and in Hebrews 8. Efroymson claims that "if Tertullian has a theology of Israel or Judaism, it can be called a *theologia vetustatis*," or theology of "oldness," that is, "having been passed by, and not

---

[223]M. Taylor, p. 168.

[224]Wilson, "Passover, Easter, and Anti-Judaism," pp. 337- 355. Wilson, in exploring the development of Easter traditions, suggests that the homily's anti-Judaism is closely linked to supersessionary theology and modalist Christology. He also reflects on our author's use of rhetoric to exaggerate the distinctions both between the Christian and Jewish Passover, as well as between Christians and Jews.

[225]As a working definition of the supersessionary position, one can point to Cyprian, who lists in *Treatise* 12.1 twenty-four ways in which "the Jews, according to what had before been foretold, had departed from God, and had lost God's favor, which had been given them in past time, and had been promised them for the future; while the Christians had succeeded to their place."

admitting it."[226] It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that our homily reflects a traditional interpretation of the value or position of Judaism as God's formerly chosen, but no longer chosen, people.

D. F. Winslow, interpreting the homily as an "anti-Jewish" tract, focuses on the homily's view of humanity as informed by its particular Christology. He claims that the phrase, "God has been murdered" (*PP* 96), epitomizes the anti-Jewish Christology of the text. Acknowledging that at one level the phrase is certainly an oxymoron, Winslow believes that, at another level, it sums up our homilist's assertions about Christ being and doing all that is associated with God. This argument is directed against Jews primarily, though Winslow adds an interesting observation. He suggests that "Melito was not a happy man,"[227] that his tirade against Jews was only slightly more vindictive than his censure of humanity in general, as seen in the passages discussing sin (for example, *PP* 47-56). For Winslow, the author's rhetoric expresses profound remorse at the human condition, in addition to a theological argument against "Israel."[228]

Winslow's emphasis upon the middle section of the homily which discusses the sinfulness of humanity, highlights the forgotten but critical summary of our author's perception of humanity and how that view informs the rest of the homilist's argument. Similarly, T. Halton postulates a relationship between the middle section of the homily and the discussion of Egypt's first-born. "Man's destruction upon the earth is dealt with in terms analogous with the destruction of the first born by the silence of death (cf. 160-193)."[229] Moreover, this angle also accentuates the salvation image of being taken by Christ to the "heights of heaven" (*PP* 46, 103, 104). For our homilist, it seems that salvation was envisioned as an escape from this wretched world and its sinfulness.

Anti-Gnostic Polemics

Winslow also cites the homily's accent on both the suffering of Christ and the historical Israel as possible anti-gnostic polemics. Yet he

---

[226]D. Efroymson, "Tertullian's Anti-Judaism," p. 44. He cites *Ad. Marc.* 1.20.4-6, 4.11.9-11, 5.2.1-4, 5.8.4-5, and offers a lengthy list on p. 47. Tertullian relates this same idea in *Apol.* 21.

[227]D. F. Winslow, "The Polemical Christology of Melito of Sardis," *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982):774.

[228]Winslow may be overstating the case here; his conclusions about the personal make-up of our author cannot be demonstrated. Moreover, our author's position on the plight of humanity is not so much an attack upon humanity as it is a conclusion about the consequences of sin upon humanity. Yet the topic of "Israel" is clearly handled in a hostile way.

[229]T. Halton, "The Death of Death in Melito *Peri Pascha*," p. 171.

concludes that the evidence only offers hints; no substantive picture of a gnostic or Marcionite enemy emerges.[230] His proposal is important as it emphasizes that our author was arguing theologically for a particular understanding of Christianity. Hence, he frees the text's possible interpretations to include other groups (both in and outside Christianity) against which our author desired a hearing. It is interesting that the Gen. 2.16-17 of our homily is quoted extensively in gnostic works and in "*adversus* heresies" literature, in the latter instance not always in defense of "orthodox" opinions, but highlighting the "heretical" position. In the Ps. Clementine *Homilies* 16.6, Simon uses this passage to argue that there are many gods. Hippolytus, in his *Refutation of all Heresies* 5.15, writes about the Sethian method of handling Scripture, noting that there are three types of law: prohibitory, permissive and adjudicatory of punishment. Gen. 2.16 is an example of the first category. The text is used again in chapter 21 to explain the position of the "heretics" on how sin came to be among humanity.

This gnostic interest in Genesis 2.16-17 is found in other sources, such as the Nag Hammadi texts *Hypostatis of the Archons* and the *Origin of the World*.[231] In both cases the rulers of the earth do not represent the authentic god. In this interpretation of Genesis, the humans' eating of the fruit is beneficial, for it reveals the rulers for what they are, second-class deities.

Given its extensive use in anti-gnostic material, as well as its use by gnostics themselves, one cannot rule out the possibility that our author's source for the quotation was anti-gnostic. But our homily itself does not seem interested in defending against a gnostic position. Thus it is almost impossible to assess if an anti-gnostic source was behind this quotation. Moreover, because this passage shares textual similarities with other passages in the homily which are rarely found in gnostic or anti-gnostic literature, the likelihood is decreased that our source for the Genesis passage was part of the gnostic debate. But if not against gnostics, perhaps our author struggled with a Marcionite enemy.

Anti-Marcionite Polemics

The battle against Marcion might have triggered a careful description of humanity. Efroymson's article on anti-Judaism in the patristic period reflects on the various ways anti-Jewish sentiment expressed itself, not least in the battle with Marcion.[232] Although his essay does not deal with our homily directly, his treatment of several

---

[230]Winslow, "The Polemical Christology of Melito of Sardis," p. 771.

[231]An English translation of the texts is found in *The Nag Hammadi Library*.

[232]D. Efroymson, "The Patristic Connection."

important similarities with Origen, Tertullian and Justin deserve mention in pursuit of possibly identifying the homily as having an "anti-Marcionite" slant.

Efroymson makes a strong case for the necessity of recognizing anti-Jewish statements wherever they may occur, and not simply limiting the scope of the discussion to explicitly *adversus Judaeos* material. He proposes that by the second century, the dialogue about the place of the Law is no longer simply between Jews and Christians, but now includes Christians debating with other Christians.[233] "Marcion's challenge or threat placed all the anti-Judaic themes in a new apologetic context, appending them to ideas of God and Christ."[234] Marcion appears to have believed (there are no extant writings of his) that a god of two testaments was an inconsistent, "schizophrenic" god, and thus concluded that the creator God of the Jewish Scriptures was not the God revealed by Jesus.

To counter Marcion, it seems that some Christians attempted to explain the Law (which, in large part, they did not observe) as resulting from the inferiority of the Jewish people. Some Christians argued that God is not inconsistent in first requiring obedience to the Law and then "shifting" to grace in Jesus, but rather that Jews were too ignorant or stubborn to accept the grace of God. For example, Tertullian writes in *Ad. Marc.* 2.19.1, "This law was not laid down because of its author's hardness, but by reason of that supreme kindness which preferred to tame the people's hardness."

Efroymson speaks of the themes of God, Christ, Scripture and the Christian way of life both as directly attacked by Marcion's proposals and as defended by an anti-Jewish response. What emerges in Efroymson's analysis is the conviction that in order for some Christians to hang onto their "Old" Testament, it was necessary to condemn Jews as unworthy of it and incapable of interpreting it correctly. This is essentially an intra-Christian problem, one springing from Christianity's developing theology/Christology, not from interaction with Jews directly. Questions about whether and how to follow the Law (or why Christians do not follow the Law, but claim the books of the Law as their own), or about why Jews have not (yet?) followed Jesus the Messiah need not come from Jews, but can and were raised by Christians and pagan critics alike. Efroymson concludes that just because a particular subject might appear to modern scholars as "Jewish" (for example the

---

[233]Langmuir, p. 106, (supported by J. Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition* vol. 1 of *The Christian Tradition* (Chicago, 1971):15), claims that Christians spent the early centuries speaking against Judaism as they argued their interpretations of the "OT" or Hebrew Scriptures.

[234]Efroymson, "The Patristic Connection," p. 105.

Law), we cannot assume that either the concern or resulting discussion included Jewish contemporaries of those Christian authors who addressed the matters.

Is there evidence that our homily could be an anti-Marcion writing? Several points may suggest an affirmative answer. First, the *PP* spends perhaps an inordinate amount of time stressing the fulfillment by Jesus of Jewish Scripture "prophecies." *PP* 57 reads, "For the thing which is to be new and great in its realization is arranged for well in advance...having been foreseen well in advance." Twice our author lists past venerable figures of Israelite history (Abel, Isaac, Moses, and others) who reflected or symbolized Jesus (*PP* 59, 69). The grouping of quotations from the "prophets" in *PP* 61-64 stresses how Jesus is the fulfillment of their words. This emphasis on the value of the Jewish Scriptures for predicting the person and Passion of Jesus could have been leveled against a Marcionite claim to the contrary.

Second, Marcion's understanding of Jesus' humanity is likewise at odds with what is found in the homily. Marcion's Jesus seems to have appeared out of nowhere, though Marcion does seem to believe (against some gnostics) that Jesus died on a cross. For Marcion, Jesus revealed a god who has absolutely no connection with humanity, "no natural or historical connection with the men whom he loved and redeemed."[235] Our homilist is at pains to underscore the participation of "Christ" with humanity, as seen in the image of "being clothed with the suffering one" (*PP* 46, cf. 100). The homily stresses Jesus was clothed in humanity and participated in what the suffering one (humans) suffered.[236]

Third, Marcion charges that the very nature and goodness of the God of Israel are to be called into question because of the destruction of Jerusalem (see Irenaeus, Ad. Haer. 4.4). If one can trust Irenaeus at this point to be preserving one of Marcion's claims, then one might wonder if our homilist's insistence on Jerusalem as the place of "Israel's" most horrendous act may have some significance. At the beginning of the

---

[235]Adolf von Harnack, "Marcion's Starting Point," p. 191 in *The Writings of St. Paul*, ed. Wayne Meeks (NY: Norton & Co., 1972). See also Harnack's *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 2d. ed (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924); *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*, (partial) English trans. John E. Steely and Lyle D. Bierma (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1990).

[236]Our homilist also credits Jesus with a role in creation, an idea with which Marcion disagreed. Jesus is described in *PP* 82-89 as "the firstborn of God, who was begotten before the morning star, who tinted the light, who lit up the day, who divided off the darkness, who fixed the first marker, who hung the earth." The homilist writes in *PP* 96, "He who hung the earth is hanging, he who fixed the heavens has been fixed," and in *PP* 104, "It is he that made heaven and earth and fashioned man in the beginning, who is proclaimed through the law and prophets, who was enfleshed upon a virgin."

tirade against "Israel" (PP 72), the homily states explicitly that Jesus was killed in Jerusalem, highlighting "Israel's" fulfilled prophecy of their own demise leveled against them (cf. PP 90, 93, 94, 99). It may be that in an attempt to counter Marcion's picture of an "evil" creator god, our homilist defended God's "wrath" towards the Jews as indicated in the destruction of the Temple, claiming it as well-deserved punishment for their behavior.

Even the homily's categories of "old" and "new" may be an attempt to wrestle out of Marcion's hand the definition of Christianity as a "new" faith. Marcion's claim that Jesus was "new" to this earth, previously unknown to all people, may be behind our author's insistence that Jesus' "newness" can be understood only in relation to his "oldness," that is, the prophecies which foretell the "new." Of course, it is also true that the Roman world was highly suspicious of anything "new" in the way of religions, and thus some Christians may have wanted to keep the connection to Judaism or, perhaps more accurately, to the ancient texts, in order to gain popular favor or avoid criticism and liability.

Yet not all the evidence points to understanding our homily as anti-Marcionite, at least in the sense that Tertullian (and perhaps Justin[237]) handled the claims. In Tertullian's work *Ad. Marc.*, the overwhelming concern focuses on the "one God" issue, over against Marcion's "two gods" theory. Justin (*Dial.* 10-30), in his argument to Trypho about the Law, emphasizes the Creator God of the Jewish Scriptures, an emphasis which might be unnecessary if he was truly directing the argument to a Jew. Our author does not seem to speak to Marcion's charge, though it may be that our author interpreted Marcion's "threat" differently than Justin or Tertullian, giving less attention to the "two-gods" component of Marcion's thought.

Another central consideration of Tertullian, following Justin and Irenaeus, is the claim that the Jews were unable to understand God, and so God sent the Law as a temporary measure to control and correct them. The Law was never intended to be permanent (see also 2 Cor. 3-4). Justin suggests that the Jews, by making the Law a necessity which God had to place on them, are responsible for the heresies which misunderstand the Law:

> But impute it to your own wickedness, that God even can be accused by those who have no understanding, of not having always

[237]Efroymson believes Justin's argument against Marcion is in part preserved in his *Dialogue,* taken perhaps from his lost "treatise against all the heresies which have arisen." Efroymson, "The Patristic Connection," pp. 105-106. See also Theodore Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosiac Law* (Missoula, MT: SBL, 1975).

> instructed all in the same righteous statutes. For such institutions seemed to be unreasonable and unworthy of God to many men, who had not received grace to know that your nation were called to conversion and repentance of spirit, why they were in a sinful condition and laboring under spiritual disease (*Dial.* 30).

Efroymson notes that Tertullian addresses directly Marcion's argument that Jesus cannot be the Messiah, because the Jews have not recognized him as such. Tertullian's response is to repeat that Jews did not, and have not ever, understood God. Moreover, says Tertullian, their own prophets spoke on this very matter, judging the people unable or unwilling to understand God.

While our author does not tackle this charge in the same way as Tertullian, there are perhaps enough similar themes—"Israel" not keeping the honor of being God's chosen, but losing it to Christians, and the prophets predicting the Jews' "failure"—to consider the possibility that our homilist was driven in part by Marcionite accusations. Lieu suggests that it is because our author does not stress the "blindness" of "Israel" but rather notes it's "ingratitude" that she hesitates to define the homily's primary target as anti-Marcion.[238] Yet surely the charge of ingratitude infers blindness; in fact, it assumes willful disregard. As such, it is not too far from Tertullian's and others' charges of misunderstanding.

Summary of the Homily's Anti-Judaism

In summarizing the various possibilities in interpreting our homilist's anti-Jewish rhetoric, the majority of scholars accent the social situation of Sardian Jews as a backdrop to explaining the homily's vitriol. Kraabel is credited with first focusing on the historical setting of the Sardian Jews in relation to our homily, and he concludes that their established position in Sardis led to the resentment and anger expressed by our author. Following Kraabel, some scholars interpret the Sardis archaeological and literary evidence as indicating that Jews and Christians fought each other for converts, or that Christians felt persecuted by Jews, or that Christians desired the political clout attained by the Jewish community. Yet I maintain that in some cases (as in the case of portraying Judaism as missionary), the existing evidence is stretched beyond its limits. More importantly, I argue that the Sardis milieu is precarious at best, and thus cannot support any analysis of the homily.

Other scholars propose that our homily does not reflect any second or third century rivalry between Jews and Christians in Sardis, but rather

---

[238]Lieu, p. 231.

highlights the developing theological arguments about identity among Christians. They claim that our homily reveals little about the author's contemporary Jews or Judaism, but rather centers on defining Christianity over against a caricature of Judaism. A variation of this approach is the hypothesis that the homily addresses Marcionite charges and thus represents an intra-Christian controversy which uses "Jewish" categories such as Law to define Christianity. This argument, however, in no way discredits the evidence that Judaism in the early centuries was active, vibrant, even prominent in some cities. It simply suggests that our homily's anti-Jewish rhetoric is not the place to find historical evidence for Jews or Judaism at this time.

One is tempted to argue that the homily was directed against several adversaries. The carefully elaborated typology from the Jewish Scriptures may indicate some significant concern for the Israel of the Bible and Jews of Jesus' generation, while the rhetoric or tone of the homily might suggest that the issue is urgent, thus implying a current standoff with contemporary Jews. If the argument is primarily against Marcion, then biblical Israel and the generation of Jews at the time of Jesus are probably intended, but one could not rule out the possibility that the homilist might be consciously distinguishing current Jewish Passover practices with the Passion celebration in the homilist's community. Wilson offers just such a model for interpreting the homily. He notes that an important element is our author's attempt to articulate Christian belief, but also reminds readers that "the Jews in Sardis were, in short, a force to be reckoned with, and scarcely to be ignored by a Christian community attempting to establish a distinct identity and political standing."[239]

Taylor challenges this synthesis of the contemporary and historic Jews:

> In their determination to avoid the pitfalls of the theologically over-determined approach, and to uncover the social and political context of early Christian existence, scholars come to their interpretation of the Christian texts on Judaism with a preconceived notion of the level of reality revealed in the writings.[240]

She maintains that for some texts, one is only dealing with a particular aspect of Christian identity, and that rather specific view does not allow one to extrapolate conclusions about the author's Jewish contemporaries.

Her admonition is an important one when dealing with our text whose provenance is undetermined. The significant level of diversity among Jewish communities in the ancient world cautions against any

---

[239]Wilson, "Passover, Easter, and Anti-Judaism," p. 350.
[240]Taylor, p. 140.

general assumptions about a particular Jewish community's make-up. One should not rule out the possibility that knowledge about Jews in any city might nuance a particular Christian's view about "biblical" Jews. For example, Chrysostom's fire against the Judaizers (Christians who were following certain "Jewish" practices) might have been stoked by his inability to remove from Antioch the positive presence of Jews. Yet the assumption that a vibrant Jewish community tends to provoke a Christian's direct attack against it might not always prove true. One need look no further than Theophilus in Antioch one century earlier (ca. 180 CE) for a Christian who seemed unaffected by the contemporary Jews. Within the same city (though with about 150 years between them) Theophilus and Chrysostom express different attitudes about Jews and/or Judaism; thus, archaeological, epigraphic and even certain literary evidence (as from Josephus) about Jews might not help explain a particular Christian's attitude toward Judaism or Jews. In our homily, the probability that the author was only speaking about Jews from biblical times should caution against drawing general conclusions about the possible impact the second or third century Jewish community might have had on our author.

Part Two

Sources

Quotations Used in the Homily

The quotations in our homily are identified in part by the author's apparent self-conscious effort to quote what is considered today to be biblical material.[1] Often this self-consciousness can be determined by noting formulaic introductions, in our case for example, *phēsin*, or *eipen* (he/it says) in *PP* 12-14 and *PP* 61-64. There are several formulae employed by our author or the sources, but no particular pattern emerges, nor are certain introductory formulae specific to a particular context in the homily.[2]

The following is a list of those passages which contain explicit quotations as defined by the criteria presented above:

PP 11: "But I will relate the words of the scripture (*diēgēsomai de ta rēmata tēs graphēs*), how God has given command to Moses in Egypt, when he intends to bind Pharaoh under a scourge and to free Israel from a scourge by Moses' hand."

PP 12: "Look," he says, "you shall take a lamb, spotless and unblemished, and towards evening you shall slay it with the sons of Israel, and by[3] night you shall eat it with haste, and you shall break no bone of it."

---

[1]Our author, in theory, could quote from non-biblical material which s/he considered authoritative. Though not a quotation, there may be allusions to the Gospel of Peter 3.6 in *PP* 72, with its blame of Jesus' death laid at "Israel's" feet and to Gospel of Peter 6.21 in *PP* 79, referring to sharp nails used in the crucifixion.

[2]The lists in *Studia Patristica* and passages recovered by search in the TLG have helped to identity other ancient authors who quote similar passages. Also helpful is the critical apparatus found in the Göttingen editions, edited by J. W. Wevers (1977) and by J. Ziegler (1957).

[3]Hall writes, "in the night," *Melito of Sardis*, p. 2.

PP 13: "Thus," he says, "you shall do:
in one night you shall eat it by families and tribes, belted at your loins and with your staves in your hands. For this is the Pascha of the Lord, an eternal reminder for the sons of Israel."

PP 14: "But take the blood of the sheep
and smear the front doors of your houses, putting on the posts of the entrance the sign of the blood to win the angel's respect. For look! I am striking Egypt, and in one night she will be made childless, both beast and man."

PP 47: [Gen. 2.16-17]
...laying down this law for him by his command: "Of every tree in the paradise by all means eat, but of the tree of knowing good and evil you shall not eat; and on the day you eat you shall certainly die."

PP 61: [Deut. 28.66]
For Moses says to the people: "And you shall see your life hanging before your eyes night and day; and you will not believe on your life."

PP 62: [Ps. 2.1-3]
And David said: "Why have nations snorted, and peoples contemplated vain things? The kings of the earth stood by and the rulers assembled together against the Lord and against his Christ."

PP 63: [Jer. 11.19]
And Jeremiah: "I am like a harmless lambkin led to be sacrificed. They devised evil things for me, saying: 'Come on, let us put wood on his bread, and wipe him out from the land of the living; and his name shall not be remembered.'"

PP 64: [Is. 53.7-8]
And Isaiah: "As a sheep he was led to slaughter, and as a lamb speechless before him that sheared him this one opens not his mouth: but his generation who shall tell?"

PP 72: [Ps. 35.12 + Jer. 11.19 + Is. 3.9-10]
Where is it written in law and prophets, "They repaid me bad things for good and childlessness for my soul, when they devised evil things against me and said, 'Let us bind the just one, because he is a nuisance to us'?"

PP 74: [Jer. 7.6]
Or is it not written for you, "You shall not shed innocent blood, so that you may not die an evil death"?

PP 93: [Ex. 12.8]
As it is written for you: "You shall eat unleavened bread with bitter flavors."

PP 101: [Is. 50.8]
[The Lord] arose from the dead and uttered this cry: "Who takes issue with me?—let him stand against me."

Quotations Inform the Design of the Homily

In reading the homily, one is struck by the emphasis placed on model and fulfillment, on typology. Our author is not interested in verse-by-verse exegesis,[4] nor with allegorical interpretation;[5] rather our homilist seems intent on highlighting the prophetic nature of the Jewish scriptures and their stories, in particular, the Passover narrative. The homily's structure rests on the typological explanation of Jewish scriptural material to convince the audience of Jesus' identification with the Passover lamb.

The author discloses this structure at the beginning of the homily, where *PP* 1 reads in part: "how the sheep is sacrificed and how the people is saved and how Pharaoh is scourged through the mystery." The first half of the homily emphasizes the sacrifice of the sheep at Passover, while the second half explains how Jesus is the sacrificial lamb. This same pattern is repeated with "the people" (ancient Israelites) being saved at the Passover, though with a bit of a twist. *Ho laos* (the people) foreshadows discussions in the second half of the homily, where "the people" refers to Christians being saved through Jesus' Passion.

Pharaoh acts as a foil to the exploits of both "Israel" in the first part of the homily, and Jesus in the second half of the homily. In the interpretation of the Passover event, the homilist describes the Pharaoh as mourning over the death of Egypt's first born, and being clothed with mourning. In the latter half of the homily, the author invokes the picture of Pharaoh mourning to expose what "Israel" is *not* doing (*PP* 98). Moreover, the image of Pharaoh clothed in mourning is drawn into the discussion of Jesus being clothed with "the suffering one" (*PP* 66). The image is used in two distinct ways, and is integral to the homily's structure.[6]

The Genesis 2.16-17 quotation is used by our author to stress that the first human's sin has forever altered every subsequent human—a contention which can be found in Christian thought as early as the beginning chapters of Romans (though I am not suggesting any direct or

---

[4]Contrast Origen, *Peri Pascha* 3, or Ps. Hippolytus, *Peri Pascha*.
[5]See Philo, *All. Int.* 1.101-104 and *On Genesis* 1.15.
[6]Yet the reader should be aware that the phrase in *PP* 1, "how Pharaoh is scourged through the mystery," is not found in A (B is missing *PP* 1-6, and C-S lacks this section). The phrase is found, however, in the Latin and the Georgian editions.

indirect connection). Thus, the first human becomes a type of humanity; humans are now "prisoners under the shadows of death" (*PP* 56).

In the quotation series in *PP* 61-64, the homilist seems as interested in the names of prophets (the author's term), Moses, David, Isaiah and Jeremiah, accompanying the quotations as in the meaning of the quotations themselves. In fact, the Ps. 2 quotation itself receives relatively little attention in subsequent discussion. Parenthetically, by suggesting that our author was interested in the names of the prophets attached to the quotations, the use of a derivative-biblical source follows somewhat naturally as it seems unlikely that our author would take the time to look up passages unrelated to the homily's message just to include a passage from a particular author.

The typological approach takes an unfortunate turn in *PP* 72, 74 and 93, where the quotations' "fulfillment" are found in Israel's unfaithfulness. Our author seems to emphasize typology most among these three quotations as "Israel" is cast in the role of Egypt during the Exodus. For example, instead of the joy that ancient Israel experienced in eating bitter herbs as recorded in the Exodus Passover, now "Israel" faces bitter condemnation from God (*PP* 93). Lieu describes the author's approach as "replacement theology,"[7] a helpful concept that penetrates the heart of our homilist's concerns. The Pascha is replaced because it was merely a model or type of the Passion. Being replaced, it loses all worth. Instead, it is Jesus and the Church which now fulfill the model.

The phrase uttered by Christ in *PP* 101 from Is. 50.8, "who stands against me," is not explained typologically. As with the quotations used against "Israel," Is. 50.8 is interpreted as direct prophetic fulfillment. Yet in the overall description of Jesus found in *PP* 100-103, the author refers to him as the "Pascha of salvation" and the "lamb slain for you" (*PP* 103). The general context is saturated with typology.

The Passover Motif and Exodus 12

The Passover motif organizes the homilist's argument. Moreover, a careful examination of it counters the claims that our homily can be tied with emerging rabbinic thoughts and liturgy. *PP* 11 introduces the passage:

> *PP* [11] "But I will relate the words of the scripture (*diēgēsomai de ta rēmata tēs graphēs*), how God has given command to Moses in Egypt, when he intends to bind Pharaoh under a scourge and to free Israel from a scourge by Moses' hand."

---

[7]Lieu, p. 216.

PP [12] "Look," he says, "you shall take a lamb, spotless and unblemished, and towards evening you shall slay it with the sons of Israel, and by[8] night you shall eat it with haste, and you shall break no bone of it."

PP [13] "Thus," he says, "you shall do: in one night you shall eat it by families and tribes, belted at your loins and with your staves in your hands. For this is the Pascha of the Lord, an eternal reminder for the sons of Israel."

PP [14] "But take the blood of the sheep and smear the front doors of your houses, putting on the posts of the entrance the sign of the blood to win the angel's respect. For look! I am striking Egypt, and in one night she will be made childless, both beast and man."

PP Passage	***Line #***
[12] *Idou gar, phēsin, lēmpsē aspilon amnon kai amōmon*	#72
kai pros hesperan sphaxeis auton meta tōn huiōn Israēl,	#73
kai nuktōr edesthe auto meta spoudēs	#74
[B kai] ostoun ou suntripseis autou.	#75
[13] *houtōs, phēsin, poiēseis.*	#76
en mia nukti edesthe auto kata patrias kai dēmous,	#77
periezōsmenoi tas osphuas humon	#78
kai hai rhabdoi en tais chersin humōn.	#79
estin gar touto [om. B] pascha kuriou,	#80
mnēmosunon aiōnion tois huiois Israēl.	#81
[14] *labontes de to tou probatou haima*	#82
chrisate ta prothura tōn oikiōn humōn,	#83
tithentes epi tous stathmous tēs eisodou	#84
to sēmeion tou haimatos eis dusōpian tou aggelou.	#85
idou gar, patassō Aigupton	#86
kai en mia nukti ateknōthēsetai apo ktēnous heōs anthrōpou.	#87

The homilist records selections from the biblical material in almost every line of *PP* 12-14. The description of the lamb as spotless and unblemished in the first line is not found in the LXX's Ex. 12, but a similar phrase is found in 1 Pet. 1.19. The LXX reads *probaton teleion* (sheep perfect or unblemished) while 1 Peter reads, *amnou amōmou kai aspilou* (lamb without blemish [blameless] or spot [pure]). Our homily includes the same terms as 1 Peter, but in a different order: *aspilon amnon kai amōmon*. This similarity of terms, which varies from the LXX of Ex. 12.5, may indicate a developing traditional way of characterizing Jesus, if not a traditional Jewish description of the Paschal lamb which was taken up by some Christians.

The wording in line 74 is close to Ex. 12.11, with the addition of *nuktōr* (night) after *kai* (and). The reference to night is found in Ex. 12.8,

[8]Hall writes, "in the night," *Melito of Sardis*, p. 2.

but, perhaps more importantly for our purposes, it is found also in the homily's crucifixion account in *PP* 71. Here the timing of the crucifixion seems to be critical: "he was sacrificed at evening and buried at night." The composite quotation of *PP* 72 opens the door to the anti-Jewish section, where images from the Passover (*PP* 12-14) are used against "Israel." Moreover, in *PP* 71 one finds direct parallels drawn between the Passover and the Passion. In discussing the Passion, Jesus is identified as the lamb being slain and as *ho amnos ho aphōnos*, retaining the variant placement of *aphōnos* as in the Is. 53.7 citation quoted in full at *PP* 64. A comparison of *PP* 12 and 71 follows:

***PP* 12**	***PP* 71**
you shall take a lamb	he is the one taken from the flock
and toward evening you shall slay it	and dragged to slaughter and sacrificed at evening
and in the night you shall eat it with haste	and buried at night
and you shall break no bone of it	who on the tree was not broken

Two points are noteworthy. First, our author may be drawing a parallel between the phrase "eating with haste" and mention of burial. The author speaks of the body as food for death in *PP* 21, 22, and 54. In examining the LXX of Ex. 12, the phrase about no bones being broken is in Ex. 12.10, while the "eating in haste" phrase is found in 12.11,[9] but in the Gospel of John, the claim that no bones were broken comes after mention of Jesus' death. Apparently following a tradition similar to John's, our homily mentions the bones after "eating with haste" (death).

Line 75 from *PP* 12, *ostoun ou suntripseis autou*, is very similar to the LXX Ex. 12.10 passage (repeated in Ex. 12.46). The homilist retains the use of the singular verb tense, matching the singular in the previous lines. An interesting variant is the omission of the *ap'* before the *autou* (his). The same omission is found in John 19.36: "For these things took place that the scripture might be fulfilled, 'Not a bone of him shall be broken'" (*ostoun ou suntribēsetai autou*). While one cannot assert on this evidence alone that our homilist or the source used knew John's Gospel, it is probably safe to say that a tradition which omitted *ap'* circulated among some Christians.[10] This is a second similarity with John's Gospel,

[9]In the Hebrew Bible, the reference to broken bones is found only in Ex. 12.46.
[10]Our author seems to know the tradition of the raising of Lazarus found in John 11 because he mentions that Jesus raised someone from the dead who was already four days in the grave (*PP* 78).

and may reflect the preference of our author or source in interpreting the Passion or perhaps echo a tradition in John which built on a source similar to one used by our homilist.[11]

Further examination of the two passages also gives rise to a second, more speculative observation. Our author includes the phrase "on the tree" in the last line of *PP* 71. A similar phrase is found in Justin's quotation of Ps. 95 (*Dial* 73), which reads, "the Lord reigns *from the tree.*" Tertullian also mentions the text as coming from the Psalms (*Ad. Marc.* 3.19 and *Ad. Jud.* 10). Tertullian assumes his readers know these "words of David," and he emphatically stresses their prophetic character. "Why may not Christ be said to have reigned from the tree, from His having shut up the kingdom of death by dying upon the tree of His cross" (*Ad. Marc.* 3.19). Both these early writers seem to take for granted that "the tree" is part of biblical tradition, and interpret the phrase as prophetically fulfilled in the Passion. These references from Justin[12] and Tertullian suggest at the very least a source or tradition which included this phrase in its citing of Psalms or poetic material, and our homily's language suggests that the phrase was incorporated into a retelling of the Passion. Paul speaks of Jesus as "becoming a curse for us" because he was hung on a tree, perhaps alluding to Deut. 21.23 (Gal. 3.13-14). His discussion indicates that some of the earliest Christians speculated on the role the cross (tree) played in interpreting Jesus' Passion.

Before looking at the last variant, it may be helpful to summarize early Jewish and Christian perspectives on the Passover story. After which, the discussion on the last significant variant, *touto* (this), will introduce an exploration of possible sources available to our homilist.

Early Jewish Passover Material

Jubilees 49, 2 Chron. 30.1-27 and 35.1-19, Wisdom of Solomon 18.2-25 and other texts, stress the joy of the Passover festival. They speak of the sacrifice being made in the evening, and, following Deut. 16, emphasize the sacrifice taking place in a public central location (unlike the more

---

[11]Sykes, pp. 279-281, suggests that John's Gospel reflects a theologically and socially similar context to Melito's situation.

[12]It was thought that some of Justin Martyr's textual variants were the result of his faulty memory, but the discovery of the R scroll of the Minor Prophets has indicated that, at least in those instances, Justin's source must have been a "variant" text tradition. D. Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septant," *RB* 60 (1953):18-29; reprint, pp. 128-130 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text,* ed. R. M. Cross and Sh. Talmon (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975); *The Greek Minor Prophets from Nahal Hever, DJD 8,* ed. E. Tov with the collaboration of Robert A. Kraft (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990).

private home setting of Ex. 12). They remark on the delight which comes from thanking God for bringing their ancestors out of slavery. Jubilees promises that those who remember the Passover each year will be safe from any plague which might seek to destroy them (49.14-15). Similarly, the Wisdom of Solomon speaks of the praises given to God (18.2-25). Distinctions are drawn between God's protection of Israel and punishment of Egypt's firstborn.

Almost all early Jewish writings (pre-rabbinic) emphasize the sacrifice as a very important part of the Passover celebration, and most link that night with the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Num. 9.1-15 stresses the joining of the two). Most early Jewish writings assume that the Passover sacrifice should take place in Jerusalem (Samaritans being a noteworthy exception). Josephus emphasizes the great number of pilgrims who travel to Jerusalem in *War* 6.423-24. Philo, however, has sympathy for those in the Diaspora who are unable to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (*Moses* 2.224-232). Unfortunately, it is unclear whether those families performed a ritual killing of a lamb in their own homes. No firm evidence that Diaspora Jews celebrated Passover with a special meal exists, though one could not rule out that possibility.[13]

In this discussion, Paul's description of Jesus as the Passover sacrifice in 1 Cor 5.6-8 is intriguing. Paul begins by chastising the Corinthians for allowing evil "yeast" to ferment within their group, and calls them to be "unleavened" bread. He claims that "Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed; let us celebrate the feast, then, by getting rid of all the old yeast of evil and wickedness" (1 Cor. 5.7-8). While Paul is undoubtedly drawing symbolic interpretations about the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, his assumptions about the association of the Passover sacrifice and the Feast of Unleavened Bread may reveal historical practice in Corinth. Because he makes no mention of the Corinthians performing a "sacrifice" but implies they eat the unleavened bread, one wonders if the Corinthian Christians celebrated the Feast of Unleavened Bread only (or knew of such a celebration).[14] At the very least, it seems

---

[13]Baruch M. Bokser, *The Origins of the Seder*, p. 54. He writes, "Despite the probability that some Jews who lacked access to a paschal sacrifice felt the need to do something on Passover eve, none of the pre-rabbinic accounts of the celebration mentions a meal without a sacrifice, much less comes close to matching the multifaceted description of the gathering in the Mishnah."

[14]1 Cor. 11.17-34 speaks of the "Lord's Supper" which the Corinthians eat on a regular basis, perhaps weekly or monthly, as part of a communal meal. Paul makes no specific mention here about Jesus being a sacrifice, though the descriptions of the "Last Supper" in the synoptic gospels are identified as a Passover meal (Matt. 26.17-30 and parallels).

that Paul expected the Corinthians to understand this connection between Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

The bitter herbs are not a central focus for many early Jewish writers; neither Josephus nor Jubilees mention them at all. The exception to this is Philo, who explains that bitter herbs symbolize the work required to leave passions behind. "They think that the unlearning of passion is a bitterness, though to a mind that welcomes effort that same is a joy and a feast" (*Preliminary Studies* 28).

In several works, Philo alludes to the Passover story as an example of the soul overcoming the passions which rule the body. For instance, twice in *Quis Her.*,[15] Philo refers to reason conquering passion,[16] as in this statement about "the Passover, which is held when the soul studies to unlearn irrational passion (*pathos*) and of its own free will experiences the higher form of passion (*paschē*) which reason sanctions." In this work, as well as in *Mig.* 25, one finds an interest in fleeing from passions "in haste." Our homilist also mentions "in haste," emphasizing the *timing* of the meal, not the speed with which one eats. Conversely, Philo seems to stress haste, "to the intent that the Mind with resolute purpose and unfailing eagerness may carry out both its passing away from the passions without turning back, and its thanksgiving to God its Savior."[17]

Some scholars question whether (and if so, when) Ex. 12 was read during the Jewish Passover celebration. Angerstorfer points to the Gemara on *bMeg.* 31a as indicating that Ex. 12.21 was read on the first day of the feast. She suggests that nothing prohibits the reciting of Ex. 12 during the Passover, though she notes that Deut. 26.5-9 ("a wandering Aramean was my ancestor; he went down into Egypt and lived there as an alien") is the text used in the traditional Passover Haggadah (*mPes.* 10.4g).[18] Hall also "can find no evidence for the reading of [Ex. 12.1-20] on the eve of Passover earlier than Melito."[19] Both acknowledge that the

---

[15]Philo, *Quis Her.* 193; 255. English translation from Loeb Classical Library.

[16]Expressing this same interest, see also Philo, *Sac.* 16 and 17.

[17]Philo, *Mig.* 25; see also Philo, *Quis Her.* 255.

[18]Angerstorfer, pp. 32-36. The Deut. 26.5-9 text does not speak of the evening sacrifice, nor of unleavened bread, but of God's power in bringing Israel out of Egypt and into a land flowing with milk and honey.

[19]Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah," p. 34. Hall does discuss A. Buchler's reconstructed triennnial synagogue lectionary, which places the reading of Ex. 12 on the first Sabbath of Nisan in the cycle's second year. Hall also notes that Mishnah *Megillah* 3.4 states that Ex. 12 was read in the latter Sabbaths of Adar, the month preceding Nisan. Hall concludes that "it is therefore clear that the reading of Exod. xii.1-20 and the exposition of Passover law took place in various Jewish traditions on one of the Sabbaths shortly before 14 Nisan" pp. 35-36. See A. Buchler, "The Reading of the Law and the Prophets in a triennial cycle," *JQR* 5 (1893):420-68.

central emphasis given to Ex. 12 in our homily is not found in rabbinic discussions on the Passover.

Until the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, most extant Jewish discussions on the Passover include some sacrificial element in the celebration. Jubilees 49, Ezekiel the Tragedian (l. 152-189), Wisdom of Solomon 18, Philo and Josephus, among others, focus on the sacrifice when describing Passover.[20] Yet the Mishnah, Pesahim 10,[21] seems to elevate the place of unleavened bread and bitter herbs, giving them equal value with the sacrifice. Later the Mekilta of Rabbi Simeon ben Yohai to Exodus 12.18 makes the claim more forcefully:

> Therefore the teaching says, "Upon it [with the Passover sacrifice] you shall eat unleavened bread" (Deut. 16.3). The verse makes it an obligation.
>
> C. I only know [from this] concerning the time when the Temple exists.
>
> Concerning when the Temple does not exist, whence?
>
> [Therefore] the teaching says, "At evening you shall eat unleavened bread" (Ex. 12.18).[22]

One discovers a corresponding effort both to relegate the literal Passover sacrifice to the past and reinforce its symbolic meaning by verbalizing its interpretation, "Pesah—because the Omnipresent skipped over the houses of our ancestors in Egypt" (*mPes.* 10.5c). Bokser remarks that "the symbolic approach to the sacrifice is further reflected in the custom of putting two cooked foods on the table to represent the passover and festival sacrifices. This custom would have developed when people no longer roasted a lamb to resemble the sacrifice."[23] It seems less likely that our homily, with its interest in sacrifice as

---

[20]See Philo, *Q and A on Ex.*, 1-23; *Special Laws*, 150- 155; *Preliminary Studies*, 161-162; *Sac.*, 62-63; *All. Int.*, 154. See also Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6.

[21]*mPes.* 10 should not be equated with the various current Passover Haggadahs available and used in contemporary Judaism, though similarities are numerous.

[22]Bosker, *The Origins of the Seder*, pp. 39-43. He claims that the Haggadah developed over time, and that *mPes.* 10 as it stands today includes interpolations and layers of thought. This point becomes important in dating the rituals discussed, especially when attempting to draw connections between our homily and rabbinic texts. J. Neusner, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Appointed Times* 5 (Leiden, Brill, 1983):6, calls attention to the fact that the Bar Kokhba revolt marked a break in the continuity within Jewish tradition, and thus "the claim that the authorities of Usha [ca. 140-170] carry forward what they learned from the masters of Yavneh [ca. 70-140] on the surface cannot be taken for granted but must be demonstrated and tested item by item and point by point."

[23]Bokser, p. 43.

described in Ex. 12, followed emerging rabbinic thought, which was de-emphasizing and re-defining the place of the sacrifice.

Although hinted at above, it should be stated explicitly that the development of the Passover Haggadah is unclear. Neusner remarks on the "unMishnaic character" of Pesahim 10 in his analysis that "we are unable to demonstrate that any of these materials comes prior to the Mishnah's own time....We simply do not know what to make of the present attributions."[24] Bokser concludes that the Haggadah tradition evolved, as for example in the phrase "and two cooked foods" in *mPes.* 10.3c, which, he claims, "are mentioned in the Gemara [Palestine recension ca. 350-400 CE, Babylonia recension ca. 500 CE], in a baraita, and have been anachronistically interpolated into the text of Mishnah Pesahim 10.3."[25] Material from the Tosefta and the Gemara, as well as developments in the Seder, contribute to the final version of the Haggadah.

One might also speculate on the ramifications of developing Christian thought concerning the "sacrifice" of Jesus on the rabbis' re-evaluation of the Passover celebration.[26] Though our homilist does not stress this, several early Christian writers, including Justin, *Dial.* 40, declare that with the fall of the Temple in Jerusalem, Jews can no longer offer valid Passover sacrifices, and thus cannot celebrate the Passover correctly.[27] The Mishnah records the early rabbis' efforts to explain how the destruction of the Temple, and the subsequent inability to offer sacrifices there as done in the past, does not disqualify Jews from celebrating the Passover. In establishing what was to become the Passover Seder, they likely drew from (1) Ex. 12 with its emphasis on a home celebration (ignoring the prominent place of the sacrifice), (2) connections made between the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in various biblical texts, and (3) developing traditions, such as singing and praising God during the festival celebrations.[28]

Exodus 12 and the Passover in Early Christian Writings

In a survey of early Christian writings that refer to Ex. 12, a continuum emerges which includes at one end careful quotations

---

[24]Neusner, p. 123.
[25]Bosker, *The Origins of the Seder,* p. 43, see also p. 29.
[26]It should be asserted, however, that the destruction of the Temple (and the subsequent inability to offer sacrifices) would be reason enough to re-evaluate the Passover celebration.
[27]See also N. R. M. deLange's discussion on Origen, *Origen and the Jews* (NY: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976):94-95 and Robert Wilken's discussion on Chrysostom's attitudes toward the Temple in *John Chrysostom and the Jews.*
[28]Bokser, *The Origins of the Seder,* p. 28.

following the LXX, and at the other end periphrastic citations. There are texts which exegete individual, consecutive phrases of the Ex. 12 story in a commentary format, such as Origen's *Peri Pascha* and (Ps.) Hippolytus' *Peri Pascha.* There are also direct quotations of a short section, verse or phrase from Ex. 12 outside the general context of the Passover story. These tend to emphasize the timing of some aspect of Jesus' Passion, usually explaining liturgical practices surrounding the remembrance of Jesus' death or the timing of the resurrection.

The Christian writings that present the Ex. 12 Passover text as a continuous story with no commentary interspersed, as in our homily, often give careful attention to the story's prefiguring of the Passion. For example, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Lactantius "summarize" some or all of the story.[29]

"Tertullian" (*Ad. Jud.* 10),[30] explaining that the Passover foreshadows the Passion, introduces a paraphrased version of the Passover with a quotation from Amos 8.9-10, stressing that the day of the Passion would be a dark one (literally) and that the Jews would bear responsibility for killing Jesus. The reference to darkness is similar to our homilist's stress on night as the time for both the Passover and the Passion.

While not in Greek, the phrases in *Ad. Jud.* approximate some found in the homily. For example, Moses' speech to the sons of Israel that they should sacrifice a lamb in the evening runs parallel to the claim found in the first line of *PP* 12, for each mentions the sons of Israel, the sacrifice of the lamb, and the "evening" setting. *Ad. Jud.* then refers to eating the sacrifice, coinciding with the PP's order, and interprets the Passover as prophesying Jesus' Passion directly, writing "it was the Passover of the Lord, that is, the Passion of Christ." In light of these correspondences, it is possible that the compiler of this section of *Ad. Jud.* knew our homily or shared a similar source.[31]

---

[29]For brief allusions to the Passover as it "prophesied" the Passion, see also Hippolytus' *Apost. Trad.* 41.90.7 and Irenaeus, *Dem.* 25.

[30]Tertullian is in quotation marks here because many scholars assume that chapters 9-14 of *Ad. Jud.* are spurious. Quasten argues that the chapters were taken from an earlier draft of *Ad. Marc.* by a compiler and attached to *Ad. Jud.* 1- 8 (Quasten, *Patrology* 2, pp. 268-69). Efroymson suggests that "since most of the biblical texts and arguments found in *Ad. Jud.* 9-14 are found again, in Tertullian's own style, in *Ad. Marc.* 3, 7-12, nothing is lost as far as Tertullian's thought is concerned." D. Efroymson, "Tertullian's Anti- Judaism and Its Role in His Theology," p.10, n. 19.

[31]Three points are worth making here. First, *Ad. Jud.* 10 begins with a discussion of the Passion prefigured in the Jewish Scriptures, where both Is. 53.7-8 and Jer. 11.19 are expounded. Second, the summary from Ex. 12 is not found in the parallel section from *Ad. Marc.* Third, *Ad. Jud.* 10 notes that Jews eat the sacrifice

Often the Passover is equated with suffering (*paschein*, to suffer), as seen in our homily.[32] Lactantius (*Divine Inst.* 4.26) records an account of the Passover within a discussion on the "sign" of the cross made on believers' foreheads (perhaps during a baptismal ritual).[33] He asserts that this sign was given to the Jews at Passover for their protection, though it was but an "image of things to come."

An interesting tangent is Lactantius' discussion about no bones being broken at the Passion. Ex. 12.46 specifies that no bones are to be broken, but submits no reason for this. Lactantius claims that the bones were not broken because they would have then been unsuitable to be raised. Our author offers no reason for keeping the bones unbroken (*PP* 12 and 71). The stipulation about unbroken bones is not mentioned in the Deut. 16 passage, nor in many early Jewish writings. An exception noted above is Jubilees, which while promoting the centralized sacrifice site as advocated in Deut. 16, also explains that no bones are to be broken in the sacrifice, "for of the children of Israel no bone shall be crushed" (49.12).

Not every ancient Christian writer handles the Passover story as does our homilist. Cyprian (twice), Origen, Dionysius of Alex, Ps. Hippolytus, and the *Didascalia* examine one or several specific passages in Ex. 12. The latter two are generally considered to represent Quartodeciman views. While in the homily the time element serves to highlight fulfilled prophecy, the above listed authors focus on the timing of the church's celebration of Easter as it relates to the time Jesus's crucifixion took place (in the evening). Cyprian writes in *Letter* 63 that the celebration of the "sacrifice of the Lord" should be done in the evening, supported in part by the phrase from Ex. 12.6 concerning the time of the Passover lamb slaughter. This practice is contrasted with the custom of celebrating the Resurrection in the morning. Dionysius of

---

with bitterness, whereas our author uses that phrase toward the end of the homily in describing the fate of Israel (*PP* 93).

[32]Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. 23, n. 30, notes that this "false etymology of the Aramaic *pascha* as if it came from the root of the Greek *paschein* is widespread in early Christianity." Philo interprets the term differently, focusing primarily on the Hebrew meaning of the term, "passing" as in *Q and A on Ex.* 4, where he offers several "literal" meanings, and then suggests that the deeper meaning includes "souls [giving] up the pursuits of youth and their terrible disorder and [changing] to a better and older state." See also *Mig.* 5.25 and *Sac.* 17.63.

[33]Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, p. 9, n. 5, writes, "Melito regards the Pascha as an initiatory rite with apotropaic effect, and insinuates into 14-16 the language of Christian baptism and unction, especially *sphragizein, chriein, pneuma, amuētos.*" He points to Justin, *Dial.* 40.1, 111.3, who draws a parallel between the Passover and baptism. Baptism was done during the time of Passover/Easter in some early Christian communities, and thus a baptism might have followed the homily, but no direct evidence can be found within the homily itself that such occurred.

Alexander's letter to Basilides, bishop of the churches in the Pentapolis, includes Ex. 12.6 to support the claim that the lamb slaughtered (and therefore the crucifixion) happened in the late afternoon, *toward* evening, but not in the evening. This is important to his overall contention, which is to prove that three days elapsed between the crucifixion and the resurrection.[34] The *Peri Pascha* attributed to (Ps.) Hippolytus explains why "evening" is important in Ex. 12.6, and why the 10th of the month is critical (see passage 20-23).[35] In the *Didascalia,* interest centers on prescribing the number of days one should fast during the Pascha.[36]

In reviewing the homily's Ex. 12 Passover story in light of historical parallels, several important points bear repeating. The Passover story provides the context for the later exposition of the Passion, as well as the justification for "Israel's" condemnation. The Passover narrative furnishes substance for the discussion of the model/fulfillment pattern in the introduction and the working out of that paradigm in our author's Christology. The interpretation of the Passover connects the experience of the Egyptians to those which befell "Israel," and contrasts Pharaoh and Jesus.

The Homily's Variants and their Sources

Returning to the Ex. 12 reading preserved by our homilist, an interesting variant , *touto* (this) appears in line #80 in ACG, while B follows the LXX.[37] Hall notes that both line length and the number of letters per line, as well as poetic considerations, point to A as the more original reading.[38] Hall also asserts that B seems to "correct" variants in the quotations—for example, in *PP* 12, ACG reads "you shall break no bone," while B includes an "and" at the beginning of the sentence as found in Ex. 12.10, 46. In this same phrase in *PP* 12 ([*kai*] *ostoun ou suntripseis autou*), the verb in AG is singular, whereas BC has the plural verb (*suntripsete*), as found in the LXX. I noted in Part One that in the Is. 53.7 quotation (*PP* 64), A has *eisphagēn,* while B follows the OG reading

---

[34]In a passing reference to the Passover beginning at evening, see Anatolius, *On the Date of the Passover,* 18; see also Clement of Alex., *Strom.* 2.51.2.

[35] Ps. Hippolytus, *Peri Pascha,* in *Homelies Paschales, SC* 27, ed. by P. Nautin (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1950):18- 42.

[36]On the issue of fasting, see Irenaeus in Eusebius, *EH* 5.24; Hippolytus, *Apost. Trad.,* and Dionysius of Alex, *Ep. Canon.* Routh 3, 229.

[37] This variant may be rooted in Ex. 12.27 which also speaks about the Pascha of the Lord, though with a different agenda than that of Ex. 12.11. A rather insignificant variant in the homily is the addition of the *gar* which is attested in many ancient authors and MSS, and may be explained by stylistic needs.

[38]Hall, "The Melito Papyri," p. 480.

epi sphagē(n).[39] In *PP* 63, the Jer. 11.19 quotation in A includes *eis eme* (for me), while B and the OG have *ep' eme*. One might also note in this connection *PP* 47, the variant quotation of Gen. 2.16-17, where the reading in A, *agathon* (good), is "corrected" in B to the LXX's *kalon*. These "adjustments" by B toward the LXX might signal that the copyist of B sought to bring the homily's scriptural references into closer conformity with the LXX's renderings.

Questions concerning Sources for Passover Story

Several questions emerge from a close reading of the Ex. 12 Passover account in *PP* 12-14, not the least of which are (1) whether our author self-consciously quoted scriptural material, (2) whether the homily's material was taken from a biblical or derivative-biblical source, and (3) whether the homilist quoted directly from a written source or relied on memory in retelling the Exodus story.

An indication that our homilist used a derivative-biblical source is the PP's ordering of the Passover story, which differs from the LXX, but which is reflected in *PP* 71's portrayal of Jesus' Passion. It is possible, on the one hand, that our author is responsible for re-arranging the Ex. 12 text to match *PP* 71. However, the similarities between *PP* 12-14 and the accounts of Ex. 12 in other Christian texts, as well as the similarities of the Passion account in *PP* 71 to other Christian works, suggest that, at the very least, the author was aware of a traditional interpretation of the Ex. 12 material which paired it with an account of the Passion. This suggestion is supported by the recurrence of the "silent" variant in *PP* 71 (*ho amnos ho aphōnos*) from the phrase in Is. 53.7 (*PP* 64), as well as the inclusion of the phrase "on the tree," a variant perhaps from Ps. 95.

A final example is in *PP* 11, where our author recounts (*diēgēsomai*) the words of the scripture (*graphēs*). The same root word is found in *PP* 46, "You have now heard the *diēgēma* (account) of the model and what corresponds to it," summarizing the importance of the Passover as a type of Christ's Passion, though not apparently referring to a specific biblical quotation.

It is probable that the use of *diēgēsomai* and *diēgēma* intentionally structure the Passover discussion in the homily, highlighting and emphasizing for the listener the importance of the mystery, its model and fulfillment. This frame incorporates the citation of the Ex. 12 Passover story in *PP* 12-14, the explanation of the tenth plague in *PP* 16-33 (death of the first born Egyptians) and the interpretation of the Passover as a type of the Passion, *PP* 34-45. Our homily reflects a

---

[39]See Part One, pgs. 41-45.

developing tradition connecting the Passover and the Passion, explaining the latter by pointing to the former.

General Use of Sources by the Homilist

Our examination of the Exodus story has pointed to the use of derivative biblical sources. At this point a general explanation describing derivative biblical sources is in order to more completely answer the question of sources in our homily. Often scholars assume that our author had access to complete, individual biblical books, even to most or all of those books that were later accepted as canonical. But evidence is rather limited concerning available biblical scrolls and codices,[40] so one cannot assume that our author could secure entire books of the Bible.[41] Instead, it may be that our author had access to or even him/herself compiled excerpts from biblical books and used them in writing. Those books or excerpts could have been the author's personal property or have come from a friend, a library, a synagogue or church.

Though a definitive reconstruction of possible derivative-biblical sources behind the homily's quotations is not feasible, suggestive hints as to their possible form and purpose(s) can be found through a careful comparison of similar quotations from other ancient writings. The recognition that numerous types of sources were available to ancient writers must be considered in any thorough analysis of the homily's quotations.

The situation behind each of the homily's quotations is complex, as the following example illustrates. In quoting Is. 53.7, "as a lamb silent before him that sheared him" (*PP* 64), the homily shares a variant with *Barn.* 5.2 and the Acts of Philip 78, specifically the placement of the term "silent" (*aphōnos*). In the above three works, the term follows directly the word "lamb" (*amnos*); in all other preserved biblical manuscripts and secondary citations, "silent" comes at the end of the line, "as a lamb before him that shears him is silent." One might suppose that our homily, *Ep. Barn.* and the Acts of Philip share a common source,[42] but Ps. Barnabas' quotation appears to be part of a composite text, while the homily includes the quotation as the last in a series of four quotations. This suggests different sources behind each, ruling out the possibility of

---

[40]Eric G. Turner offers a helpful listing of Greek and Latin codices up through the sixth century CE, *The Typology of the Early Codex,* pp. 101-185.

[41]An interesting question is whether the congregation had access to biblical books and/or non-biblical sources. Were the quotations in the homily familiar to the listeners/readers because they had independent access to the biblical texts in some form, or were they relying on our author for most of their knowledge of the biblical texts? Any answer at this point would be pure speculation.

[42]Kraft, "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and Melito's Paschal Homily."

direct sharing. A similar variant might be preserved in different sources or in different forms within a school or liturgical tradition, exponentially complicating the reconstruction of our homily's sources.

The proposal that our author is using written (or fixed oral) derivative-biblical sources in writing biblical texts is rooted in the observation that ancient authors often preserved similar variants from an OG text. This data contributed to Rendel Harris' testimony book hypothesis,[43] which concluded that a book of proof-texts documenting fulfilled prophecies circulated in early Christianity. Major modifications have been made to this theory to allow for the complex picture of sources which has developed since the theory's introduction.[44] As well, several theories today find some continuity between pre-Common Era Judaism's creation and use of sources and those used by Christians.[45] Yet the salient feature of Harris' position, that Christians had access to collections of written biblical quotation sources, is still operative.

Sources Available in the Ancient World

In listing sources which might have been available to the homily's author, one must not forget the obvious, the biblical texts themselves. During the second century, the Hebrew Bible and Christian biblical texts were in some state of flux;[46] for example, while Psalms and Isaiah appear

---

[43]Rendel Harris, *Testimonies* I and II (Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1916-1920). Edwin Hatch was the first to hypothesize that a testimony source was behind the NT composite quotations, though he discussed in detail only Rom. 3.10-18. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889). Krister Stendahl summarizes the development of the testimonies theory, but concludes that the theory does not explain adequately the Gospel of Matthew's Jewish scriptural quotations. Instead, Stendahl postulates a school working with and interpreting the quotations as the resource for the gospel author's information. Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (Uppsala, 1954; reprint, Ramsey, NJ: Sigler Press, 1990).

[44]Foundational as the testimony book hypothesis is to our examination of the homily's sources, it is more accurate to speak of sources and source traditions supporting our homily's quotations. Testimony sources commonly consist of a group of quotations thought to support the argument of a particular fulfilled prophecy.

[45]Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy,* and Robert A. Kraft, "The Epistle of Barnabas, Its Quotations and their Sources." See also P. Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif, L'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources* (Paris; Libraire LeCoffre, 1961) and *Justin et l'Ancien testament: l'argumentation scripturaire du traite de Justin contre toutes les heresies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la premiere Apologie* (Paris: Librairie LeCoffre, 1964) for a discussion of Ps. Barnabas and Justin.

[46]An important discussion on the use of the Greek Bible by Jews well into the Common Era is found in Kurt Treu, "Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die

to have been rather fixed by the turn of the era, Jeremiah texts preserve quite a few variants in the manuscripts. Finding a variant in one of the homily's quotations, then, does not immediately rule out the use of a biblical manuscript. A variant may take on greater significance, however, if it comes from a scriptural passage with a rather uniform textual history, as in the case of the Is. 53.7 example above.

The second, and equally obvious source is the author's memory. In the particular case of our homily, most scholars who suggest that memory is behind the quotations assume the memorized source is a biblical manuscript, but this need not be the case. It is quite possible that our author (or any author) had memorized biblical material from derivative-biblical sources, or liturgy, or school lessons (catechetical material). Closely connected with the concept of memorization is that of "retelling," by which I mean the paraphrasing of biblical material. In our homily, one could argue that *PP* 12-14, the Ex. 12 passage on the Passover, is a retelling of biblical material in that certain biblical phrases are interspersed with apparently non-LXX language.

A third possible source is the developing teaching and liturgical materials from Jewish synagogues and Christian communities.[47] The targumim, Aramaic translations of the Hebrew biblical texts, should be noted in this context.[48] Included here as well might be midrashic interpretations of a particular biblical passage, as in the pesharim (commentaries) found at Qumran, or a grouping of scriptural texts, as found in the Qumran Hodayot psalms.[49] In grouping a series of passages, often the catalyst is a key term or phrase. Stendahl notes an example of this in Paul's composite quotation in 2 Cor. 9.10, "where all the three quotations in their Hebrew form have some bearing on 'rain,' though they do not use the same Hebrew word: Is. 55.10, Deut. 28.11f.,

---

Juden im römischen Reich," *Kairos* 15 (1973):123-144; English trans. William Adler, "The Significance of Greek for Jews in the Roman Empire."

[47]The Two Ways material might have flourished in the teaching setting of the synagogue, though specific evidence of any Jewish written material behind the Christian usage is not extant. The Two Ways material is found in *Barn.* 18.1- 21.9, *Didache* 1.1-6.2. A detailed discussion of these passages is found in Robert A. Kraft, *The Apostolic Fathers, A New Translation and Commentary* 3, *Barnabas and the Didache* (NY: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1965).

[48]For example, one could point to Targum Onkelos, a very close translation dated to ca. 400, and a proto-Onkelos to the first or second century CE. Ps. Jonathan, another early targum, is a very free translation. *ABD:* "Targum, Targumim" (Philip S. Alexander). See also "Targum," *The Encyclopedia of Judaism,* ed. Geoffrey Wigoder (NY: MacMillian, 1989).

[49]G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English.*

Hos. 10.12."[50] Another example is the grouping built around "stone" references in Ps. 118.22 and Is. 8.14,[51] found in various forms in 1 Peter 2.6f., Rom. 9.33, Matt. 21.42 (and parallels) and *Barn.* 6.2-4.

A fourth possible source are the ethical and moral injunctions preserved by Christians that may have started in synagogue homilies or school traditions emphasizing right living. Rewritten biblical text (para-biblical source), for example, Jubilees, could be included here, where the biblical story is presented along with non-biblical materials, the author making no distinction between the two. Traditional interpretations of the "biblical" text might find their roots in this type of literature. Paul may have benefitted from a para-biblical text in his argument about head coverings (hair styles) in 1 Cor. 11.2-16. It may be that his remark that a woman should have authority on her head because of the angels (v. 9) was based on 1 Enoch's Book of the Watchers, a more elaborate version of the Gen. 6 story about the sons of God mating with the daughters of men. If Paul were thinking about the Genesis creation myth, as indicated by his reference to human creation in 11.7, it is possible that his understanding of creation was informed by 1 Enoch's Watchers myth or a similar story.[52]

A fifth source can be found in the anthologies and school notes created in the ancient world. As a subgroup of anthologies and school notes, a testimony tradition incorporates excerpts taken from what is considered to be authoritative literature, often organized around a particular word or theme. When used by Christians, the tradition often seeks to demonstrate some claim about Jesus. This particular source has special relevance for our homily, given Eusebius' claim that Melito (assumed by most modern commentators be the homily's author) compiled several books of Excerpts. Given my apprehension over equating Eusebius' Melito with the homily's author, perhaps all that one should conclude from Eusebius' reference is that he believed that testimonies were created by Christians (for Eusebius the specific Christian was Melito, bishop of Sardis) in the later second century. The third century North African figure, Cyprian, compiled a testimony source emphasizing the fulfillment of prophecies by Jesus (*Ad Quir.*). Justin, in his *Dial.*, used excerpted scriptural passages to support his

---

[50]Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, p. 216. 2 Cor. 9.10 reads, "He who supplies seed to the sower and bread for food will supply and multiply your seed for sowing and increase the harvest of your righteousness."

[51]Ibid., pp. 67-69 for a careful explanation of the evidence.

[52]For a discussion on possible interpretations of this passage, see Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch (Phila., Fortress Press, 1975):189.

contentions about Jesus,[53] as did Eusebius in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* (ca. 315), and Ps. Gregory in his *Testimonies of the Martyrs by the Jews* (ca. 400). Christians preserved testimonies in their *adversus Judaeos* literature, as seen in (Ps.?) Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Ps. Epiphanius.[54]

The formulating of testimony traditions seems not to have originated among Christians, for evidence abounds that Jews were interested in creating and using testimonial material. One can point to the Testimonia (4Q175) and the Florilegium (4Q174), Dead Sea Scroll fragments in Hebrew that include excerpts from several scriptural texts.[55] The Is. 40.3 citation in the synoptic gospels (Mk. 1.2-3 and parallels), identifying the "voice in the wilderness" as John the Baptist, might have been taken from followers of John, who saw him as fulfilling the Is. prophecy.[56] Again, Paul may have had access to excerpts of scriptural texts, as seen in his quotation in Rom. 3.10-18.

A sixth category of sources might include those particularly Christian materials such as *logia* of Jesus and what Justin calls apostolic "memoirs."[57] Christians preserved the words of Jesus not only in gospels (both canonical and non-canonical) but in letters, treatises, acts, and other genres. For example, though nowhere in the canonical gospels does Jesus speak about slavery, the author of 1 Timothy claims to be speaking the words of Jesus about slavery in 1 Tim. 6.1f. Acts 20.35 claims to repeat Jesus' words, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."[58]

Similarly, a source might preserve an axiom or truism which circulates in that culture, and which some might believe comes from biblical material, but in fact does not. Current examples might be the principles "God helps those who help themselves," or "cleanliness is next to godliness"; some people today assume that these phrases are derived from the Bible. A source might also preserve a phrase from biblical material that has become so ingrained in vernacular expression that no connection is made to the Bible when spoken or written by the average person. For example, a sports announcer might praise a baseball

---

[53]See also *Dial. TA* and *Dial. AZ* probably from the fourth century CE.

[54]See *A Ps-Epiphanius Testimony Book,* ed. and trans. Robert V. Hotchkiss (Missoula, MT: SBL, 1974); M. Simon, *Verus Israel;* Efroymson, "Tertullian's Anti-Judaism and its Role in his Theology"; see also M. Taylor.

[55]For a brief description of the texts, see Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Qumran in Perspective* (London: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1977; revised, Phila., Fortress Press, 1981):80-1.

[56]Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew,* p. 215.

[57]Justin, *Apol.* 66.3, 67.3.

[58]The various isolated sayings of Jesus are called Agrapha, "unwritten" in the canonical gospels. *ABD:* "Agrapha" (W. D. Stroker).

pitcher for "pulling that one out of the fire" (see Jude 23), without self-consciously quoting from the canonical Scriptures.

Definitions

At this point I should define more carefully some terms which might have raised questions in the reader's mind, specifically terms such as "biblical," "scriptural," and "canonical." Often the first two terms are used within the framework of a canon of literature, a grouping of authoritative writings. This is, however, an anachronistic setting for "scriptural" and "biblical" as used here. Canon consciousness in the modern sense among Jews and Christians developed slowly and sporadically in the late second and third centuries of the Common Era as the ability to collect into a single book form (codex) the various individual works increased. By canon consciousness, I mean the recognition of a particular group of books which have a relatively fixed form. An earlier stage in the development toward a standardized written form can be called scriptural consciousness, with a focus on the individual writings that later were collected into a canon. A quotation suggesting scriptural consciousness should show an interest in the written form of the text, often demonstrated by a formulaic introduction. It is not enough that the author is aware of a biblical story; the quotation must indicate some respect for an authoritative written (or fixed oral) source behind the quotation.[59]

In our homily, there appears at first to be rather clear scriptural consciousness with regard to the Jewish scriptural quotations, as seen in the formulaic introductions and closeness of the homily's text to a biblical text, not withstanding the homily's variants. Yet the matter is more complex, for no specific evidence can be brought forth that our author used only written sources or that, in each case, the author knew the homily's sources were consciously citing from biblical material. It may be that our author did cite directly and self-consciously from a biblical manuscript (either a manuscript present during the writing of the homily, or retained in the author's memory), though I have suggested that in specific cases this seems unlikely. It may also be that our author self-consciously quoted from derivative-biblical sources (again, either in written form or preserved in memory).

Allusions to what ultimately become specifically Christian biblical texts (NT) have no introductory formula in our homily. Our author shows little concern for specific wording. In fact, one is hard pressed to

[59]This could also include a liturgy which was transmitted orally, but may have been written down initially or taken its scriptural references from a written source.

cite any direct evidence that our homilist knew of or used any specifically Christian biblical text, for the references to events and persons also found in the Christian biblical text are sufficiently vague in their wording to have been known to the author from a developing oral form.[60]

A careful look at the historical situation in the first few centuries of the common era indicates that scriptural variants appear widespread, not surprising given the copying techniques of the day. Scribal emendation of texts occurred with some frequency. Though dealing primarily with the transmission of Christian biblical texts, Bart Ehrman's work informs the discussion.[61] He postulates that scribal activity often "altered" the Christian text to make it say what the scribe or the community knew to be the "true" meaning of the text. This activity arose amidst the Christological debates of the second and third centuries as Christians disputed interpretations about Jesus. I highlight his findings as an example of scriptural consciousness which allows for some self-conscious changing of the text as it grew into its present form in the fourth century. Thus the modern concept of canon consciousness, which today implies a fixed text and an established list of books, should not be imposed back into the pre-Constantine period. As one moves into the later third and fourth centuries, one finds a steady decrease in the number of textual variants as the communities begin to finalize their respective canons' texts.

A derivative-biblical source theory attempts to explain similarities and differences between quotations found in writings that do not seem to be directly related. The assumption is made that an author was convinced that the immediate source held as much authority or effectiveness in persuading the listeners/readers as that of the ultimate source (in this case the biblical manuscript, or the community which preserved the material if the author was unaware that the material was biblical). Perhaps rooted in an interpretation of the Letter of Aristeas, there seems to have been a broadening affirmation of the authority of the Greek biblical text (whether found in a derivative-biblical source or biblical book, or preserved in liturgy or within a community's tradition).

---

[60]Paul speaks of traditions handed on to him in 1 Cor 11. The second century Christian, Papias, admired the oral traditions of the Apostles, but was suspicious of any written Christian material (Eusebius, *EH* 3.39). One could argue that among certain Christians, scriptural consciousness extended primarily to the Jewish scriptures, and the Christian biblical material took longer to be accepted in its written forms. In our homily, there are no quotations of Jesus' words as preserved in any extant gospel, early Christian or NT writing.

[61]Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993).

Characteristics of Derivative Biblical Sources

A careful examination of the textual variants among ancient authors has led to theories about various sources available to them; however, it is not simply the presence of textual variants which sustains the argument concerning sources. For if it were only variants, then one could conclude that the ancient biblical manuscripts were even more numerous and varied than previously thought. But it is the textual variant, coupled with the quotation's context, which gives rise to speculation about secondarily biblical sources. Prigent[62] and others have suggested five characteristics which signal a written (or oral) anthological source, such as a "testimony" collection, behind a quotation: (1) composite quotations, in which are found (2) series of separate quotations in authors known or thought to be independent, (3) inaccurate attributions of quoted material, (4) textual variants shared by independent authors but otherwise not attested in the biblical textual tradition, and (5) quotations of the same passage in at least two different forms within a single author's work. These criteria are not without their limitations; for example, inaccurate attribution may simply be the result of the author's copying mistake or memory failure. Yet they provide some measure of control over the data, and can apply to sources other than collections of testimonies. Thus the criteria will be used with care in this study.[63]

Another criterion, not limited to testimony sources, is the author's apparent re-interpretation of a quotation from its probable intent in the presumed biblical context. Similarly, the author's seeming unawareness of the biblical context for a quotation might suggest a "new" or isolated use by the author's source, perhaps reflective of a community's interpretation of that biblical text. This criterion is less significant if the author has an atomistic approach to the biblical text which minimizes the importance of context. The lack of context awareness might also signal that the author (or the community) does not know of the quotation's biblical "status." Again, it may be that the quotation has become part of the community's vernacular and its place in biblical tradition has been forgotten, or that the biblical material grew up simultaneously with a similar expression circulating in the common, everyday speech of the community.

A further suggestive hint that a derivative-biblical source might be behind a discussion of a quotation is a difference between the stated quotation (lemma) and the application of the quoted material following it. That is, the quotation introducing the discussion might be in a

---

[62]P. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le christianisme primitif*, p. 28. For the earliest attempt at such criteria, see E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*.
[63]See Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy*, p. 22, n. 9.

"standard" form, but the author's interpretation of that quotation indicates that the author presupposed a different text. What probably occurred in the process of transmission is that the copyist knew the quotation did not match the current biblical text, and so emended the lemma. But to emend the work's explanation of the quotation would go beyond the main interests of the copier in most cases, and so arises the difference between the lemma and its explanation by the author.[64]

Another way of establishing whether a derivative-biblical source was used is to ask how a direct quotation from a biblical manuscript might be presented. Assuming that an author did look up every passage (and keeping in mind that at this time there were no numbered verse versions of the sort we know), what might the resulting quotation look like? Kraft notes that:

> A priori, then, we might expect that someone who went to all the trouble of culling his OT quotations directly from an OT MS (1) would tend to give extensive quotations, and (2) often would show an awareness of the exact source from which the quotation comes. Our texts of Philo, J(ustin) M(artyr), and Theophilus of Antioch, for example, frequently exhibit such a firsthand knowledge of the Greek scriptures....[65]

Given that our homily's author nowhere offers lengthy quotations, and at times even appears to hedge about a quotation's origin, I argue that the author had access to and primarily used secondary-biblical sources (either written or memorized from written sources, liturgy or community traditions) for the quotations.

In suggesting possible resources used by our author in writing the Passover story in *PP* 12-14, one must acknowledge the lack of unambiguous evidence and recognize the tenuous nature of any conclusion offered. That disclaimer notwithstanding, the suspicion arises that our homilist had access to para-biblical or derivative-biblical traditions connecting the Passover and the Passion. This supposition is encouraged both by similarities with other Christian writings on the subject and by connections within the homily itself to quotations reflecting the use of secondary-biblical sources. It hardly seems coincidental, for example, that the order of events in the Passover account (*PP* 12-14) conforms to the homily's Passion account in *PP* 71. In addition, *PP* 12-14 is introduced with *phēsin*, which may suggest that our

---

[64]See the discussion of Ps. Hippolytus' quotation of Ex. 12.8 above. For a classic example of such situation, see P. Katz, *Philo's Bible: the Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1950).

[65]Kraft, "The Epistle of Barnabas," p. 72. See also P. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le christianisme primitif.*

author was aware that the material was biblical. *PP* 71 has textual ties to the variant Is. 53.7 quotation ("silent" following "lamb") as well as a possible connection with a variant rendering of Ps. 95 ("from the tree"), both suggesting the use of a derivative-biblical source.

The Human Predicament

Turning to second quotation used by our homilist, Gen. 2.16-17 supports the author's convictions on the dismal condition defining humanity. Moreover, the passage is used in connection with our homilist's portrayal of Jesus and Christians as suffering ones. The suffering of "Israel," which our author described as just reproof for its role in Jesus' Passion, is of a totally different sort from that endured by Jesus and his followers. Jesus' suffering is redemptive, whereas "Israel's" reflects punishment. Our homilist, in explaining why Jesus suffered, provides a lengthy discussion in *PP* 48-56 about sin's grip upon humans. Our author concludes that humans were divided at death; "every soul was driven out of its fleshly dwelling. And what was taken from earth was to earth dissolved, and what was given from God was confined in Hades" (*PP* 55).[66] The "mystery" of the Pascha, the suffering Jesus, centers on the body of Jesus suffering in order to reunite the human soul and body. "This, then, is the reason why the mystery of the Pascha has been fulfilled in the body of the Lord" (*PP* 56).

Views on the function of this section can be divided into two camps which line up about 180 degrees apart from each other. Some, like Hall, see *PP* 46 as the seam by which two separate homilies are stitched together. For Hall, the first "homily" (*PP* 1-46) is best characterized as a discussion of the Ex. 12 Passover narrative, while the second part of the *PP* is a "Christian Passover Haggadah."[67] Hall's position is weak, however, in part because it fails to account for the numerous parallels our author draws between Egypt and "Israel."

On the other side of the spectrum is the theory that *PP* 46-48 forms the foundation of the author's agenda, that it summarizes what has been discussed, and moves the reader forward in an expansion of those views.

---

66 The *Ep. Barn.* 6.9 has a curious phrase, "for man is earth suffering" (*anthrōpos gar gē estin paschousa*) which at first glance seems to be related to *PP* 55, "and what was taken from earth was to earth dissolved" (*kai to lēmphthen ek gēs eis gēn anelueto*). Yet *Ep. Barn.* is interested in discussing a second or new creation brought about by Jesus; the land flowing with milk and honey symbolizes that "we have been created afresh" (*hēmeis anapeplasmetha*). Our homilist has no interest in a "new creation" but rather promotes leaving the earth behind for the "heights of heaven."

67 Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah." See Part One, pgs. 19-21, for a thorough discussion.

This perspective holds the most promise, for it explains how our author's key idea, "the suffering one," is the link between "Israel's" modeling of the "church" in the first half of the homily and the "church" as reality in the second half. The Egyptians' fate elaborated upon in the beginning of the homily and the plight of Israel in the second half are also held together by this middle section. The crux for our author is the pronouncement that Pascha equals suffering (*PP* 46), and that this suffering is a result of the Fall as recorded in Gen. 2 and 3, summarized by our homilist. With this declaration, our homilist secures the tight connection between Passover and Passion, for in both it is Jesus who suffers. This correlation explains the plight of humanity in general (sinful) and the necessity for the Passion.

Our author describes Jesus as one who is clothed with the suffering one and who shares in the suffering of the suffering one (the homilist identifies Christians as the "suffering one," *PP* 46). This description of Jesus serves our author's purpose of explaining the relationship of the Pascha to the Passion in several ways.

First, the suffering Jesus is said to be foreshadowed in the Passover lamb sacrifice. It should be noted that "Israel" is not said to have suffered in Egypt, rather only the sheep's sacrifice is seen as a prefiguring of Jesus' suffering. By explaining Pascha as equivalent to the Greek verb, *paschein*, "to suffer," our homilist is able to tie together the Hebrew Scriptures and the traditions about Jesus' suffering (*PP* 46).

The connection between the Hebrew Scriptures and traditions about Jesus is critical for our author, who opens the homily with the claim that the Hebrew Scriptures show but a model of what is now here in the life of Jesus: "Tell me, angel, what did you respect? The slaughter of the sheep or the life of the Lord? The death of the sheep or the model of the Lord? The blood of the sheep or the Spirit of the Lord?" (*PP* 32). The author can then write in *PP* 57, "but first the Lord made prior arrangements for his own sufferings in patriarchs and in prophets and in the whole people."

Second, the afflicted Jesus is able to suffer in the body, and thus reunite the body and soul separated by sin (*PP* 56). This reunification has important salvific ramifications, for the author seems to suggest that under the influence of sin, the body becomes food for death (*PP* 54) and the soul is impounded in "Hades" (*PP* 55). Only when the two are joined, can one rise to the "heights of heaven." And only Jesus can reunite them, can "fulfill" in the body "the mystery of the Pascha" (*PP* 56). The body spoken of here indicates a single person, not a community as in Paul's writings about the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12, Rom. 12). Our author is not seemingly interested in community life, but rather in encouraging each individual to become a follower of Jesus.

Third, the suffering Jesus is able to critique is Israel's current situation by yoking it with Egypt's punishment in the Passover. "The people" (the ancient Israelites) in the first half of the *PP* symbolize and foreshadow the Christians of the second half, as seen in *PP* 16 where "Israel is being marked" (*sphragizetai*). Egypt is described as "uninitiated in the mystery" (*tēn amuēton tou mustēriou*) in *PP* 16; our author is drawing a contrast between "the people" and Egypt.

It is important to note that although "Israel/the people" is modeling the church, they are not described as suffering, or having gone through suffering in their slavery. The category of suffering is reserved for Jesus and his followers. Jesus is the lamb who suffers as the Passover lamb/sheep (*PP* 4, 8, 9, 32, 44), and it is Jesus who is "Israel's" salvation (*PP* 31) because the angel of death saw not the sheep slaughtered, but "the life of the Lord" (*PP* 32). Israel, in the second half of the homily, receives the same punishment and fate as the Egyptians did in ancient Israel's history. Our author assumes that "what is said and done is nothing, beloved, without a comparison and preliminary sketch...in order that, just as what is done is demonstrated through the prefiguration, so also what is spoken may be elucidated through the comparison" (*PP* 35). Our author identifies the salvation of Israel during the Passover as the model of the "salvation of the Lord" (*PP* 44).

I noted briefly above that Jesus is said to be clothed with the suffering one, but in *PP* 100, one reads that he was clothed with humanity (*anthrōpos*). This reference is probably speaking to the humanness of Jesus who, as emphasized above, had a human body to reunite what sin had separated. A contrast to the image of Jesus clothed with the suffering one is found in the Pharaoh, who is clothed in grief. Even as the Pharaoh is clothed with all Egypt mourning, so too Jesus is clothed with the suffering one (the Christian). Even as the Egyptians shared the fate of their Pharaoh, our homilist maintains, so too Christians will share the victory over death with Jesus.

The specific purpose of the Genesis quotation is to explain why suffering exists at all. The Gen. 2.16-17 quotation is cited as the command of God which humans failed to heed, and thus were "cast out into this world as into a convict's prison" (*PP* 48). The homilist leaves no doubt in the reader's mind that humans have degenerated from a pristine state in the garden of Eden, where they were morally innocent, to a level of complete and utter perversion. The author is at pains to establish that humanity's condition resulted in the separation of soul and body ("every soul was driven out of its fleshly dwelling") and a loss of the image of God ("desolate lay the Father's image" *PP* 55).

According to the homilist, then, the "Fall" as described in Genesis thus defines humanity, and becomes the *raison d'être* for Jesus' suffering.

But for our author, a careful distinction is made between the consequences of sin in Christians' lives and its results in the lives of Israel and Egypt. For in the Christian's life, and most poignantly in Jesus' life, suffering is a unfortunate consequence of the world's sinfulness. Suffering is a mark of distinction; it takes on a theological dimension with salvific ramifications, and is reserved for Christians. Israel's negative experiences, however, are not understood as sufferings but as due punishment for sins.

Salvation as conceived by our homily is not the "new heavens and new earth" hoped for, as in some earlier Christian writings such as Paul's letters, 1 Peter or Revelation. Instead, salvation is fleeing from this earth: "I [Christ] am the one that...trod down Hades...and carried off man to the heights of heaven" (*PP* 102).[68] Those eligible for salvation, according to our author, are "you families of men who are compounded with sins," who are charged with getting "forgiveness of sins" (*PP* 103).

The tradition of Jesus going to Hades is not unique to our homily; it is found as early as 1 Peter. One also reads of this in Ps. Hippolytus' *Apost. Trad.* 4.8, which includes both a hymn similar in style and content to *PP* 102 as well as a phrase concerning "Christ" destroying death and trampling Hades.[69]

Gen. 2.16-17 Quotation

By way of summary up to this point, *PP* 46 is a pivotal passage in the homily, for it functions as the climatic conclusion to the Passover story, as well as the introduction to the suffering one (Jesus) and sinful humanity. There appears to be a similar pattern in the telling of the Passover event and the reporting of the creation story. *PP* 12-14 cites several phrases from Exodus 12 and, in *PP* 47, Genesis 1 and 2 are "cited"—a combination of phrases directly from the LXX held together

---

[68]The phrase "heights of heaven" is found in *PP* 46, 102, 103, 104.

[69]Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion*, p. 26. In examining our author's hymn-like style, Bonner wonders how much is a creation of the homilist, and how much was borrowed from sources. He cites W. Bousset's theory that the *Apost. Const.* likely had available a collection of Jewish prayers, and points out that *Apost. Const.* 8.12 is similar to *PP* 82, concluding that "there seems to be a curious verbal proof that the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* drew upon the same source as Melito, or else was influenced by a reminiscence of Melito's own words. See also David A. Fiensy, *Prayers Alledged to be Jewish: an Examination of the Constitutions Apostolorum* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985).

by narrative—and then following this a direct quotation from Gen. 2.16-17.[70]

These two passages from Genesis and Exodus stand out from the other scriptural quotations not only because of their narrative style, but also because they attempt to cover a chapter of biblical text within a passage or two. The term *phēsin*, used in citing direct quotations both in our homily and generally by later Christian writers, seems to indicate that our author knew that Genesis 2.16-17 existed in the biblical text, though the source for the quotation need not be a biblical manuscript itself. The summary of Gen. 1-2 in *PP* 47, which concludes with the direct quotation of Gen. 2.16-17, illustrates "why the Lord is present on the earth to clothe himself with the suffering one and carry him off to the heights of heaven" (*PP* 46).

> *PP* 47: When God in the beginning had made the heaven and the earth and all the things in them by his word, he fashioned from the earth man, and gave him a share of his own breath. This man he set in the paradise eastward in Eden, there to live in bliss, laying down this law for him by his command: Of every tree in the paradise by all means eat, but of the tree of knowing good and evil you shall not eat; and on the day you eat you shall certainly die.

The quotation is charted below, with the first column citing the LXX text, the second the A text, and the third the B text.

LXX Gen. 2.16-17	***PP* A**	***PP* B**
1 *apo pantos*	*apo pantos*	*apo pantos*
2 *xulou tou en*	*xulou tou en*	*xulou*
3 *tō paradeisō*	*tō paradeisō*	
4 *brōsei phagē*	*brōsei phagete*	*brōsei phagē*
5 *apo de tou xulou*	*apo de tou xulou*	*apo de tou xulou*
6 *tou*	*tou*	*tou*
7 *ginōskein*	*geinōskein*	*geinōskontos*
8 *kalon kai*	*agathon kai*	*kalon kai*
9 *ponēron*	*ponēron*	*ponēron*
10 *ou phagesthe*	*ou phagesthe*	*ou phagesthe*
11 *ap' autou*		
12 *ē d' an hēmera*	*ē d' an hēmera*	*ē d' an hēmera*
13 *phagēte*[71]	*phagē*	*phagesthai*
14 *ap' autou*		

[70]One important difference between the Gen. 2 section and the Passover section is that one does find a rather exact quotation from Gen. 2.16-17, with no corresponding lengthy quotation from Ex. 12, in the Passover section.

[71]Gott. follows the majority reading, Philo (ed), Origen (Greek), Athanasius (ed), Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria; Brooke-Mclean reads *phagēsthe* with A (*phagēsthai*).

15 *thanatō*	*thanatō*	*thanatō*
16 *apothaneisthe*	*apothanē*	*apothanisthe*

One of the more puzzling aspects of this passage is its combination of singular and plural verbs for "to eat." The LXX uses a singular verb in Gen. 2.16, but uses the plural in both places in Gen. 2.17. Our homily's B text follows the LXX, while A begins with two plural verbs, in 2.16 and 17, and ends with a singular in the last occurrence of the verb in 2.17.[72] Commentators as early as Philo speculate on the difference between the singular and plural verbs in the two verses. In *All. Int.* 1.101-104 and in *Questions and Answers on Gen.* 1.15, Philo suggests that the singular is used in 2.16 because "the good is scarce, but evil abundant." Philo laments that few are good and wise among us who will take the nourishment of understanding,[73] but numerous are those who do wrong.

Bonner emends A's singular reading *pheugē* to *phagē* (line 13), citing several such examples of that variant in Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* 1.90, Theodoret and others (B reads *phagesthai*, the LXX reads *phagēte*). Sibinga agrees with the emendation, and adds that A's reading is closer to the Hebrew text of Genesis, suggesting to him that our author's Greek text for the quotation reflects closely a Hebrew original.[74]

A second important variant is found in A, the use of *agathon* (line 8), found also in Aquila and Symmachus. Both the LXX and B read *kalon.* Sibinga postulates that our author used a "text incorporating a number of corrections from the Hebrew."[75] It is true that B tends to agree with the LXX/OG over against A, for example in the Is. 53 quotation in *PP* 64 (A has *eisphagēn*) or in the Jer. 11.19 quotation in *PP* 63 (A reads *eis*). The Deut. 28.66 quotation shares some variants with the MT and the Palestinian Targum.

Sibinga's hypothesis is certainly possible, though it is difficult to say how direct (or indirect) the influence of the Hebrew might be on the source. His assumption, that the material used by our homilist was a biblical manuscript, has been called into question numerous times in this

---

[72]This order is unattested elsewhere; however, both Epiphanius and Methodius have plural verbs (*phagesthe*) in all three places. The second and third occurrences of the verb "to eat" are found in several different forms among early authors.

[73]Perhaps influenced by Philo, Ambrose, *Paradise* 5, explains that singularity or oneness symbolizes both God in union with the faithful as well as the "Father's" union with the "Son," while plurality indicates division. Chrysostom, Augustine (*Iul.* 6.30) and Jerome (*Ep.* 140.7.2), as well as the Vulgate, identify both verbs as singular. In Justin's *Dial.* 81, he alludes to the passage and uses the singular, but the context requires it because the focus is upon Adam only.

[74]Sibinga, "Melito of Sardis, The Artist and His Text," p. 82.

[75]Sibinga, "Melito of Sardis, The Artist and His Text," p. 84. This discussion is important as it highlights the problems one has in reconstructing the source of our author's biblical text, and its relationship to a Hebrew text.

study. Yet his point that the source may have been influenced by a reading preserved in some Hebrew biblical manuscripts and/or Greek texts adjusted to the prevalent Hebrew (such as versions by Aquila and Theodotion) is certainly credible. On the one hand, that possibility does not necessitate a close connection with any Jewish community, for Christians might have preserved the variant without regard to its place in Jewish writings. On the other hand, the variants invite speculation about any interaction our homilist might have had with a Jewish community or with material that had direct links with a synagogue. Unfortunately, so little is confirmed about the role of Hebrew among Jews in the second and third centuries Diaspora, though what is known suggests that Greek predominated. Hoping to connect Christian with Jew via a line drawn in Hebrew fails to consider that. Even more, Hebrew influence does not necessarily mean that the source is Jewish. Origen's Hexapla intimates that some Christians were interested in the language of the Bible.[76]

The theory that A's text (*agathon*) is original is supported not only by its occurrence in the composite quotation in *PP* 72, but also by the homilist's apparent preference for *kalon* in the rest of the homily. In the composite quotation's citing of Ps. 35.12, both A and B use *agathōn* while the OG has *kalōn*. In the brief allusion to that Psalm in *PP* 90, we find A using *agathōn* while B and the LXX have kalōn. One possible explanation of the evidence is that B edited the *PP* 47 quotation and the *PP* 90 allusion closer to the LXX/OG. This supposition seems reasonable given a tendency among some Christian scribes to move closer to the LXX/OG. Perhaps B did not emend the composite quotation because the text was seen as a unit, making the variant less apparent or "preventing" the copyist from identifying the passage as Ps. 35.12. B's copyist may have known Ps. 35.12, as the "change" in the brief allusion to it in *PP* 90 might attest. It is doubtful that *kalos* stood originally in our author's Gen. 2.16-17 quotation, because it leaves unexplained the agreement between A and B in the composite quotation.

Further evidence that A's reading is the more original can be found in *PP* 71, which preserves an interesting phrase *tēs kalēs amnados* (the lovely ewe-lamb) describing Mary. This description might echo a tradition, for just above this description of Mary is a reference to the lamb being slain and speechless. In Is. 53.7-8 quoted in *PP* 64, the peculiar placement of *aphōnos* ("speechless") is quite rare, and its recurrence in *PP* 71 might reflect a tradition.

Several questions suggest themselves based on the variant's appearance in the homily, including whether a similar source tradition is

[76]See Part One, pgs. 37-39, for a thorough discussion.

behind the composite quotation in *PP* 72 and the Gen. 2.16-17 quotation in *PP* 47. The evidence seems to suggest an affirmative answer, indicating that the source used by the author favored *agathos* in these quotations. Because *agathos* is found in Aquila and Symmachus, one cannot rule out the possibility that our author's source was influenced by a tradition shared by some second century Jews.

The Jer. 11.19 citation in the composite quotation can be connected with *PP* 63's quotation of the same verse because of their similar variants. It seems, then, that *PP* 72 has similar textual variants with two other quotations in the homily, the Jer. 11.19 variants in *PP* 63, and the *agathos* variant in *PP* 47. Yet *PP* 47 and *PP* 63 share no specific variants. The only common term between them, "evil," is expressed by *ponēros* in *PP* 47 and *kakos* in *PP* 63. The Genesis quotation in *PP* 47 follows the LXX with its word choice (*ponēron*); however, the variant in the Jeremiah quotation is consistent with the homily's citing of Jer. 11.19 in *PP* 72. Unfortunately, neither term is used outside quotations (except in the case of *ponēros*, found in *PP* 48).

One is left to speculate on several different explanations for these variants: our homilist used (1) two different written texts (biblical manuscripts or derivative-biblical sources), (2) a single written tradition containing within itself quotations drawn from various biblical manuscripts, (3) a memorized liturgy or school tradition which contained both ways of saying "evil," (4) or two memorized sources which reflected the different terms. A scholar is often drawn to the explanation which favors consistency, efficiency and organization on the part of the ancient writer—in this case we might suggest that our homilist had a single source which had itself drawn from diverse sources to produce these quotations. Yet it is entirely possible that our author memorized the Gen. 2.16-17 quotation in a catechism lesson as a youth, and years later drew from a written source that preserved the variant Jer. 11.19 readings, and incorporated both into the homily.

To summarize the textual findings, it appears that B in general reflects the LXX reading when A and B disagree on a term (the exception being the *geinōskontos* variant). I submit that the variants found in the quotation are best explained as coming from a derivative-biblical source, for several reasons. First, the *agathos* variant in A, (B and the LXX read *kalon*) seems original to the homily, as this term for "good" is not used outside this passage and the subsequent one in the homily, nor is it the term of choice for our author (who seems to prefer *kalos*). Second, the variant renderings of the three occurrences of "to eat" (the first two plural, the third singular) suggest a derivative-biblical source. That Philo and then later Ambrose acknowledge that the number in the verb "to eat' shifts from singular to plural in the two verses indicates that at least

some writers were aware of the difference. Moreover, so many ancient authors include different combinations of the singular and plural, intimating that the situation was known, but that no consensus was established on how to understand the passage.

The variants are suggestive in another sense as well—there are some ties with Jewish works and authors. For example, Symmachus and Aquila both include the *agathos* variant. Philo writes *phagē*, perhaps the same reading as A in line 13 (Bonner emends [*pheugē* to *phagē*). How might this shape the picture of our homily's sources? First, it points to possible cross fertilization between Christian and Jewish authors and texts. Second, it suggests a possible Jewish origin of the source used in the Gen. 2.16-17 quotation, though that influence might be remote or indirect. Third, because our author does not discuss the variant "to eat" nor highlight that the variant *agathos* is found in some Jewish writings, it seems prudent to resist the conclusion that our homilist was aware that the variants had any close relationship with some Jewish renderings of the passage. Again, no conclusions should be drawn about whether our author "favored" a Jewish text, or was even cognizant of the fact that the Gen. 2.16-17 quotation had similarities to Jewish works. In the same way, one should not forget that numerous other Christian authors include variant readings of "to eat," making it very possible that our author's source took the reading from a "Christian" tradition, perhaps from a liturgical rendering of the passage.

Because no other author preserves Gen. 2.16-17 in exactly the same way as does our homilist, Angerstorfer concludes that memory of a biblical manuscript of Genesis is behind this quotation. The specific variant use of *agathon*, however, and not the author's preferred *kalon*, points to a source other than faulty memory of a biblical manuscript. The several shared variants with other ancient writers suggests that the passage circulated with variant readings, a point which at the very least fails to strengthen Angerstorfer's proposal. Instead, it suggests that in pre-Christian times, Jews (Philo, for example) had access to sources, biblical manuscripts or derivative-biblical sources, which included these variants.

Series Quotations, *PP* 61-64

Looking next at the series of quotations, *PP* 61-64, it must be said that though an exact duplicate of the homily's particular ordering of the four quotations in *PP* 61-64 is not attested in other writings, several similar groupings are found in ancient authors. For example, from early in the third century, Tertullian, *On the Res. of the Flesh* 10, cites Is. 53.7 directly after Ps. 2.1-2. In *Ad. Marc.* 4.39, he cites, with some commentary in

between, Is. 53.7 and Jer. 11.19. In the mid-third century, Cyprian compiled or composed an extensive collection of proof-texts addressing issues pertinent to developing Christianity; *Ad Quir.* 15 has a series of quotations which focus on the key terms "sheep" and "lamb" beginning with Is. 53.7-9, 12, and Jer. 11.18-19. Interestingly, these two quotations are followed directly by verses from Ex. 12—these same connections operate in our homily.[77]

The examples of these passages grouped together suggest that they have a heritage of association among several Christian writers, particularly those from North Africa. The above mentioned authors employ the scripture passages against Jews or Judaism. However, in *Ad. Marc.* 4.40, Tertullian mentions Jer. 11.19 in the context of the Eucharist, explaining that the phrase "let us cast the tree upon his bread," is a clear reference to the crucified body of the "Lord." Here he is leveling an attack against Marcion's view of Christ's body, which Tertullian labels as a "phantom body." This context highlights that Christians were not simply arguing with Jews in our homilist's time, they were debating amongst themselves as well.

Our author's position in the developing tradition of this series of quotations is not easy to place, but several points should be considered. There are some textual variants from the LXX/OG common to these authors and our homilist, which might indicate that the tradition included specific textual forms in some cases. The homily is likely contemporaneous with Tertullian or Cyprian, and as such, direct borrowing is possible, though because the lists of quotations are not exactly the same in each author, it seems more likely that each drew from a common, fluid tradition. The appearance of these quotations among apparently independent and chronologically close authors supports the theory of a shared broad, developing tradition between them.[78]

Psalm 2.1-2 and Isaiah 53.7-8

Both the Ps. 2.1-2 and the Is. 53.7-8 quotation are very close to the OG, prompting some scholars to postulate a careful memory behind them.[79] Given the very close, often exact, rendering of this verse in the Greek and Latin sources, however, it seems likely that these quotations are not evidence of our author's excellent memory, but of the passages' careful transmission or repeated use in church and synagogue contexts.

---

[77]In *Ad Quir.* 20, Cyprian cites Is. 65.2, Jer. 11.19, Deut. 28.66 and Ps. 22.16-22 as speaking of the crucifixion of Jesus.

[78]This is not to deny that a few of the authors mentioned might have had some contact with each other's work, for example, Tertullian and Cyprian.

[79]Angerstorfer, p. 109.

Even if one wants to argue that the Ps. quotation, for example, is from memory, one can imagine our author remembering the text from Acts 4 or from church liturgy; the point of reference need not be the book of Psalms. At some point prior to our homily, it seems that these quotations from Ps. 2 and Is. 53 became part of many Christians' understanding of Jesus. Moreover, it seems that the actual text itself in both cases fossilized quite early in tradition, and thus one must look hard for any textual variations.

That said, I must point out two important variants found in the Isaiah passage.

> *PP* 64 reads: And Isaiah, He was led as a sheep to slaughter, and as a lamb speechless before him that sheared him this one opens not his mouth: but his generation who shall tell?
>
> Manuscript A:
> *Ho de Ésaias: Hōs probaton eisphagēn ēchthē (B: epi sphagē ēchthēn), kai hōs amnos aphōnos enantion tou keirantos auton houtos ouk anoigei to stoma autou, tēn de (om. B) genean autou tis diēgēsetai;*

The variant *eis sphagēn* (to the/for slaughter) has been detailed in Part One, the section on fragments, because so much of the argument hinges on fragment evidence.[80] A second noteworthy variant is the homily's placement of *aphōnos* (silent), discussed above as an example that our homilist used derivative-biblical sources. Our homily, *Ep. Barn.* 5.2 and the *Acts of Philip* 78 place the term *aphōnos* directly after *amnos* (lamb) and not at the end of the sentence.[81] Kraft discusses this variant in relation to *Ep. Barn.*,[82] noting that this variant may suggest that these three authors had access to a common source(s). This source(s) was probably not a biblical manuscript now lost, but rather a testimony tradition which circulated among Christians, perhaps even within certain school traditions.[83]

Ps. Barnabas cites Is. 53.7 as part of a composite quotation, the blending of short scriptural references into a single quotation. Our homily and the *Acts of Philip* do not use the Is. text as part of a composite quotation, but rather as part of a proof-text argument. Nothing in the

---

[80]See Part One, pgs. 41-44.
[81]The Latin epitome of the homily follows the OG in the placement of "silent."
[82]Kraft, "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and Melito's *Paschal Homily*," pp. 371-373.
[83]Angerstorfer, pp. 110-111, counters his hypothesis, suggesting that because each of the above three authors uses the text in dissimilar ways, our author (and perhaps the others) relied on memory in writing the Isaiah quotation. This theory fails to recognize how ancient writers interacted with testimony traditions and materials.

three works suggests any direct, literary dependence between them.[84] While it is possible that each author quoted from non-extant OG manuscripts of Isaiah which included this variant, the different forms of the quotation (composite quotation, series quotation, and proof-text) in themselves suggest prior handling of the material such as one would expect in a derivative-biblical, testimony tradition.

In addition to the variants shared by our homilist and several authors, indicating perhaps a shared source or tradition as noted above, certain authors' contexts also seem to demonstrate access to derivative-biblical sources. Justin in particular seems relevant to our topic. Skarsaune's description and characterization might further illuminate possibilities for our homily's potential sources.

Justin has several Is. 53.7-8 citations (*Apol.* 50, *Dial.* 13,[85] 72, 111) which Skarsaune categorizes as coming from a derivative-biblical source focusing upon fulfilled prophecy and steeped in anti-Jewish sentiment. Looking closely at *Dial.* 72, the chapter itself remonstrates the Jews for removing "incriminating" passages from their scriptures. Justin begins the chapter quoting a passage attributed to Esdras, though it cannot be found in any extant biblical book. He cites Jer. 11.19 (with some variants), as evidence of the Jews' mishandling of the scriptures. Justin explains that some "correct" copies of Jeremiah still exist in synagogues, that is, copies with Jer. 11.19 included. He culminates his attack by citing a text allegedly from Jeremiah, though it is not found in any biblical manuscript:[86] "The Lord remembered his dead people of Israel who lay in the graves and He descended to preach to them His own salvation." This passage is found twice in Irenaeus (*Ad. Haer.* 3.20, as coming from Isaiah, and 4.22, attributed to Jeremiah).[87]

---

[84]Kraft, "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and Melito's *Paschal Homily*," p. 373.

[85]I noted above in Part One, p. 43-44, that one could suggest that the biblical text behind the quotation in *Dial.* 13 might be different than the text behind the other Is. 53 quotations. This does not preclude Skarsaune's proposition that several Is. 53.7 texts were placed in a collection focusing on fulfilled prophecy.

[86]The two "Jeremiah" citations in Justin have every appearance of coming from a testimony source. The Jer. 11.19 passage shares with several other ancient writers some deviations from the OG.

[87]Justin continues his argument in the beginning of the next chapter, quoting from Ps. 95.10, "the Lord reigns," but he adds, "from the tree." When Justin quotes the entire Psalm (either from a biblical or non-biblical source), the phrase "from the tree," is not reproduced. This may be due to scribal emendation, or to the fact that Justin's source for the entire Psalm was different from his source for the variant reading. While Skarsaune (pp. 35-44) proposes that the sources are Christian, Kraft suggests that the source of this "addition" might come from Jewish circles, which was taken up by Christians. Kraft, "Christian Transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures: A Methodological Probe," p. 216 in *Paganisme, Judaisme, Christianisme,* ed. A. Benoit et al. (Paris: Éditions E. DeBoccard, 1978).

Isaiah 53.7 is cited in the midst of the argument in *Dial.* 72, not as another example of how the Jews are removing material from their scriptures, but rather as "proof" that the Jews put Jesus to death. Justin charges that the Jews sought to remove evidence of their behavior from the scriptures. He does not record the Is. 53.7 passage completely, as he does with those "Jeremiah" verses before and after the passage. Instead, he interjects commentary and he (or his source) changes the verb tense to fit his sentence. The entire phrase reads, "he himself is both declared to be led as a sheep to the slaughter, as was predicted by Isaiah, and is here represented as a harmless lamb." The verb is not *ēchthē* but *agomenos*, and the term "silent" is omitted.[88] In fact, this rendering of the Isaiah passage might classify this text as an allusion rather than as a quotation.[89] Yet the possible formula "predicted by Isaiah" seems to indicate Justin's self-consciousness in citing material. In the general context, Justin presents himself as reflecting upon written material, identified by him as "Jewish" and "Christian."

Looking at Justin's *Apology*, Skarsaune suggests that the same source behind *Dial.* 72 is used in *Apol.* 50, an extensive citation of Is. 53.12, 52.13-53.1-8. In *Apol.* 50, Justin lists "prophecies" which speak of Jesus' sufferings. Justin jumps from Is. 53.12 to the preceding chapter (52.13-15), and continues with the beginning verses of chapter 53. In and of itself, this is not conclusive proof that a testimony source was used, for one could imagine that Justin simply moved his eyes about on the scripture page to include various verses. Yet his Is. 53.12 includes significant variants from the OG; Justin writes, "because they (Jews) delivered his soul unto death," while the OG reads, "because he poured out his soul to death." This argument seems pre-packaged to reflect anti-Jewish sentiment. Skarsaune may be right in suspecting a testimony source behind Justin's citations, though given the length of the quotation, one cannot rule out the possibility that Justin edited a biblical manuscript himself, as might be the case in his *Dial.* 13 discussed above.

Justin's statements about the differences between the Jewish biblical text and his own "correct" biblical text are interpreted by Skarsaune as indicative of Justin's own understanding of his sources. Justin claims to be able to distinguish between Jewish and Christian texts in *Dial* 72 by what each text includes. If his biblical text (which Skarsaune suggests was copied by Jewish scribes) does not match his traditional exegesis or

---

This "addition" is extant only in a Coptic and a Greek/Latin manuscript of the Psalms.

[88]In *Dial.* 114.3, Justin also quotes Is. 53.7 without including the adjective "speechless."

[89]In another allusion, Trypho says that "we know that he should suffer and be led as a sheep," *Dial.* 90.1.

if it does not contain certain passages which he assumes should be there, he "therefore believes that the responsibility for the discrepancies must lie with the Jewish scribes producing the LXX MSS....But he is of course wrong in claiming his very deviant testimonies to be the original LXX text."[90]

Inasmuch as he claims to know Jewish biblical texts, and yet also cites (allegedly) from Jeremiah and from the Psalms passages which are extant in only a few biblical manuscripts, Justin's comments invite speculation about where he drew his information. Skarsaune postulates that "*Dial.* 72 draws on a source with passion testimonies which had the paschal lamb typology as their common denominator, emphasizing the purifying, propitiary blood of Christ and placing this concept in a baptismal setting."[91] Skarsaune's reconstruction of the source behind Justin's argument is certainly possible. Yet Kraft argues that the Ps. 95.10 phrase "from the tree" might refer to the tree of life as described in Rev. 2.7, 22.2 and elsewhere. Moreover, the source of this phrase need not originate in Christian circles.[92] Justin may have had a different biblical text for Jer. 11.19, as some of his differences elsewhere are witnessed by the Minor Prophets scroll found in Nahal Hever.[93] These recovered readings of the OG, however, do not solve the puzzle of where the Ps. 95.10 phrase or the other Jeremiah (?) and Esdras quotations come from. Especially in the case of *Dial* 72, Justin seems to have access to a derivative-biblical source assembled perhaps as a testimony source (conceivably within Jewish circles initially) which Justin understood to represent a true reading of the biblical text.

Deuteronomy 28.66

Left to be dealt with from that series of quotations are Deut. 28.66 and Jer. 11.19. Both of these quotations have significant variations from the LXX/OG text, as well as share some similarities with other ancient writers. Because Jer. 11.19 is also part of a composite quotation and thus will require an extended discussion, the Deut. 28.66 quotation will be examined first.

PP 61: For Moses says to the people:

---

[90]Skarsaune, p. 426.
[91]Skarsaune, p. 282.
[92]Kraft, "Christian Transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures," p. 216.
[93]See D. Barthélemy, "Redécouverte," and *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, SVT 10 (Leiden, Brill, 1963); E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets from Nahal Hever, DJD 8.*

PP	LXX
And you shall see your life hanging before your eyes	Your life shall hang in doubt before your eyes
night and day	you shall be afraid by day and by night
and you will not believe on your life	you shall be in dread and have no assurance of your life

Manuscript A:

phēsin gar Mōusēs pros ton laon:
Kai opsesthe tēn zōēn humōn(om. B) kremamenēn emprosthen tēn ophthalmōn humōn nuktos kai hēmeras, kai ou (qq B) pisteuset e (qq B) epi tēn zōēn humōn.

The homily's textual variants from the LXX texts are numerous in this quotation, and they shift the meaning of the text to speak more directly about the Passion. In the first line, one notes the addition of the verb *opsesthe* (you shall see). This change moves the phrase "your life" from subject to direct object, and has the apparent result of strengthening our author's contention that Moses is speaking of the Passion here. This variant is also found in Athanasius, *Dial. AZ*, Novatian and Epiphanius.

One should also note that the verb *opsesthe* is plural along with the final verb.[94] In our homily, this change is accompanied by shifts in all the pronouns to the plural. Also pluralizing the three pronouns *sou* to *humōn* are Origen, *Dial. AZ*, Hilary, and the Palestinian Targum. The Targum's evidence suggests that this variant is non-Christian and that it circulated in a volume of Deuteronomy, not (only?) as a single variant proof-text. While nothing would prevent a Christian author from independently creating such a variant, and subsequently having it circulate among Christians, the second century CE Targum evidence would also allow for the variant's dispersion among several otherwise unrelated Christian authors. Because it seems possible that the variant was part of one edition of Deuteronomy, it is conceivable that a Christian might use a similar copy of that work. But given the number of Christian sources that witness to this variant, it is also possible that, in some cases, the Deuteronomy text was picked up early in Jewish or Christian derivative-biblical source traditions.[95] It should be pointed out, however, that a

---

[94]At the end of the passage, both B and O have *pisteusēte* (You [pl.] will [not] believe, 2 pers. pl. aor. 1, subj.) where the LXX text has the singular. A has *pisteusete* (2 pers. pl. fut. ind.) found also in Origen, Athansius and *Dial. AZ*.

[95]Another variant which seems to reinforce directly the variant "you shall see" is the presence of *epi* (believe on). It is found only in our homily, and seems to emphasize the separateness of the subject (you or the people) and the direct object (your life).

biblical text can lie behind a secondary or derivative use and coexist with it, just as a secondary text could be produced by modifying a biblical text.

The third critical variant is the omission of the verb "you shall be afraid" (phobēthēsē), the exclusion of which further stresses the direct object, "life," that one sees hanging night and day. Our homily appears to be unique in omitting only the verb, while including the terms "night and day." Several witnesses, however, omit both the verb and the references to time, resulting in the reading represented in Iren. *Ad. Haer.* 4.10.2; 5.18.3, "and your life shall be hanging before your eyes, and you will not believe your life."[96]

Irenaeus also preserves the passage in *Dem.* 79 but includes the phrase, "and you will be afraid day and night," so that the whole passage reads, "Moses also said the same thing to the people with these words, 'and your life will be suspended before your eyes, and you will be afraid day and night, and you will not believe in your life'." It seems, then, that the evidence points to Irenaeus having access to the Deut. 28.66 passage in two different forms, and at least in the case of *Dem.* 79, he used a derivative-biblical source. The *Dem.* 79 passage is preceded by a composite quotation attributed to David, which echoes Ps. 22.21, 17, 119.120 and 86.14. *Ep. Barn.* 5.13 includes the same composite quotation, "Spare my soul from the sword, fasten my flesh with nails; for the assemblies of the wicked have risen against me," in a series of excerpts (which, incidentally, includes Is. 53.7). In his discussion of the quotation, Kraft notes that this passage need not have come from Christian circles, given the Jewish hymns which circulated concerning a Messiah figure,[97] but it is impossible to tell whether Ps. Barn. used a Jewish source directly or one developed already in Christian circles. He is more certain that Irenaeus did not use *Ep. Barn.* directly in recording the composite quotation, and thus suggests that the two drew from a common source tradition.[98] Important in our case is the possibility that a derivative-biblical source was behind the quotation of Deut. 28.66, at least in some of the cases noted above. We should also recognize that Jewish texts/sources must have been used directly by some early Christians,

---

[96] Irenaeus is joined by Origen, Athanasius, *De Incarnatione* 35, *Dial. AZ, Dial. TA,* Novatian, *Trinity* 9, Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, *Adv. Ioud., The Disputation of Gregentius with Herban,* and John Damascus, *Hom. in Sabb. Sanct.* The number of seemingly independent witnesses suggests that a tradition circulated widely with these variants.

[97] See G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (NY: Penguin Books Ltd., 1962, 4th ed. revised. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

[98] Kraft, "Epistle of Barnabas," p. 145.

while Christians undoubtedly also created variants and composite quotations independently as time went on.

Novatian's quotation in *Trinity* 9 also suggests a derivative-biblical source. He cites several prophetic quotations as coming from Moses: Gen. 49.10, Ex. 4.13, Deut. 18.15, Deut. 28.66, "You shall see your life hanging by night and day and shall not believe Him," concluding with a series from Isaiah. In agreement with our homily, but against Irenaeus, Novatian includes the phrase "you shall see." Furthermore, while our homily seems to imply that "your life" at the end of the quotation refers to Jesus at the crucifixion, Irenaeus remarks prior to citing Deut. 28.66 that "they will not believe on him," and Novatian incorporates the pronoun into the quotation itself: "You shall see your life hanging by night and day and shall not believe him." The use of the masculine pronoun suggests at the very least a developing Christocentric interpretive tradition.[99] This also raises interesting questions about the preservation of biblical material by Christians, and possible changes they made to further develop an application to Jesus.[100]

A final point taken from Novatian's quotation is the phrase, "night and day," which is reversed in most texts, in agreement with the LXX, but is found in this order here and in our homily, as well as in the MT, the Arabic, Armenian, Syro-Hexapla and Codex Colberto-Sarravianus (G) and S^m as well as a quotation in Hilary. Angerstorfer suggests that our author was influenced by Jewish sources, a possibility raised in connection with other variants in the quotation. But the evidence found in Christian writings also intimates that traditions including variant Deut. 28.66 passages were disseminated rather widely. Even more, given the evidence of the Targum's plural pronouns, it could be that this section of Deuteronomy circulated within Jewish circles with several variants, which made their way into early Christian tradition. One should not forget that Hilary witnesses both our homily's plural pronouns and the "night and day" phrase, while Novatian includes the phrases "you shall see" and "night and day." Our author's quotation,

---

[99]The addition of the *mē* (strengthened negative) in the final phrase, "you will not believe one your life" is found in *Dial. TA* as well as *PP* B (it is lacking in *PP* A). The *Dial. TA* passages also includes the important variant "you shall see," omits "you shall fear," and pluralizes the second personal pronoun (*sou*). Such similarities to our homily lend further support to the possibility that our author had access to a derivative-biblical source circulating in early Christian circles.

[100]Bart Ehrman discusses a similar phenomenon in the transmission of the New Testament, "it appears that these scribes know exactly what the text said, or at least they thought they knew (which for our purposes comes to the same thing), and that the changes they made functioned to make these certain meanings all the more certain." B. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, p. 280.

therefore, might have begun in an older Jewish text of Deuteronomy, which was later taken up by some Christians in their testimony traditions or scripture editions.[101]

In summary, it should be stressed that in almost all cases, the variants in our homily are found in other works, such as Athanasius, *Dial. AZ, Dial. TA,* Novatian, and Hilary. Bonner, pointing to the large number of anti-Jewish works which share in the homily's variants (for example, Athanasius, Novatian, Hilary, *Dial.* AZ, *Dial.* TA, Ps. Greg. Nyss. *Ad. Jud.*), concludes that "the reading was adopted in an old book of proof-texts or 'testimonies'."[102] His evaluation is perhaps more specific than the evidence allows, but is certainly feasible. Yet the issue is more complex because not all of the homily's variants are found together in any other work. Furthermore, none of the works in which variants have been found belong to the group of authors (Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius and Commodius, for example) which cite a series similar to the one in our homily.

Several possible explanations present themselves, including that our author used a variant biblical manuscript that attests a textual tradition no longer extant except in quotations. That other works share one or more variants might indicate that the passage itself circulated in several forms, in biblical manuscripts and/or derivative-biblical sources. Finally, the shared contexts and interpretations might suggest that at times the passage was part of a textually fluid, derivative-biblical source tradition. Possible Jewish influence, such as the use of a Jewish derivative-biblical source or biblical manuscript, should not be ruled out, nor possible influence from liturgical or paraenetic traditions in the synagogue or church.

Jeremiah 11.19 and the Composite Quotation

Shifting our attention to the Jeremiah material, Jeremiah 11.19 is cited twice in the homily, in *PP* 63 and *PP* 72, a composite quotation of Ps. 35.12, Jer. 11.19 and Is. 3.10. Given the homily's limited number of quotations, it is quite a boon to have the text occur twice, as this allows for textual comparisons within the homily itself.

---

[101]One can only speculate on what the text would mean in a pre-Christian Jewish context. The context in Deut. 28 in the MT and the LXX speaks of the consequences of disobeying God and His laws. If that context was kept in mind, one might imagine the passage used in Two Ways material. Again, it might have been applied to the enemies (Jewish or non-Jewish) of a Jewish sect, claiming that the enemies would be fearful because of their evil deeds.

[102]Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion,* p. 37.

PP 63: And Jeremiah, "I am like a harmless lambkin led to be sacrificed. They devised evil things for me, saying: Come on, let us put wood on his bread, and wipe him out from the land of the living; and his name shall not be remembered."

Manuscript A:
ho de Ieremias: Egō hōs arnion akakon agomenon tou thuesthai. elogisanto eis (ep' B) eme kaka eipontes: Deute embalōmen xulon eis ton arton autou kai ektripsōmen auton ek gēs zōvtōn kai to onoma autou ou mē mnēsthē.

OG, Jer. 11.19:
Egō hōs arnion akakon agomenon tou thuesthai ouk egnōn; ep' eme elogisanto logismon ponēron legontes. Deute kai embalōmen xulon eis ton arton autou kai ektripsōmen auton apo gēs zōvtōn kai to onoma autou ou mē mnēsthē eti.

PP 72: (Where) is it written in law and prophets, "They repaid me bad things for good and childlessness for my soul, *when they devised evil things against me and said,* 'Let us bind the just one, because he is a nuisance to us'"?

Manuscript A:
(pou B) gegraptai en nomō kai (en B) prophētais, "Antapedōkan moi kaka anti agathōn kai ateknian tē psuchē mou, logisamenoi ep' eme kaka eipontes, "Dēsōmen ton dikaion hoti duschrēstos hēmin estin;

Several variants in *PP* 63 require comment, including the absence of the term *logismon* (thought). Its omission is unattested and its absence seems to emphasize the "evil plan" by removing all reference to "thought." The specific Greek terms in the phrase, *kaka eipontes* (evil things [for me], saying) is also unattested in other Jer. 11.19 quotations. A possible explanation for this variant phrase might be found in the Is. 3.10 text in the composite quotation (*PP* 72), which follows this phrase from Jeremiah. In the OG Isaiah text, 3.10 is introduced with *eipontes*, the same term used in the homily. It could be that the initial compiler of the composite verse used the Is. 3.10 term. If the homily's Jer. 11.19 quotations are from the same source, then the use of *eipontes* in *PP* 63 becomes more understandable. Even if we did not have the benefit of the composite quotation, the similar message of Jer. 11.19 and Is. 3.9-10 could have created some confusion in the transmission (or remembrance) of the two passages.[103]

Inquiring further into the use of the terms for "evil" in the quotations, *kakos* and *ponēros*, it seems that each word is associated with specific ideas or quotations in the homily. The term *ponēros* (used in the

[103]The synonyms *kakos/ponēros* and *leg-/eip-* are well attested elsewhere. It does not appear that any quotation of Is. 3.10 (there are very few) nor any biblical manuscripts uses our homily's *kakos* or *legontes* in that passage.

OG's Jer. 11.19) is found in *PP* 47, a quotation from Gen. 2.16-17, and in the following passage (*PP* 48) where the language of the preceding quotation is picked up to explain humanity's sinful state. It is also used in *PP* 50, as an adjective in a list of sins humans have committed. The term *kaka* (sing. *kakos*) is used in the Jer. 11.19 quotation of *PP* 63 and 72, where it is found in both Jer. 11.19 and in Ps. 35.12. The plural term is also found in *PP* 90, in a phrase which is very similar to Ps. 35.12 quoted in *PP* 72. When our homilist makes a negative assessment, the term *kainos* (which Hall often translates as "strange") is used (for example, *PP* 19, 50, 52, 56, 73, 81, 94, 97).

These word selections are consistent and tied to particular contexts. This challenges the argument that our author's arbitrary memory of biblical manuscripts is behind the quotation, and instead suggests the use (or memory) of specific textual traditions preserved in the author's sources. From the evidence of these three words for "evil" alone, it does not seem possible to determine whether a biblical manuscript or a derivative-biblical source was used or remembered. Yet the likelihood that a derivative-biblical source or liturgical or ethical tradition was behind the quotations is not weakened by the fact that the two terms for "evil" in the quotations are confined to specific contexts.

The third variant concerns the phrase *elogisanto ep'* (*eis* in A) *eme* in *PP* 63 (*PP* 72 has *logisamenoi ep' eme*). The OG reads *ep' eme elogisanto*. The homily's variant *eis* in *PP* 63 A is found only in one Greek Jeremiah manuscript[104] and some of the versions. In both A and B of *PP* 72, *ep'* occurs. The A text may have an affinity for *eis*, for in the next passage, *PP* 64, the Isaiah quotation of A has the variant *eisphagēn* (see above). Yet because the prepositions were basically interchangeable, one cannot conclude that a source is behind the variant.

This same Greek manuscript in which one reads the transposition of the verb and the prepositional phrase also places *autou* after *mnēsthē* in the final line of the passage. Thus this transposition is almost unique, and it occurs in both A and B, and in both *PP* 63 and 72. On the one hand, the fact that our author transposes the words "silence" and "lamb" in the several Is. 53.7 quotations (see *PP* 64) and "reverses" the OG wording of "day and night" to read (with the MT) "night and day" in the Deut. 28.66 quotation (see *PP* 61), may not strengthen the case for a derivative-biblical source behind the quotation. On the other hand, because (1) the Is. 53.7 transposition is found in Ps. Barn. and Acts of Philip, (2) the MT offers the "night and day" reading, as do several versions (see above), and (3) other textual variants in the Jer. 11.19 are found in several ancient

[104]See 534, Paris Bibl. Mat. Corsl. 18 (eleventh century CE).

works, it is possible that our author's source for Jer. 11.19 contained the transposition variant.

Briefly summarizing the findings for *PP* 63's Jer. 11.19, it would seem that the evidence of those numerous variants, often shared with other writers, points to a derivative-biblical source or a variant biblical source. The unattested variants in our homily's quotations of Jer. 11.19 have suggested to some scholars that the author's faulty memory is behind the "errors." The correspondences, however, between the two quotations (one in a composite quotation and thus not identified as from Jeremiah) suggest a similar source behind both passages. It may be that our author recalled a variant biblical manuscript, but it is more likely that if memory was used, it was memory of a derivative-biblical source, as the homilist gives no hint of recognition that the composite quotation contains Jer. 11.19. One might lean toward a written text, given the similarities some of the quotations in the series share with other authors who give the impression that they are working with written material (i.e., Justin). The specific peculiarities found only in our homily do not rule out a liturgical (oral or written) or catechetical source.

Composite Quotation

Turning to the opening phrase of the composite quotation, one notes that our homily's quotation of Ps. 35.12 differs in several ways from the OG text. The verb "to reward or repay" is first aorist in the homily (*antapedōkan)* and perfect (*antapedidosan*) in the OG. Interestingly, the same verb form found in the homily is also in Gen. 44.4. Neither Gen. 44.4 nor Ps. 35.12 of the OG, however, has the terms used for good (*agathos*) and evil (*kakos*) in the homily, though one does find these specific words used in a similar context in OG Ps. 37.20. It may be that in a liturgical source or recitation of biblical material, the various terms used for stating this idea were combined. It is possible that our homilist's source is a witness to such a combination, though that is not to insist that the source was liturgical. One could also suggest that the phrase developed its own "life" in common parlance, and that the author's source reflects a particular community's phraseology. When copying from a source or remembering the phrase, the homilist simply wrote the phrase as learned from the larger community setting.

The quotation "they were repaying me evil for good" is found in "Tertullian's" *Ad. Jud.* 10.4, but not in the parallel material in *Ad. Marc.* 3.18. The springboard for the discussion in *Ad. Jud.* is the passage from Deut. 21.22, 23, the key phrase of which is quoted by Paul in Gal. 3.13: "Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree." A series of quotations from the Psalms follows, including Ps. 69.5, 22.16, 69.21 and 22.18. Although it

appears that the author realizes he is quoting from separate Psalms, the series is tightly woven together. In *Ad. Jud.*, there is no commentary interjected in between the passages, the Ps. 35.12 passage does not stand by itself, nor is the entire verse quoted. It is interesting that both our homily and *Ad Jud.* preserve this Psalm as part of a unit—either as part of a composite quotation or in a series. Both configurations suggest a derivative-biblical source.

The Is. 3.10 quotation in our homily reads, *Dēsōmen ton dikaion hoti duschrēstos hēmin estin* (Let us bind the just one, because he is a nuisance to us). The reading is exactly as one finds it in the OG, using the verb *dēsōmen* (from *deō*). In the textual tradition outside biblical manuscript evidence, however, one finds the verb *arōmen* (from *airō*) also used. The evidence reveals that the PP, Justin, *Ep. Barn.*, *Acta Apollonii*, Hippolytus and the OG all include *deō*, while a form of *airō* is found in Justin (he includes both verbs), Clem. of Alex, and Hegesippus in Eusebius.

In the PP, the emphasis is on Jesus as the "just one." *Ep. Barn.* 6 also uses *deō*, and the context is a series of quotations held together by certain key terms. Is. 3.9-10 itself is sandwiched between two verses which appear related by the term "honey/honeycomb." An interesting connection between this work and our homily is that both interpret Is. 3.10 as speaking about the Passion, and the Jews' responsibility for it. Justin, *Dial.* 17, executes the same judgment against the Jews for their part in the Passion. Justin further claims that the Jews also published false reports about Christians, which got the latter into trouble in their towns. *Dial.* 133 (*deō*) is either an expanded version of his source in chapter 17, or chapter 17 condensed the source from chapter 133. The primary reason for this suggestion is the similarity of quotation series (chapter 17 includes Is. 3.9-11 and Is. 5.18, 20, while chapter 133 has the Is. 3.9-15 and Is. 5.18-25 passages). The combination of these two verses, along with the similar anti-Jewish context, strengthens the hypothesis that Justin had access here to a derivative-biblical source for his quotations.

In an attempt to explain the use of both *deō* and *airō* by Justin, Skarsaune calls attention to Justin's own words as speaker in *Dial.* 137:

> For, mentioning the Scripture which says, "Woe unto them! for they have devised evil counsel against themselves, saying" (as the Seventy have translated, I continued): "Let us take away (*arōmen*) the righteous, for he is distasteful to us;" whereas at the commencement of the discussion I added what your [Trypho's] version has: "Let us bind (*dēsōmen*) the righteous, for he is distasteful to us."

Skarsaune identifies the *airō* verb as coming from Justin's Christian testimony source(s),[105] for several reasons. First, there are no extant Isaiah manuscripts with this verb. Second, *Apol.* 48.5-49.7 has a series of quotations including Is. 57.1f and Is. 5.20. Justin's quotation of Is. 57.1 has *airō* twice, and Justin's form of Is. 5.20 contains important variants indicating that it too is from a derivative-biblical source (according to Skarsaune). The change of verbs from *deō* to *airō*, then, begins with Justin's Christian tradition, which joined Is. 57.1 and Is. 3.9-10. The *deō* verb, he suggests, comes from a biblical manuscript copied by Jews, for Skarsaune does not believe that Christian scribes were actively copying biblical texts in Justin's day. The fact that both *Dial.* 17 and 133 use *deō*, coupled with Justin's claim (see above) that he is taking the *deō* reading from "your version" (that is, a Jewish text), lead Skarsaune to suggest that Justin was identifying his source for *deō* quotations as Jewish biblical manuscripts. He concludes that the *airō* variant was "created" by Christians due to "the influence from Is. 57.1 [which] strengthens the assumption that these two texts were joined in Justin's testimony source, because in his own writings Is. 57.1 and the *arōmen* version of Is. 3.10 never occur together."[106]

Skarsaune's analysis seems circular, however, in that he pronounces Justin's Is. 3.10 quotations in *Dial.* 17 and 133 as coming from a Jewish Isaiah manuscript, from which Justin himself copied, but ignores the quotation's placement in the same series of quotations which he claims led to the change of verb. Skarsaune does not explain why both *Dial.* 17 and 133, which use *deō*, quote Is. 3.9-10 in a series which includes Is. 5.20 (in *Apol.* 48.5-49.7, Is. 57.1f and 5.20 are in a series). He suggests that Justin was familiar with the connection made between these verses from his Christian teaching, but that Justin linked the verses himself using a "Jewish" biblical manuscript of Isaiah in recording these quotations in *Dial.* 17 and 133. Skarsaune must assume not only that Justin had no Christian tradition which used *airō* in connection with Is. 57.1, but also that Justin thought Is. 3.9-10 and 57.1 were to be associated in an effort to interpret each passage better. So Justin himself combined the texts in a series, using a Jewish biblical manuscript of Isaiah to do so.

One might argue just as convincingly that Justin had available two traditions which included Is. 3.9-10, and that one of those traditions used *the deō* verb quotation in a series. Skarsaune's uncritical acceptance of Justin's claim that *deō* is part of Jewish tradition, as well as Skarsaune's assumption that a "Christian" text would have the *airō* verb, does not take into account the use of *deō* in Matt. 27.2 in describing the binding of

---

[105]Skarsaune, pp. 30-31.
[106]Ibid., p. 31.

Jesus. Justin's "Christian" (*airō*) text, moreover, might not have sprung from a connection made between Is. 57.1 and 3.9-10, but have grown out of Jewish speculation on the "just one."

In several other authors using the *airō* verb, the "just one" is not identified as Jesus, but as James the Just or an innocent suffering man. For example, Hegesippus uses this verb in his quotation in the story of James the Just's death, according to Eusebius, *EH* 2.23.[107] In another example, Clem. of Alex., *Stromata* 5.14.108, writes that Plato knew of this text in writing about the righteous (or ethical) one (see *Republic* 2). For an interesting twist, in *Acta Apollonii*, one finds both a reference to "Christ" as the righteous one, as well as a quotation from Plato's *Republic* 2 on the righteous man. It seems possible, then, that Plato's text was associated with Is. 3.9-10 in Christian tradition, emphasizing an individual's righteousness.

Could it be that *airō* became associated with figures other than the Messiah in Jewish thought, and this same emphasis continued in Christianity? Or was there a rather conscious effort among some Christians to connect *deō* and its emphasis on "binding" with the Passion? Neither of these explanations would fit with Justin's claim that *airō* is the "Christian" (and therefore correct) version.[108]

In reviewing the data on our homily's composite quotation, one finds a phrase basically unattested (in Greek) from Ps. 35.12 coupled with a more widely attested and closely followed Is. 3.10 phrase (though with an important variant verb tradition not attested in our homily), in between which is sandwiched a variant Jer. 11.19 text similar to the Jer. text in *PP* 63 (modified to a participle form to connect more smoothly with the preceding passage). The formula introducing the quotation is general, "where is it written (it is written A) in law and prophets," and the subsequent quotation is treated as coming from a single biblical text. In considering all these pieces of evidence together, it seems that our author had access to a derivative-biblical source, perhaps one similar to that used in the series quotation.

---

[107]The same application of the title "just one" to James is found in the *Second Apocalypse of James*, p. 254, in *Nag Hammadi Library*, ed. James M. Robinson (Leiden: Brill, 1978; paperback edition, NY: Harper and Row, 1981).

[108]Pro. 1.12 is the only place in the TLG LXX/OG where *arōmen* specifically is used, "and let us swallow him alive, as Hades would, and remove the memorial of him from the earth" (*kai arōmen autou tēn mnēmēn ek gēs*). The context focuses on "Solomon's" injunctions to his "son" about righteous behavior. The use of *arōmen* here may indicate that in Jewish thought, both *deō* and *airō* adequately described a "just" person, and thus it is conceivable that a biblical manuscript used by Jews carried *arōmen* in Is. 3.10. This possibility may weaken Justin's claim that *arōmen* is a "Christian" word choice.

Isaiah 50.8 Quotation

Taking up the Is. 50.8 quotation in *PP* 101, it betrays our author's Christology. "The Lord...arose from the dead and uttered this cry: 'Who takes issue against (*pros*) me? Let him stand against me.'" The Göttingen OG reads, "Who takes issue with me? Let him stand up together (*ama*) [with us]. Who is my adversary? [Who takes issue with me?] Let him come near to me."

PP 101	**OG Is. 50.8**
tis ho krinomenos pros eme antistētō moi	*tis ho krinomenos moi antistētō moi ama kai tis ho krinomenos moi engisatō moi*

OG Is. 50.8	***Ep. Barn.* 6.1**	**Iren. *Ad.Haer.* 4.13 *Dem.* 88**
tis ho krinomenos moi; antistētō moi ama kai tis ho krinomenos moi engisatō moi	*tis ho krinomenos moi antistētō moi kai tis ho dikaioumenos moi enginatō tō paidi kuriou.*	*Quisquis iudicatur? Ex adverso adstet Et quisquis iustificatur? Appropinquet puero Dei.*[109]

There are significant textual variants in the first clause, including the phrase *pros eme* (B has *me*), against the OG's *moi*. This variant, unique to our homily, spotlights opposition against the "Lord." Next, the addition of *pros* in our text (the second variant) removes ambiguity, and establishes an adversarial relationship between the "Lord" and "Israel," who failed to accept the "Lord" (*PP* 99). In the OG Is. 50.8 passage, the verb's meaning and its context are somewhat obscure. The speaker is both challenging others to find fault with him, and inviting them to join with him in celebrating God's vindication. The note of triumph found in the OG Is. 50.8 is retained in our homily, as seen in the following passage, "I am the one," says the Christ, "I am the one that destroyed death and triumphed over the enemy" (*PP* 102).

Irenaeus uses a passive construction, and not only in the clause quoted in our homily, but in the remaining two clauses of the entire verse. The *moi* in the final clause of the OG has in its place, "the Lord's servant," so that the entire quotation in Irenaeus, *Ad. Haer.* 4.13 (see also *Dem.* 88), reads, "and again, when one says, 'Whosoever is judged, let him stand opposite; and whosoever is justified, let him draw near to the

[109]The columns here were taken primarily from Kraft, "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and the 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis," p. 346.

servant of God.'" *Ep. Barn.* replaces the final *moi* with the same phrase as in Irenaeus, "the servant of God." This particular feature behind the form of the text in Ps. Barn. and Irenaeus may be rooted in the general context of Isaiah's "suffering servant" presentation.

The second important variant is our homily's omission of *ama* at the end of the second phrase, which sharpens the adversarial stance in the PP. Both Ps. Barnabas and Irenaeus omit this word as well, and their inclusion of the phrase "servant of God," in the following phrase brings out more forcefully the condemnation in the text. These two authors include this text within a general listing of quotations concerning Jesus, and both follow Is. 50.8 with a phrase from 50.9b. The similar contexts and variants lead Kraft to conclude, "it seems that here Barnabas and Irenaeus reflect a common source."[110] On the one hand, it is possible that our author had access to a similar source tradition and chose to quote from part of that unit. It may be that our author knew only a tradition which carried Is. 50.8, but it is likely that this derivative-biblical source was part of the same general interpretive stream as that used by Ps. Barn. and Irenaeus.

On the other hand, because the quotation is very short, and somewhat isolated in the homily (that is, not found with other quotations), one could speculate that our author knew this passage from teachings or liturgy in the church, in its attempt to interpret Jesus in Jewish scriptural terms. It is possible that our author did not know that the statement placed on Jesus' lips is also found in Isaiah. The problematic introductory formula gives no hint that this text comes from Isaiah; even more, one could argue that it would be counter-productive for our author to introduce the saying as coming from Isaiah as the rhetorical impact would be lessened if not lost altogether. The possibility that this phrase circulated as words of Jesus without reference to Isaiah is supported by *Ep. Barn.* where it is placed on Jesus' lips without mentioning Isaiah, ("When therefore he [Jesus] made the commandment what does he say?"). Irenaeus, in *Ad. Haer.* 4.13, also fails to reference Isaiah, though in *Dem.* 88, he does say that "Isaiah spoke in these words."

Jeremiah 5.8 Passage

Further support for the possibility that our homilist relied upon derivative-biblical sources instead of reading or memory of a biblical manuscript is the allusion to Jer. 5.8 in a list of sins (*PP* 53):

> Many other things, strange and quite terrible and quite outrageous took place among mankind: father for child's bed, and son for

[110]Ibid., p. 346.

> mother's, and brother for sister's and male for male's, and [Jer. 5.8] "one man for the next man's wife, they neighed like stallions."

Following the OG Jer. 5.8 *"hekastos epi tēn gunaika tou plēsion autou echremetizon,"* the PP's text reads, *kai "heteros epi tēn gunaika tou plēsion echremetizō* (A, B reads *echrēmati[[z]]en*). Though the sentence itself is quite close to the OG, our author does not identify it as from a biblical text.[111] The allusion's place in a list of five lines decrying sexual sins gives rise to speculation that this section of the homily might be taken from Two Ways traditions. Recognizing that lists of sexual vices were common in the ancient world, and that Two Ways materials were quite popular,[112] it may be that *PP* 53 preserves a traditional listing of vices which incorporated Jer. 5.8. That would account for both the exactness of the Jer. 5.8 text, as well as the absence of an introductory phrase.

The Jer. 5.8 passage itself is rarely found in quotations. Clement of Alex. refers to the verse twice in his argument against those who regard marital sex or childbirth as evil (*Strom.* 3.17, 18). The Jer. 5.8 passage serves as an example of humans who behave like animals in their lust. Chrysostom speaks of the "prophet" who denounces those who "neigh after their neighbor's wife," to expose the foolishness of humans who only desire luxury in the present.[113] With only a few occurrences of the passage in the literature, it is difficult to draw any definite conclusions about possible types of sources which may have circulated, but the context of Jer. 5.8 in the biblical text lends itself to discussion about improper sexual behaviors; not surprisingly, then, it is in this context that we find it used.

Summary of the Use of Derivative-Biblical Sources

Individual variants alone cannot tell the whole story. It is important to note the context of each quotation. For example, I urged that the context of the Ps. 2.1-2 quotation (*PP* 62) indicates a derivative-biblical sources because it is part of a series of quotations (Deut. 28.66, Ps. 2.1-2, Jer. 11.19 and Is. 53.7-8). I stressed this even though the quotation itself is very close to the OG (often an indication that the quotation was taken directly from a biblical manuscript). The same passages which make up the series can be found in similar groupings in many other works. This suggests an interpretive paradigm which influenced numerous Christian authors. For example, the series of quotations found in Tertullian's *Ad. Marc.* (contemporaneous, more or less, with the homily) includes no

---

[111]Bonner, p. 38, includes it in a section on quotations. Apparently he cited it as a quotation because of its closeness to the biblical text.

[112]Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* 2, p. 158.

[113]See also Methodius, *Convivium*, and Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* 2.165.

evidence of direct borrowing between them. This suggests a fluid written tradition or perhaps an interpretative tradition which taught that these passages were best understood by being grouped together.

Always keeping in mind the series context of the quotations, when each quotation was examined individually, the evidence points to the use of derivative-biblical source material by our author. The reasons were many and varied.

First, some of the textual variants found in our homily's quotations were encountered only infrequently in other writings. An example is the "to the slaughter" variant (*eis sphagēn*) in Is. 53.7 (*PP* 64 [A], *PP* 71), found only in our homily, frags. 9, 10, 11, and Justin, *Dial.* 13.[114] Its occurrence in Justin's *Dial.* 13, a writing which seems to have had no direct contact with our homily, precludes the possibility that our homily took this variant from the *Dial.* directly. The fact that the variant occurred in Justin and in frags. 9, 10 and 11 makes it less probable that the variant is a result of our author's (or a copyist's) error, though if the fragments are by our author, then Justin becomes the only independent witness to this variant.

Second, sometimes the variants change the meaning of the biblical text, as in the case of the homily's Deut. 28.66 quotation. In this quotation, one finds the additional verb "you shall see" (*opsesthe*) which alters the meaning of the LXX Deut. 28.66, "Your life shall hang in doubt before your eyes," to the PP's text, "You shall see your life hanging before your eyes." It was noted above that this change seems to have an implicit Christological significance for our homilist, an emphasis which is made more explicit in other apparently independent writings with the same variant (see Irenaeus and Novatian above).

Third, the composite quotation's form (*PP* 72), blending short phrases of biblical material from Ps. 35.12, Jer. 11.19 and Is. 3.10, suggests a reworking of the biblical text. The homilist prefaces the section with a question, "Where [om. A] is it written in law and prophets?" an unconventional introductory phrase, perhaps,[115] but it appears to indicate that the author thought the text in *PP* 72 was a single biblical passage. This encourages the proposal that the author did not knit together the three separate biblical passages from biblical manuscripts, but rather worked from a source which had done so. Moreover, the shared variants between it and the Jer. 11.19 quotation in *PP* 63 point to a common derivative-biblical source, perhaps embedded in a community tradition or liturgy. Another example accenting the importance of

---

[114]See Part One, pgs. 41-44.

[115]It is also possible that the quotation's introduction refers to a division of the Hebrew Bible into categories of the Law and the Prophets.

context is the allusion to Jer. 5.8 (*PP* 53), almost an exact copy of the OG Jer. 5.8 passage, but with no introduction; it is worked seamlessly into a list of sexual sins. Our homilist gives no indication of awareness that a biblical phrase was embedded into the ethical material.

Not only in quotations and allusions, but also in the lists of prominent men in the Hebrew Scriptures found in *PP* 59 and *PP* 69, one finds evidence that our author used existing traditions. Several versions of this list circulated, attributed to Melito of Sardis (frag. 15), Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Athanasius and others. Our homilist's specific variants, including the descriptions of (1) the prophets, (2) David, (3) Moses, (4) Abel and (5) "the lamb slain," point to a developing tradition from which several Christian writers drew and expanded. A second piece of traditional material is the author's argument that "Israel" is guilty of killing "God," even when Jesus' suffering was the will of God (*PP* 74). This is echoed in Justin's *Dial.* 95, where he explains to Trypho that the Jews are judged guilty for Jesus' Passion, even though it was necessary for Jesus to die. The two comparable accounts can be understood to preserve a developing tradition which included scriptural phrases and allusions.

Fourth, and finally, insofar as our homilist shares variants with other works that seem to have used a derivative-biblical source for their citations, this strengthens the possibility that our homilist also used a similar source or had access to a similar stream of tradition. The discussion surrounding the use of the variant verb *airō* (our homily has *deō*) in some quotations of Is. 3.10 is pertinent here. Justin's evidence of having both verbs in his several quotations probably reflects the use of at least two different sources, and (modifying Skarsaune's argument) it may be that both were secondary-biblical sources.

Another point arising from Justin's evidence is the relationship the sources might have had to Judaism. The possible connection might be illustrated from the Deut. 28.66 quotation (*PP* 61), which shares variants with the MT and targumim. Again, the Gen. 2.16-17 quotation (*PP* 47) has correspondences to Philo, Aquila and Symmachus. These similar variants, however, are also found in Christian writings. The evidence seems to suggest that our author's derivative-biblical source for the Deut. 28.66 quotation may reflect borrowing from the targumim or MT sources or from a similar tradition. The "Jewish" derivative-biblical material might have entered into a Christian stream of tradition, and our author drew from it in the latter context. This may hold true as well for Philo's material or Aquila and Symmachus, which may have been incorporated into traditions used by our author. Unlike Justin, who sometimes discusses and labels biblical quotations as coming from "Jewish" or

"Christian" hands (see *Dial.* 137), our author shows no concern for such questions.

Moreover, in the Gen. 2.16-17 quotation, the singular and plural mixing of the verb "to eat" might reflect the ongoing discussion of this peculiarity in the biblical text, beginning with Philo and continuing through to Ambrose. The text in question was discussed by both Jews and Christians. It may be that our author or the source used was aware of the debate; however, no evidence in the homily would indicate that. The homily's Gen. 2.16-17 text itself would appeal to both Philo and Ambrose. In general, then, the few similarities with Jewish texts in the homily leave open the possibility that our author used "Jewish" secondary-biblical sources.

As a final caution, although individual variants from the *PP* are shared by other works, the exact form of each quotation is not found in any other author or their works directly. This suggests both that our homilist did not use any other extant author's work directly, and that other writers did not use our homily for their quotations.[116]

Description of Sources

In speculating on what the source(s) or tradition(s) for the quotations might have looked like, the data seems to point to at least two layers behind our homily's quotation series. It seems that variant renderings of Is. 53.7, Deut. 28.66 and Jer. 11.19 circulated singularly and grouped with other passages. Our homily shares specific variants with other works, pointing to the likelihood that variant texts (biblical texts or secondary-biblical sources) circulated widely among Christians. At some point prior to our author's handling of the quotations, variant texts of Is. 53.7, Deut. 28.66 and Jer. 11.19 were collected with Ps. 2.1-2 in a series. This collection drew from the available texts, liturgy or tradition, preserving the variants of each quotation. Our author might have added specific variants from community tradition to the copied (or recalled) quotation series, adding yet another layer on top of the collection of quotations. It seems that the collecting of the series of quotations was not limited to those communities (or authors) which used the specific variant readings found in our homily. This may indicate that the collection grew independently of the specific variant texts. It seems that our author used a source which was aware of the combining of these quotations, yet used texts which contained variants not found in other collections of these quotations. Our homily's source, then, seems to reflect developing traditions both in the collecting of those quotations and in their forms.

---

[116]It is always possible that the *PP*'s quotations were used in other writings, or that our author used other writings, which have not survived.

While our author might have had a different source for each of the quotations, and that particular source might have drawn from a specific textual tradition, the similar text variants between the two Jer. 11.19 quotations (*PP* 63, 72), the two Ps. 35.12 citings (*PP* 72, 90) and the scattered Is. 53.7 quotations and allusions (*PP* 4, 64, 71) support the probability that our homilist had a single source behind at least some of the homily's quotations.

One cannot rule out the possibility that a source was pre-Christian. The Qumran texts which combined several passages of biblical material (4Q174, 4Q175) establish that at least some Jews were associating different scriptures into a single collection, wherein each quotation may have been identified, or, contrarily, where the seams between each were obscured. In Deut. 28.66, the variant plural pronouns in the Palestinian Targum as well as the phrase "night and day" found in our homily and in the MT might suggest that our author's source drew from a variant biblical manuscript or from a Jewish source (to which was later added the verb "you shall see").

To acknowledge the reasonableness, however, of the possibility that the source began as Jewish material does not preclude the possibility that the source was modified by later Christians (including change of language and/or of the passage's context) to be used in an anti-Jewish capacity. Even as different Jewish groups critiqued each other and hurled polemics back and forth, it may be that some Christians re-used the sources of those intra-Jewish arguments in their own disagreements with Jews. One example of this might be the "righteous one" (see Is. 3.9-10; *PP* 72) developed in Christian circles, perhaps taken from Jewish debate (one thinks of the Teacher of Righteousness in the DDS). As was noted above, Bonner[117] remarks on the numerous writers who connected the Deut. 28.66 passage (some with our homily's variants) to other biblical material in an anti-Jewish series of quotations. He suggested that our author might have drawn from such a source.

One cannot assume, however, that what is categorized as an anti-Jewish argument, as for example in *PP* 72, is intended by our author (or perhaps by the source) to contest Jews or Judaism directly; I have advocated that our author is defending a particular interpretation of Christianity over against another Christian perspective, such as that reflected by Marcion.

A word should be said about the possible number of sources our author might have had available, based on the evidence from the homily. It seems probable that a single source is behind the Jer. 11.19 quotations in the homily, this based on the peculiar variants they share. This would

---

[117]Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion*, p. 37.

denote that the series quotation and the composite quotation come from the same source or a common tradition behind each source. Unfortunately, one can only speculate as to whether the Is. 50.8 quotation in *PP* 101 is from the same source or tradition because there are no shared variants and the contexts are not similar enough to render a judgment.

I suggested that the derivative-biblical sources might have lain at our author's side while writing, or resided in memory, or perhaps were located in a library, friend's house, church or synagogue, accessible only by visiting the place. In certain instances, the secondary-biblical sources might be best explained as part of a community tradition or school interpretation, either Christian or Jewish, or perhaps beginning in a Jewish community and preserved in a Christian one. The possibility exists that for some of the quotations or allusions, the derivative-biblical sources might reflect synagogue or church liturgy. I speculated that in specific cases, the traditions cited might be part of the author's everyday conversation, and that our homilist did not recognize that the phrase or quotation is found in biblical material. Perhaps a source might preserve a community axiom or truism given "biblical" status, even as today statements such as "cleanliness is next to godliness" are thought by many to come from the biblical text.

It is possible that our homilist was unaware that a given quotation was found in a specific biblical book. An example of this might be the Gen. 2.16-17 quotation (*PP* 47). It may be that our author never saw a Genesis manuscript. The creation story, complete with direct quotations from Genesis, might have been known to the homilist only in a derivative-biblical source form, and it was from this type of source that our homilist drew material for *PP* 47. Again, it may be that our author was self-consciously "re-telling" a biblical tradition, knowing the story from tradition, and using only some of the traditional phrases. Both the variants and the cryptic style both support this possibility.

The Is. 50.8 quotation in *PP* 101, placed on Jesus' lips, is a further example. Again, the homilist might have recounted the New Testament incidents (*PP* 78, for example) without knowing that they were recorded in gospels, for no indication is given, such as an introductory formula, that the author self-consciously cited from what might be considered an authoritative work about Jesus.

Conclusions

The theory that the author of *PP* used derivative-biblical sources helps develop a picture of early Christian hermeneutics and interpretations of Jesus informed by readings of the Jewish Scriptures.

The advantages of discovering or isolating potential derivative biblical source traditions from which the homily's author drew include further defining those concerns which preoccupied the early Christians, thus providing another angle from which to study the formation of Christianity. Moreover, determining the author's sources helps locate our homilist within the stream(s) of developing Christian thought.

My proposal that the homilist did not use biblical manuscripts directly challenges those assumptions in current scholarship which portray our homilist as closely connected with nascent rabbinic Judaism (which they assume used the biblical text directly). The theory postulates that the homilist would memorize and study biblical manuscripts,[118] because rabbis allegedly did so. For example, Angerstorfer claims there is a close, though often indirect, relationship between the homily's author and emerging rabbinic Judaism. Angerstorfer, however, vastly overestimates the author's biblical knowledge, given the relatively few clear quotations and verbal parallels or allusions in the homily. Moreover, she bases her opinions about our author's possible biblical text knowledge on a reconstruction of rabbinic Judaism (in relation to which, she claims, *PP* was written) that cannot be substantiated.[119] Evidence of second and third century rabbinic influence in the Greek world is sadly deficient; what has surfaced from archaeological and epigraphic investigation challenges the widely held assumptions that what eventually constituted rabbinic Judaism aptly characterized most Jews everywhere, already in the second century.[120] Neither of Angerstorfer's assumptions, (1) that our author studied the biblical manuscripts (2) just as the rabbis were doing, is supportable on the basis of the extant evidence.

Moreover, memory alone of biblical manuscripts is not sufficient to explain the relationship between the homily's variants and those found in other ancient works. One must also allow for a more diverse Judaism, one which need not have any close or unique connection with "rabbinic" forms of Judaism.

---

[118]Angerstorfer, p. 112, writes, "there is no doubt that he read the Greek Bible often and in depth, because otherwise he would not be able to quote sentences...with such precision."

[119]Also suggested as a source by some scholars stressing the close ties to rabbinic Judaism is the developing tradition reflected in the Mishnah and the Passover Haggadah. See Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah." I discuss this in Part One, pgs. 27-29.

[120]Kraabel, "The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions," pp. 445-464. See also Ross S. Kraemer, "On the Meaning of the Term 'Jew' in Greco-Roman Inscriptions," *HTR* 82 (1989):35-53.

More importantly, even if one assumes that rabbis did use derivative-biblical sources (and nothing suggests they did not), that does not necessarily indicate that our homilist was influenced by rabbinic thought. The potential use of shared sources between the homily and rabbinic Judaism does not bear directly on those theories suggesting ties with rabbinic Judaism. Said another way, the hypothetical use of similar sources by both does not in and of itself imply a connection of thought or purpose or conversely, polemic or confrontation. The two points (1) that our author used derivative-biblical sources and (2) was not influenced by nascent rabbinic Judaism, are not necessarily connected.

To establish a relationship with rabbinic thought, practice or perspectives, one must look at the homily's content. I have argued that the author's assertions and assumptions do not reflect a relationship (positive or negative) to rabbinic Judaism. Further, claiming that our author is indebted (however indirectly) to local rabbis (or a Jewish community) for the biblical material would not solve the problem of whether our author was friendly with or angry at contemporary Jews, because no unambiguous claims are made about these Jews in the homily.

Conclusion

A New Model of Interpretation for the *Peri Pascha*

Challenges to Current Scholarship

The study of the quotations, and the theory that derivative-biblical sources were used, brings another dimension to the homily's exegesis. Recognizing that our homilist shared traditions and interpretations with other ancient authors prevents the sort of isolationist picture which has been developed or presumed by several modern analysts. For example, some re-create the social setting as exceptionally challenging, with the homilist part of a small Christian community defending itself against a sizable, influential synagogue. Noting that Josephus (*Antiquities* 14.235; 16.171) indicates that a well-established Jewish community flourished in Sardis in the first century BCE, they assume that the community's influence continued to grow. Based on the synagogue remains which are judged the most magnificent of any found in the Roman Empire, scholars determine that our homilist, with the proverbial back against the wall, came out swinging against Jewish neighbors. This theory suggests that such a rare situation calls for an original response.

The theory further assumes that the primary value in the quotations is what they reveal of our homilist's animosity against Sardian Jews. The biblical material (Jewish Scripture quotations and allusions, and NT allusions) is noted primarily for its alleged rhetorical effect on the audience, and for revealing social exchange between Christians and Jews in Sardis. The content of our homilist's argument becomes less important than the presumed impact of the rhetoric.

If, however, our author used derivative-biblical sources, as I suggest, then the quotations (and perhaps other material such as the lists in *PP* 59 and 69) have a history apart from their use in the homily. That interpretive history may have impacted our author even more than the

local situation. Consequently, we must take very seriously the theological impact of the quotations. Wilson's suggestion, that the details themselves are less important than the vicious tone of hatred against alleged Jewish neighbors, is only speculation.[1]

The use of sources, and the connections between various authors that such traditions suggest, however, does not reduce the homily's author to a mere automaton any more than direct use of scriptural materials would. While the available sources' perspectives might shape to some degree the author's ideas, our author could be equally capable of modifying existing traditions. In the end, the use of sources does not answer how our homilist related to Jews or Judaism, it merely highlights that the homilist cannot be isolated from developing Christian theology and tradition.

At the same time, a careful examination of the arguments grounded by the quotations cautions against supporting those theories which correlate our homily directly with a Jewish form of Passover celebration. These proposals cannot explain adequately the homilist's emphasis on Ex. 12 and the lack of Ex. 12 usage in the Passover Haggadah and other post-70 CE Jewish writings on the Passover. Moreover, they cannot account for the close connection between the homily's retelling of Ex. 12 and the Passion account in *PP* 71. The homily's differences from the Exodus passage in the LXX are best explained as part of the evolving desire to pattern the Passover after the Passion, or to interpret the Passion in light of the Passover.[2] It seems quite remote, therefore, that our homilist created the Passover story in *PP* 12-14 completely from memory of the LXX Ex. 12 text, as Angerstorfer argues, or from developing Passover Haggadah tradition, as Hall maintains.[3] Additionally, the alleged ties with emerging rabbinic Judaism are problematic, as evidence for second and third century CE Jewish practices cannot be garnered uncritically from emerging rabbinic literature, which are generally dated later in their surviving forms.

I have maintained that the homily should not be classified as representing a Quartodeciman position; in fact, the evidence suggests that our author's interpretation of the Passover includes nothing that can be called characteristically Quartodeciman. No interest in measuring a fast, establishing proper procedures for fasting, dating Jesus' Passion or relating practices to a Sunday observance is found. Furthermore, no

---

[1]Wilson, *Related Strangers*, pp. 248-49. A rebuttal is given by M. Taylor, pp. 143-45.

[2]See S. E. Loewenstamm, *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition*, English trans. Baruch J. Schwartz (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992) for a general discussion.

[3]Angerstorfer, pp. 101-103. Hall, "Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah." See Part One for a discussion of rabbinic influence.

claim is made for Johannine chronology; no preoccupation with eschatology comes to light. The typological emphasis in understanding Jesus' Passion in terms of the Passover account is widespread throughout Christianity, as already attested in Paul. Thus this accent scarcely distinguishes Quartodecimans from other Christian groups.

The prospect of tracing developing liturgy on the Passover/Passion from synagogue to church, or of discovering concurrent themes between contemporary rabbis and Christians, might become clearer if a connection between our homily and rabbinic Judaism (or any other Jewish group) could be made. Unfortunately, the alleged similarities of thought between our homily and rabbinic works are unconvincing. In addition, the textual similarities between the homily's quotations and material in unambiguous Jewish writings are also found in Christian works. This should caution against assuming that a similarity between our homily and a Jewish work necessarily implies a direct relationship with contemporary Judaism.

Christian Self-Definition

The derivative-biblical source theory does not undermine the contention made at the beginning of the book, namely that our author's language against "Israel" is directed at biblical (and New Testament) Jews. I have noted that our author at times might be simply passing on traditional interpretations developed elsewhere. Clearly, our author believed that these quotations supported the homily's purposes, and thus the quotations are relevant to whatever circumstances our author faced, but the derivative-biblical source theory documents the conventions shared with the wider, developing Christian tradition. This source theory highlights that much in the homily's argument is not unique but squarely in the traditional interpretive path being laid by early Christian writers.

Yet to say that the homily and its quotations and allusions offer no suggestion of direct confrontation between our author and contemporary Jews does not rule out the possibility that such encounters occurred; it only cautions that the homily itself offers little help in reconstructing that interaction. It is certainly a valid critique that frequently scholars in religious studies tend to see all conflict between Christians and others as *religious* in nature. It is important to recognize that social, political and economic ambitions can be conveyed in religious language, and to acknowledge that religious disputation does not occur in a social vacuum. I appreciate the possibility that our author and/or the author's Christian community may have interacted with Jews on a civic or social level. This recognition is not based, however, on any specific point made

in the homily, rather it is taken from what has been assessed about everyday life in the Roman Empire.

The Homilist's Intention in Writing the Homily

I do not think the homily was written to challenge the Jewish community in Sardis. I should add that I do not see the homily confronting any contemporary Jewish community directly, primarily because the references to Jews are biblical, not contemporary.[4] I have also explained that I do not consider the homily is an attempt to write a Christian Passover Haggadah, modeled after the Jewish Passover Haggadah as developed by the rabbis. I would add that the homily was not written to defend how Christians celebrate the Pascha, in part because the homily does not ask the listeners to *do* anything specific or to avoid any particular behavior.

Instead, I suggest that the homily was written primarily to promote what is *NEW*, and to relativize what is *OLD*. Our author is intent on showing that, in fact, the Passion was "required" because of sin, was foretold in the prophets, and was carried out by "Israel." Our homily was intended to show that the Passover was celebrated primarily to foreshadow Jesus' Passion, and to reinforce the homilist's position that with the Passion and resurrection came the fulfillment of God's salvation plan for humanity.

The homily emphasizes the place of sin in human existence, as seen in Part Two. A call is given twice to "the families of men" (*PP* 94, 103) to turn from their present sinful state and become followers of Jesus. The homily explains by using the story of the Fall that "old" sin has been "forgiven" (*PP* 103) in the "newness" of Jesus and his Passion. The identity of "the families of men" is open to interpretation. It seems to be contrasted to "Israel." If I have correctly identified "Israel" as Jews mentioned in the biblical texts and in the NT stories alluded to in our homily, then the "families of men" might be gentiles, or humans in general (including Jews).

---

[4]A possible exception might be our author's reference to "Israel's" statement that, "I did kill the Lord. Why? Because he had to die" in *PP* 74. That may indicate a contemporary argument between Christians and Jews. Justin includes a very similar exchange in *Dial.* 95 and 141. However, the Synoptic Gospels preserve a saying of Jesus, "for the Son of Man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that one by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been better for that one not to have been born" (Mk. 14.21, see also Matt. 26.24, Lk 22.22), which seems to indicate that some early Christians were interested in the apparent dilemma presented in placing blame on Jesus' "betrayer" when Jesus' death was "ordained" by God. Justin and our homilist may reflect further Christian speculation on this concern.

If our author intended the phrase to indicate humanity in general, then the homilist might have hoped to address both Jews and gentiles, or perhaps our author's Christian community included both Jews and gentiles. This possible "mixed" community was mentioned by Kraabel as an explanation for our homilist's violent language against "Israel";[5] while I do not agree with his support of this claim, I do accept the possibility, based in part on the phrase "families of men," that our author's community might have included Jews. It is also clear that our author used material from the Jewish Scriptures, presumably because it was known to the audience. Yet our author did not use scriptural material extensively, and much of what was quoted might be considered "basic" information, such as creation and the Exodus. Is. 53 and Ps. 2 seem part of some Christian traditions as early as Acts (late first, early second century CE). Thus the audience is not required to know Jewish Scriptures in detail, and our author might have purposely structured the homily with that in mind.

If our author intended to speak only of gentiles using the phrase "families of men," then it is possible that our author was deliberately excluding Jews, or perhaps Jewish Christians. In this case, one could speculate that the proper interpretation of Passover might be pronounced. Because our homilist offers no unambiguous information to help decide this issue, we are left in the frustrating position of merely speculating on the matter.

The homily is built on the connection between the "old" prophets and the "new" in Jesus. Our homilist is committed to interpret the prophets because of the supersessionary model of "old" and "new" set up in the beginning of the homily. "Understand, therefore, beloved, how it is new (*kainon*) and old (*palaion*)" (*PP* 2). The Passover is given only temporary significance, "the model was abolished when the Lord was revealed, and today, things once precious have become worthless, since the really precious things have been revealed" (*PP* 43). Jesus is identified as the Passover, "I am the Pascha of salvation, I am the lamb slain for you" (*PP* 103). Wilson concurs that "at the heart of Melito's typological exegesis lies a contrast between the old and the new Pascha expressed typically in pairs of contrasting terms: *typos/alētheia, parabolē/hermēneia, nomos/euaggelion or (logos).*"[6]

Finally, our homilist wrestles with what is left of the "old." Like other Christian writers, our author concludes that "Israel" has forfeited its position as the chosen one of God (*PP* 82). It is the "church" (*ekklēsia*)

---

[5]See Kraabel, "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis: Text and Context," p. 84.

[6]Wilson, "Melito and Israel," p. 85.

which now has the right understanding of God through Jesus (*PP* 40-43). For our homilist, the "old" is no longer important except as it serves to point to the "new." Yet "Israel's" rejection of Jesus, described by our homilist in the harshest of terms (they murdered God, *PP* 72), has intensified its condemnation, in our author's eyes. Taylor writes that, "while in the first section Israel was superseded as a matter of course, as part of the inevitable progression of God's plan for salvation, in the second part of the homily, Melito gives a much more forceful and powerful reason for the substitution of Israel: supposed Jewish responsibility for the murder of Christ."[7]

It seems that our homilist was motivated not only by a concern to explain Christianity as "new," yet continuing from the "old" ("Israel"), but also by a strong desire to condemn "Israel" as unworthy to be called God's people. Our author might have hoped to convince the local Christian community of this or perhaps most listeners would have shared our homilist's viewpoint, in which case our author might be "preaching to the choir." It may be, however, that our author was anxious to correct "aberrant" Christian views within the local Christian community or challenge Christians outside the author's immediate community. One might imagine the homily's strong supersessionary claims challenging Marcionite tendencies to divorce the "old" from the "new." Again, one could speculate that (hypothetical) Jewish Christian listeners would be persuaded to re-evaluate their connection with historical Israel. But from our present vantage point, we cannot be certain to what extent the homily was intended as corrective or polemic, though these goals are not mutually exclusive.

A New Model for Interpreting the Homily

To summarize and pull together the suggestions above, I propose that the *PP* be re-evaluated based on a new approach to the homily, one which challenges the customary use of Eusebius' information and questions the Sardis provenance, one which cautions against claiming a close connection to rabbinic Judaism based on assumed Quartodeciman beliefs. I submit that the homily is best understood in the context of an intra-Christian debate on the proper understanding of Jesus. The derivative-biblical source theory exposes both the importance theology plays in our homilist's understanding of Jesus and "Israel," as well as the impact developing traditions have in our homily's argument. Extending the possibilities for a provenance other than Sardis weakens models which rely on the (reconstructed) strong Jewish community there to

[7]M. Taylor, p. 71.

bolster their claims that social antagonism motivated our author. When examining the quotations and traditions mentioning "Israel," I have concluded that no allusion to contemporary Jews is made by our homilist. The attack against "Israel" is made against biblical Jews to score theological points over other Christians, and/or to reinforce to the homilist's community that Christianity has replaced Judaism as the "true" community of God.

Appendix A

Fragment 15 and Irenaeus

Fragment 15 is from a fifth century Syriac florilegium, and the "Irenaeus" material is most completely preserved in Armenian manuscripts of the florilegium of Timothy Ailuros. For the argument concerning these two works, please refer to pages 46-49.

Frag. 15	**"Irenaeus"**
Melito the bishop, On Faith	
From the law and the prophets	The law, the prophets
we have collected the things	
which are proclaimed about our	and the gospels proclaimed
	that Christ was born from
Lord Jesus Christ, so that we	a virgin, and suffered on a tree,
	and was seen from the dead,
	and ascended into heaven,
	and was glorified by the Father,
may demonstrate to your affection	
that he is perfect mind,	and he is perfect mind.
The Word of God who was begotten before the morning star. He is the Creator with the Father, the shaper of man who was all things in all:	
who was among the patriarchs a patriarch,	who was among the patriarchs a patriarch,
who was in the law a law,	who was in the law a law,
among the priests a chief of priests,	among the priests a chief of priests,
among the kings the captain	among the kings a captain,
among the prophets a prophet,	among the prophets a prophet,
among the angels a chief of angels,	among the angels an angel,
in the utterance a Word,	
among spirits a Spirit,	
	among men a Man,
in the Father a Son,	in the Father a Son,
in God a God,	in God a God,

King for ever and ever.
It is he that steered Noah,
who led Abraham,
who was with Isaac bound,
who was with Jacob exiled,
who was with Joseph sold,
who was with Moses a captain,

who with Joshua son of Nun
divided the inheritance,
who in David and in the prophets
predicted his sufferings,
who was enfleshed in a virgin,
who was born in Bethlehem,
who in the manger was swathed with
bandages,
who was recognized by shepherds,
who was praised by angels,
who was worshiped by magi,
who was preached beforehand by
John,

who gathered the apostles,
who preached the kingdom,
who cured the lame,

who gave light to the blind,
who raised the dead,
who appeared in the temple,
who was not believed by the people,
who was betrayed by Judas,
who was arrested by the priests,

who was judged by Pilate,
who in the flesh was nailed up,
who was hung on a tree,
who was buried in earth,
who arose from the dead,
who appeared to the apostles,
who was taken up to the heavens,
who sits at the Father's right,
and by him is glorified.
He is the repose of the dead,
the finder of the lost,
the light of those who are in darkness,
the redeemer of the captives,
the guide of the wanderers,
the refuge of the forlorn,

King for ever and ever.
It is he that steered Noah,
who led Abraham,
who was with Isaac bound,
who was with Jacob exiled,
who was with Joseph sold,
who was with Moses a captain,
who gave the people the law,
who with Joshua son of Nun
divided the inheritance,
who in David and in the prophets
predicted his sufferings,
who was enfleshed in a virgin,
who was born in Bethlehem,
who in the manger was swathed with
bandages,
who was recognized by shepherds,
who was praised by angels,
who was worshiped by magi,
who was preached beforehand by
John,
and was baptized in Jordan,
who was tempted in the desert,
who was found to be the Lord,
who gathered the apostles,
who preached the kingdom,
who cured the lame,
who cleansed the lepers,
who gave light to the blind,
who raised the dead,
who appeared in the temple,
who was not believed by the people,
who was betrayed by Judas,
who was arrested by the priests,
who was led before Herod,
who was judged by Pilate,
who in the flesh was nailed up,
who was hung on a tree,
who was buried in earth,
who arose from the dead,
who appeared to the apostles,
who was taken up to the heavens,
who sits at the Father's right,
and by him is glorified.
He is the repose of the dead,
the finder of the lost,
the light of those who are in darkness,
the redeemer of the captives,
the guide of the wanderers,
the refuge of the forlorn,
the shepherd of those who are saved,

the bridegroom of the Church,
the charioteer of the cherubim,
the chief of the army of angels,
God from God,
Son from the Father,
Jesus Christ, King for ever.
Amen.

the bridegroom of the Church,
the charioteer of the cherubim,
the chief of the army of angels,
God from God,
Son from the Father,
Jesus Christ, King for ever.
Amen.

Bibliography

(Standard *JBL* abbreviations have been used.)

Editions

Birdsall, J. N. "Melito of Sardis, Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα in a Georgian Version," *Le Muséon* 80 (1967):121-138.

Bonner, Campbell. *The Homily on the Passion by Melito bishop of Sardis and some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel.* Studies and Documents 12. Phila: Univ. of Penn. Press, 1940.

Chadwick, Henry. "A Latin Epitome of Melito's Homily on the Pascha," *JTS* 11 (1960):76-82.

Goehring, James E. "Melito of Sardis on the Passover," in *The Crosby-Schoyen Codex MS 193,* Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 521, ed. J. E. Goehring. Louvain: E. Peeters, 1990.

Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S. eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 13. London: Egypt Exploration Soc., 1919.

Hall, Stuart G. *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Hawthorne, Gerald F. "A New English Translation of Melito's Paschal Homily," pp. 147-175 in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney,* ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.

Lohse, Bernard. *Die Passa-Homilie des Bischofs Meliton von Sardes.* Textus minores 24. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

Perler, Othmar. *Méliton de Sardes, Sur la Pâque et Fragments.* Sources chrétiennes 123. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1966.

Testuz, Michel. *Papyrus Bodmer XIII, Méliton de Sardes Homélie sur la Pâque.* Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1960.

van Esbroeck, M. "Le traité sur la Pâque de Méliton de Sardes en Géorgien," *Le Muséon* 84 (1971):373-94.

Reviews

Audet, J. P. Review of *Méliton de Sardes sur la Pâque et fragments,* by Othmar Perler, *RB* 75 (1968):149-151.

Cross, F. L. Review of *Die Passa-Homilie des Bischofs Meliton von Sardes* by B. Lohse, *JTS* 11 (1960):162-163.

Secondary Sources

Angerstorfer, Ingeborg. "Melito und das Judentum." Ph.D. diss., Universität Regensburg, Germany, 1985.

Attridge, Harold W. and Hata, Gohei, eds. *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.

Audet, J. P. "L'hypothèse des Testimonia," *RB* 70 (1963):381- 405.

Barthélemy, D. "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septant," *RB* 60 (1953):18-29.

Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity.* Tubingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1934. Eng. trans. and ed. Robert Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Bokser, Baruch M. *The Origins of the Seder.* Berkley: Univ. of California Press, 1984 (1986).

Bonner, Campbell. "The New Homily of Melito and its Place in Christian Literature," pp. 94-97 in *Actes du V congrès International de Papyrologie,* Oxford, 30 Aout-3 Septembre, 1937. Brussels: Fondation Egyptologique Reine Elisabeth, 1938.

———. "Two Problems in Melito's Homily on the Passion," *HTR* 31 (1938):175-190.

———. "A Coptic Fragment of Melito's Homily on the Passion," *HTR* 32 (1939):141-142.

———. "A Supplementary Note on the Opening of Melito's Homily," *HTR* 36 (1943):317-319.

———. "The Text of Melito's Homily," *VigChr* 3 (1949):184-185.

Bonz, Marianne P. "Differing Approaches to Religious Benefaction: The Late Third-Century Acquisition of the Sardis Synagogue," *HTR* 86 (1993):139-54.

———. "The Jewish Community of Ancient Sardis: A Reassessment of its Rise to Prominence," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 93 (1990):343-359.

Bousset, W. *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom.* Göttingen: Van den Hoeck & Ruprecht, 1915.

Brocke, Michael D. "On the Jewish Origin of the *Improperia*," *Immanuel* 7 (1977):44-51.

Buckler, A. "The Reading of the Law and the Prophets in a Triennial Cycle," *JQR* 5 (1893):420-68.

Cabaniss, Allen. "The Univ. of Mississippi Coptic Papyrus Manuscript: A Paschal Lectionary?" *NTS* 8 (1961-62):70-72.

Cadman, W. H. "The Christian Pascha and the Day of the Crucifixion - Nisan 14 or 15?" *ST* 5 (1962):8-12.

Campenhausen, Hans von. *The Formation of the Christian Bible,* trans. J. A. Baker. Philadelphia; Fortress Press, 1972.

Cantalamessa, R. "Méliton de Sardes: Une christologie antignostique du II siècle," *RSR* 37 (1963):1-26.

———. "Les homélies paschales de Méliton de Sardes et du Pseudo-Hippolyte et les extraits de Théodote," pp. 263-271 in *Epektasis: melanges patristiques* (Festschrift J. Daniélou), ed. J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1983-85.

Chrestou, P. K. "Τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Μελιτωνος Περί Πάσχα καί ἡ ἀκολουθια πάθους," *Kleronomia* 1 (1969):64-78.

Cohen, Shaye. "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," *HTR* 82.1 (1989):13-33.

———. "The Place of the Rabbi in Jewish Society of the Second Century," pp. 157-173 in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity,* ed. Lee I. Levine. NY: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992.

———. From *the Maccabees to the Mishnah.* Phila.: Westminster Press, 1987.

Connolly, R. H. "New Attributions to Hippolytus," *JTS* 44 (1944-1945):192-200.

Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the first Epistle to the Corinthians,* trans. James W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Cross, F. L. *Early Christian Fathers.* London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1960.

Cross, F. M. and Sh. Talmon. *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text.* Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975.

Daniélou, J. "Méliton de Sardes: Homélie sur la Pâque," pp. 262-271 in *La vie spirituelle,* ed. P. Lethielleux, Libraire. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1948.

———. "Figure et événment chez Méliton de Sardes," pp. 282-292 in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: O. Cullman,* ed. A. N. Wilder. Leiden: Brill, 1962.

Drobner, H. "15 Jahre Forschung zu Melito von Sardes (1965- 1980): eine Kritische Bibliographie," *VigChr* 36 (1982):313-333.

Dugmore, C. W. "A Note on the Quartodecimans," *Studia Patristica* 4 [*TU* 79] (1961):411-421.

Efroymson, David P. "The Patristic Connection," pp. 98-117 in *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity,* ed. Alan T. Davies. NY: Paulist Press, 1979.

———. "Tertullian's Anti-Jewish Rhetoric: Guilt by Association," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 36 (1980):25-37.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture.* NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993.

Esbroeck, Michel van. "Nouveaux Fragments de Méliton de Sardes in une Homélie géorgienne sur la Croix," *Analecta Bollandiana* 90 (1972):63-99.

Feldman, Louis H. "Jewish 'Sympathizers' in Classical Literature and Inscriptions," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 81 (1950):200-208.

———. "The Omnipresence of the God-fearers," *BAR* 12 (1986):58-63.

Finn, Thomas M. "The God-Fearers Reconsidered," *CBQ* 47 (1985):75-84.

Fitzmyer, J. A. "4Q Testimonia and the New Testament," *JTS* 18 (1957):513-537.

Foss, Clive. *Byzantine and Turkish Sardis.* Archaeological Exploration of Sardis, Monograph 4. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1976.

Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community, The Social World of Early Christianity.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1975.

———. "The Dialogue of Paganism with Judaism: Bar Cochba to Julian," *HUCA* 44 (1978):89-118.

———. *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity.* NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1983.

Gaston, Lloyd. "Retrospect," pp. 163-174 in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity 2, Separation and Polemic,* ed. Stephen G. Wilson. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier Press, 1986.

Goehring, James E. "A New Fragment of Melito's Homily on the Passion," *Le Muséon* 97 (1984):255-260.

Goodman, Martin. *State and Society in Roman Galilee, AD 132-212.* Totowa, NJ: Rowan and Allanheld, 1983.

———. "Proselytising in Rabbinic Judaism," *JJS* 40 (1989):175-185.

———. "Identity and Authority in Ancient Judaism," *American Jewish Congress* 39 (1990):192-201.

Grant, R. M. "Melito of Sardis on Baptism," *VigChr* 4 (1950):33- 36.

———, ed. *Second-Century Christianity: A Collection of Fragments.* Translations of Christian Literature 6. London: SPCK, 1957.

———. "Fragments of Greek Apologists and Irenaeus," pp. 196-198 in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey,* ed. J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson. NY: Herder and Co., 1963.

———. *Eusebius as Church Historian.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

———. "Five Apologists and Marcus Aurelius," *VigChr* 42 (1988):1-17.

Grillmeier, A. "'Das Erbe der Söhne Adams' in der Homilia de passione Melitos, Bischof von Sardes: Ein neues Beispiel griechischer Erbsünderlehre aus frühchristlicher Zeit," *Scholastik* 20-24 (1949):481-502.

Gustafsson, B. "Eusebius' Principles in handling his Sources, as found in his Church History, Books I-VII," *Studia Patristica* 4 [*T U* 79] (1961):429-441.

Gutmann, J. "Prolegomenon," pp. ix-xxxi in *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture.* The Library of Biblical Studies, ed. H. M. Orlinsky. NY: KTAV, 1975.

———. *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981.

Hall, Stuart G. "Melito's Paschal Homily and the Acts of John," *JTS* 17 (1966):95-98.

———. "The Melito Papyri," *JTS* 19 (1968):476-508.

———. "Melito in Light of the Passover Haggadah," *JTS* 22 (1971):29-46.

———. "Melito ΠΕΡΙ ΠΑΣΧΑ pp. 236-248 in *Kyriakon: Festschrift J. Quasten* 1, ed. Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann. Münster/Westf.: Aschendorff, 1970.

———. "The Christology of Melito: a Misrepresentation Exposed," *Studia Patristica* 13 [*TU* 116] (1975):154-168.

———. "The Origins of Easter," *Studia Patristica* 15 [*TU* 128] (1984):554-567.

———. "New Readings in the Text of Melito," pp. 231-237 in *Texte und Textkritik: eine Aufsatzsammlung*, ed. J. Dummer. Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1987.

Halton, T. "Paschal Homily, Melito of Sardis," *The Furrow* 19 (1968):212-222.

———. "The Death of Death in Melito, *Peri Pascha*," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 36 (1969):163-173.

———. "Valentinian Echoes in Melito, *Peri Pascha*?" *JTS* 20 (1969):535-538.

———. "Stylistic Devices in Melito, *Peri Pascha*," pp. 249-255 in *Kyriakon: Festschrist J. Quasten* 1, ed. Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann. Münster/ Westf.: Aschendorff, 1970.

Hamman, A. "Melito of Sardes," pp. 25-39 in *The Paschal Mystery: Ancient Liturgies and Patristic Texts.* ALBA Patristic Library 3, trans. T. Halton. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1969.

Hanfmann, G. M. A. *Letters from Sardis.* Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1972.

———. *From Croesus to Constantine: The Cities of Western Asia Minor and Their Arts in Greek and Roman Times.* Jerome Lectures 10. Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. of Michigan, 1975.

———. "Recent Archaeological Research in Turkey," *Anatolian Studies* 26 (1976):58-62.

———. "On Lydian Sardis," pp. 99-132 in *From Athens to Gordion: The Papers of a Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young,* ed. K. DeVries and E. Kohler. University Museum Papers 1. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1980.

———. "Pedimental Reliefs from a Mausoleum of the Persian Era at Sardis: A Funerary Meal," pp. 82-90 in *Studies in Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Sudan: Essays in Honor of Dows Dunham on the Occasion of His Ninetieth Birthday,* ed. William Kelly Simpson and Whitney M. Davis. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1981.

Hanfmann, G. M. A. and Waldbaum, J. C. "New Excavations at Sardis and Some Problems of Western Anatolian Archaeology," pp. 307-326 in *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Festschrift for Nelson Glueck,* ed. J. A. Sanders. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1970.

Hansen, Adolph. "The *Sitz im Leben* of the Paschal Homily of Melito of Sardis with Special Reference to the Paschal Festival in Early Christianity." Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1968.

Hare, Douglas R. A. *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967.

———. "The Relationship between Jewish and Gentile Persecution of Christians," *JES* 4 (1967):446-56.

Harnack, Adolf von. "Marcion's Starting Point," pp. 190-193 in *the Writings of St. Paul*, ed. Wayne Meeks. NY: Norton & Co., 1972.

Harris, J. Rendel and V. Burch. *Testimonies*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1916-1920.

Harvey, A. E. "Melito and Jerusalem," *JTS* 17 (1966):401-404.

Hawthorne, Gerald. "The Rhetoric and Theology of Melito of Sardis." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1969.

———. "Christian Baptism and the Contribution of Melito of Sardis Reconsidered," pp. 241-251 in *Studies in NT and Early Christian Literature*, ed. D. Aune. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

———. "The Man was Christ," *Christianity Today* (March 24, 1978):22-26.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism*, trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

Hunt, B. P. W. Stather. *Primitive Gospel Sources*. NY: Philosophical Library, 1951.

Huber, W. *Passa und Ostern: Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche.* BZNW 35. Berlin: A. Topelmann, 1969

Hyldahl, Niels, "Zum Titel *Peri Pascha* bei Meliton," *ST* 19 (1965):55-67.

Johnson, Sherman E. "Early Christianity in Asia Minor," *JBL* 77 (1958):1-17.

———. "Christianity in Sardis," pp. 81-90 in *Early Christian Origins, Studies in Honor of H. Willoughby*, ed. A. Wikgren. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.

———. "A *Sabazios* Inscription from Sardis," pp. 542-550 in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough*, ed. J. Neusner. Supplements to *Numen* 14 (1968).

Jordan, H. "Melito und Novatian," *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 13 (1902):61-63.

———. "Armenische Irenaeus-fragmente mit deutsche Übersetzung nach W. Lüdtke," *TU* 36 (1913):56-99.

Kahle, P. "Was Melito's Homily on the Passion Originally Written in Syriac?" *JTS* 44 (1943):52-56.

Katz, P. *Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1950.

Keresztes, Paul. "Law and Arbitrariness in the Persecution of the Christians and Justin's First Apology," *VigChr* 18 (1964):204-214.

Kee, Howard Clark. "Defining the First-Century CE Synagogue: Problems and Progress," *NTS* 41 (1995):481-500.

Kilpatrick, G. D. "The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 4 (1963):33-47.

Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament,* 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Kraabel, A. T. "Judaism in Western Asia Minor under the Roman Empire with a Preliminary Study of the Jewish Community at Sardis, Lydia." Th.D. diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1968.

———. "*Hypsistos* and the Synagogue at Sardis," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 10 (1969):81-93.

———. "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis: Text and Context," pp. 77-85 in *Studies Presented to George M. A. Hanfmann,* ed. D. G. Mitten, J. G. Pedley and J. A. Scott. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1971.

———. "Paganism and Judaism: The Sardis Evidence," pp. 13-33 in *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme,* ed. A. Benoit et al. Paris: Éditions E. DeBoccard, 1978.

———. "The Diaspora Synagogue: Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence since Sukenik," *ANRW* 2.19 (1979):477- 510.

———. "The Disappearance of the 'God-Fearers,'" *Numen* 28 (1981):113-126.

———. "The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions," *JJS* 33 (1982):445-464.

———. "Impact of the Discovery of the Sardis Synagogue," pp. 178-190 in *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times,* ed. G. M. A. Hanfmann. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983.

———. "Synagoga Caeca: Systematic Distortion in Gentile Interpretations of Evidence for Judaism in the Early Christian

Period," pp. 219-245 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us, Christians, Jews 'Others' in Late Antiquity,* ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

———. "Greeks, Jews and Lutherans in the Middle Half of Acts," *HTR* 79 (1986):147-157.

———. "Traditional Christian Evidence for Diaspora Judaism: The Book of Acts," *SBL Seminar Papers* 25 (1986):644-651.

Kraemer, Ross S. "A New Inscription From Malta and the Question of Women Elders in the Diaspora Jewish Communities," *HTR* 78 (1985):431-438.

———. "Hellenistic Jewish Women: The Epigraphic Evidence," *SBL Seminar Papers* 25 (1986):183-200.

———. "On the Meaning of the Term 'Jew' in Greco-Roman Inscriptions," *HTR* 82 (1989):35-53.

———. "Jewish Tuna and Christian Fish: Identifying Religious Affiliation in Epigraphic Sources," *HTR* 84 (1991):141-162.

———. *Her Share of the Blessings.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992.

Kraft, Robert A. "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and the 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis," *JBL* 79 (1960):336-350.

———. "The Epistle of Barnabas, Its Quotations and Their Sources," Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1961.

———. "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and Melito's Paschal Homily," *JBL* 80 (1961):371-373.

———. "Some Notes on Sabbath Observance in Early Christianity," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 3 (1965):18-33.

———. "Jewish Greek Scriptures and Related Topics," *NTS* 16 (1970):84-96.

———. "Judaism on the World Scene," pp. 81-98 in *The Catacombs and the Colosseum,* ed. S. Benko and J. J. O'Rourke. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1971.

———. "Christian Transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures: A Methodological Probe," pp. 207-226 in *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme,* ed. A. Benoit et al. Paris: Éditions E. DeBoccard, 1978.

———. "Scripture and Canon in Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," pp. 199-216 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, The History of Its Interpretation* 1, ed. Magne Sœbø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Kraft, R. A. and Nickelsburg, G. W. E. *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

de Lange, N. R. M. *Origen and the Jews.* NY: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976.

Langmuir, Gavin I. *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism.* CA: Univ. of California Press, 1990.

Levine, Lee. *The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity.* NY: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1989.

Lewis, L. G. "The Commentary: Jewish and Pagan Backgrounds of Origin's Commentaries with Emphasis on the Commentary on Genesis." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1958.

Lieu, Judith, John North and Tessa Rajak, eds. *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire.* London: Rutledge, 1992.

Lieu, Judith. "Circumcision, Women and Salvation," *NTS* 40 (1994):358-370.

Lifshitz, B. "Fonctions et Titres honorifiques dans les communautés juives, d'épigraphie palestinienne," *RB* 67 (1960):58-64.

Loewenstamm, S. E. *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition,* Eng. trans. Baruch J. Schwartz. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992.

Lucchesi, Enzo. "Encore un Témoin Copte du 'Peri Pascha' de Méliton de Sardes," *VigChr* 41 (1987):290-292.

Magie, D. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1950.

Malatesta, Edward. "The Paschal Mystery," *The Way* 2 (1962):145-154.

Manis, Andrew M. "Melito of Sardis: Hermeneutic and Context," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 32 (1987):387-401.

MacLennan, Robert S. and A. T. Kraabel. "The God-fearers—A Literary and Theological Invention," *BAR* 12 (1986):46-53.

MacLennan, Robert S. *Early Christian Texts on Jews and Judaism.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

McDonald, J. I. H. "Some Comments on the Form of Melito's Paschal Homily," *Studia Patristica* 12 [*TU* 115] (1975):104- 122.

McDonald, Lee Martin. "Anti-Judaism in the Early Church Fathers," pp. 215-252 in *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity,* ed. Craig A. Evans and Donald A. Hagner. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1993.

Meeks, Wayne and R. Wilkin. *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1978.

Metzger, B. "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," *JBL* 91 (1972):3-24.

Meyers, Eric M. "Ancient Gush Halav (Giscala), Palestinian Synagogues and the Eastern Diaspora," pp. 61-77 in *Ancient Synagogues, The State of Research,* ed. Joseph Gutmann. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981.

Mitten, D. G. "A New Look at Ancient Sardis," *BA* 29 (1966):38- 68.

Mitten, D. G., J. G. Pedley and J. A. Scott, eds. *Studies Presented to George M. A. Hanfmann.* Monographs in Art and Archaeology 2. Fogg Art Museum, Harvard Univ., 1972.

Murray, Robert. "On Early Christianity and Judaism: Some Recent Studies," *RSR* 60 (1972):441-451.

———. "Defining Judaeo-Christianity," *Heythrop Jour.* 15 (1974):301-310.

———. "'Disaffected Judaism' and Early Christianity: Some Predisposing Factors," *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982):194-208.

Nautin, P. "L'Homélie de 'Méliton' sur la Passion," *RHE* 44 (1949):429-438.

———. *Le dossier l'Hippolyte et de Méliton.* Patristica 1. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1953.

———. *Lettres et écrivains Chrétians des II and III siècles.* Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1961.

Neusner, J. "Alike and Not Alike," pp. 227-235 in *Take Judaism for Example,* ed. J. Neusner. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1983.

———. *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Appointed Times* 5. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

Noakes, K. W. "Melito of Sardis and the Jews," *Studia Patristica* 13, [*TU* 116] (1975):244-249.

Norris, F. W. "Melito's Motivation," *ATR* 68 (1986):16-24.

Oesterley, W. O. E. *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Orbe, Antonio. "Imago spiritus: A proposito de s. Meliton, *Peri Pascha* 56," *Gregorianum* 48 (1967):792-794.

Otto, Johann K. T. von, ed. *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi* 9. Jena: Hermann Dufft, 1872.

Overman, J. A. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Pedley, John G. *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis.* Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1972.

Perler, O. "Recherches sur le *Peri Pascha* de Méliton," *RSR* 60 (1963):407-421.

———. "L'Évangile de Pierre et Méliton de Sardes," *RB* 71 (1964):584-590.

———. "Typologie der Leiden der Herrn in Méliton *Peri Pascha,*" pp. 256-265 in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten* 1, ed. Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann. Munster/Westf.: Aschendorff, 1970.

———. "Le fragment du traité 'Sur le dimanche' de Méliton de Sardes," *TU* 125 (1981):445-453.

Petersen, William L. "Eusebius and the Paschal Controversy," pp. 311-325 in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism,* ed. Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1992.

Peterson, Erik. "Ps. Cyprian, Adversus Iudaeos und Melito von Sardes," *VigChr* 6 (1952):33-43.

Prigent, P. *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé 1-16 et ses sources.* Paris: Libraire LeCoffre, 1961.

———. *Justin et l'Ancien Testament.* Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1964.

Quasten, J. *Patrology* 1. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1950.

Rache, G. "Perspectives christologique de l'Homélie paschale de Méliton de Sardes," *Studia Patristica* 9 [*TU* 94] (1955):263-269.

———. "Melito of Sardes," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 9 (1967):631-633.

———. "A propos du Christ-Père dans l'Homélie paschal de Méliton de Sardes," *RSR* 50 (1962):400-408.

Rajak, Tessa, "Jews and Christians as Groups in a Pagan World," pp. 247-262 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us, Christians, Jews 'Others' in Late Antiquity*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Ramage, A. *Lydian Houses and Architectural Terracottas.* Sardis Monograph 5. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978.

Reicke, Bo. *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism.* Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1946. Reprint. NY: AMS Press, Inc., 1984.

Reynolds, J. and Tannenbaum, R. *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias.* Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1987.

Richard, M. "La Question Pascale au IIe siècle," *L'Orient Syrien* 6 (1961):179-212.

———. "Témoins grecs des fragments 13 et 15 de Méliton de Sardes," *Le Muséon* 85 (1972):309-336.

Rist, Martin. "Additional Parallels to the Rending of the Veil in Melito's Homily on the Passion," *HTR* 31 (1938):249-250.

Robert, Louis. *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Sardes.* Paris: Libraire d'Amerique et d'Orient, 1964.

Robinson, James M., ed. *The Nag Hammadi Library.* Leiden: Brill, 1977. Paperback edition. NY: Harper and Row, 1981, 3d ed., 1988.

Ruether, Rosemary R. *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism.* NY: Seabury Press, 1974.

Ruiz, F. Mendoza, "Estado actual de la investigación sobre la 'Homilía acerca de la Pascua,' atribuida a Melitón de Sardes," *Scripta Theologica* 1 (1969):475- 492.

Runia, David R. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey.* Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum III.3. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Saldarini, Anthony. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1994.

Sanders, Jack T. *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants: The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations.* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1993.

Schuerer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC - AD 135).* New English Version revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black and P. Vermes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973-1987.

Scott, J. A. "Sardis," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 5, ed. K. R. Crim. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Scott, J. A. and Hanfmann, G. M. G. "Sardis," pp. 809-810 in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1976.

Seager, A. R. "The Building History of the Sardis Synagogue," *AJA* 76 (1972):425-435.

———, ed. and trans. *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian.* Translated Documents of Greece and Rome 6. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988.

Setzer, Claudia. *Jewish Responses to Early Christians.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Shepard, A. A. R. "Pagan Cults of Angels in Roman Asia Minor," *Talanta* 12-13 (1980):77-101.

Sibinga, J. Smit. *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr.* Leiden: Brill, 1963.

———. "Melito of Sardis, The Artist and His Text," *VigChr* 24 (1970):81-104.

Simon, M. *Verus Israel: étude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l'Empire roman, 135-425.* Paris, Éditions E. DeBoccard, 1948, 2d ed., 1964. Eng. trans. H. McKeating, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135-425.* Reprint of 2d ed. NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1985.

Skarsaune, Oskar. *The Proof from Prophecy.* Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Smallwood, E. M. *The Jews Under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian. SJLA* 20. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Smith, Morton, "Terminological Boobytraps and Real Problems in Second-Temple Judaeo-Christian Studies," pp. 295-306 in *Traditions in Contact and Change,* ed. P. Slater and D. Wiebe. Proceedings of the Fourteenth Congress IAHR, Waterloo, Canada: Wilfred Laurier Univ. Press, 1983.

Smith, J. Z. "The Social Description of Early Christianity," *Religious Studies Review* 1 (1975):19-25.

Snyder, Graydon F. *Ante Pacem, Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine.* Mercer, IN: Indiana Univ. Press, 1985.

Stanton, G. N. "Aspects of Early Christian-Jewish Polemic and Apologetic," *NTS* 31 (1985):377-392.

Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew.* Uppsala, 1954. Reprint. Ramsey, NJ: Sigler Press, 1990.

Stern, M. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism,* 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, 1974-1984.

Strack, Hermann L. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1931. Reprint. NY: Atheneum, 1969. Revised and edited by Herman L. Strack and G. Stemberger. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991. 2d ed. by G. Stemberger, Eng. trans. by Marcus Bockmuehl. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1996.

Strobel, A. "Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders," *TU* 121 (1977).

Stylianopoulos, Theodore. *Justin Martyr and the Mosiac Law.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1975.

Sundberg, A. C. "On Testimonies," *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959):268-281.

———. "The O.T. of the Early Church," *HTR* 51 (1964):205- 226.

Sykes, Alistair Stewart. "The Quartodeciman Paschal Liturgy in the Light of Melito's *Peri Pascha* Form Critically Examined." Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham, England, 1992.

———. "Melito's Anti-Judaism," *Journal of Early Christian St.* 5 (1997):271-283.

Tannenbaum, Robert E. "Jews and God-Fearers in the Holy City of Aphrodite," *BAR* 12 (1986):54-69.

Taylor, Miriam S. *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity.* Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Taylor, R. E. "Attitudes of the Fathers towards Practices of Jewish Christians," *Studia Patristica* 4 [*TU* 79] (1961):504-511.

Testuz, Michel. "Un nouveau manuscrit et l'homélie *Peri Pascha* de Méliton," *Studia Patristica* 3 [*TU* 78] (1960):139-141.

Tov, E. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research.* Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981.

Tov, E. with Robert A. Kraft, eds. *The Greek Minor Prophets from Nahel Hever, DJD* 8. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990.

Trebilco, Paul R. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor.* NY: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Treu, Kurt. "Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die Juden im römischen Reich," *Kairos* 15 (1973):123-144. Eng. trans. William Adler, "The Significance of Greek for Jews in the Roman Empire." IOUDAIOS-L server, 1991.

Tsakonas, B. G. "The Usage of the Scriptures in the Homily of Melito of Sardis on the Passion," *TATh* 38 (1967):609-620.

Turner, Eric. *The Typology of the Early Codex.* Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1977.

Van der Horst, Pieter. "Jews and Christians in Aphrodisias in the Light of their Relations in other Cities of Asia Minor," pp. 166-181 in *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity,* ed. Pieter W. van der Horst. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1990.

Van Unnik, W. C. "A Note on the Dance of Jesus in the 'Acts of John,'" *VigChr* 18 (1964):1-5.

Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism.* Leiden: Brill, 1961.

———. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English.* NY: Penguin Books Ltd., 1962. 4th ed. revised. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Vermes, G., F. Millar, M. Black and P. Vermes, eds. and Eng. trans. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC-AD 135),* by Emil Schuerer. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973-1987.

Vermeule, C. "Le traite sur la pâque de Méliton de Sardes in georgien," *Le Muséon* 84 (1971):373-394.

———. "Les ouvres de Méliton de Sardes en georgien," *Bedi Kartlisa* 31 (1973):48-63.

Weijenborg, Rainoud. "Méliton de Sardes Lecteur de la *Première Apologie* et du *Dialogue* de Saint Justin," *Anton.* 49 (1974):362-366.

Wellesz, E. J. "Melito's Homily on the Passion: An Investigation into the Sources of Byzantine Hymnography," *JTS* 44 (1943):41-52.

Werner, Eric. "Melito of Sardis, The First Poet of Deicide," *HUCA* 37 (1966):191-210.

White, L. Michael. "The Delos Synagogue Revisited, Recent Fieldwork in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora," *HTR* 80 (1987):133-60.

———. *Building God's House in the Roman World.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1990.

White, Richard C. "Melito of Sardis: Earliest Christian Orator?" *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 2 (1967):6-18.

———. "Melito of Sardis: An Ancient Worthy Reappears," *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 2 (1979):6-18.

Wifstrand, A. "The Homily of Melito on the Passion," *VigChr* 2 (1948):201-223.

Wilde, R. *Treatment of Jews in Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries of the Common Era.* Washington, DC: Catholic Univ., 1949.

Wilken, R. "Toward a Social Interpretation of Early Christian Apologetics," *Church History* 39 (1970):347-358.

———. *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind.* New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1971.

———. "Melito, The Jewish Community at Sardis and the Sacrifice of Isaac," *TS* 37 (1976):53-69.

———. "The Authenticity of the Fragments of Melito of Sardis on the Sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22): Comments on Perler's edition," *TU* 125 (1981):605-608.

———. *John Chrysostom and the Jews.* Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1983.

Williams, Margaret H. "The Jews and Godfearers Inscription from Aphrodisias—A Case of Patriarchial Interference in early Third Century Caria?" *Historia* 41 (1992):297-310.

Willis, William H. "The New Collections of Papyri at the University of Mississippi," pp. 381-392 and 2 plates in *Proceedings of the IX International Congress of Papyrology,* Oslo, 19-22 August, 1958. Oslo: Norweigian University Press, 1961.

Wilson, Stephen G., "Passover, Easter, and anti-Judaism: Melito of Sardis and others," pp. 337-355 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us,* ed. J. Neusner and E. Frerichs. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

———. "Melito and Israel," pp. 81-102 in *Anti- Judaism in Early Christianity* 2, *Separation and Polemic,* ed. Stephen G. Wilson. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier Press, 1986.

———. *Related Strangers, Christians and Jews 70-170 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Winslow, D. F. "The Polemical Christology of Melito of Sardis," *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982):765-776.

Wright, John. "Origen in the Scholar's Den: A Rationale for the Hexpla," pp. 48-62 in *Origen of Alexandria, His World and His Legacy,* ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen. Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame, 1988.

Zeiller, J. "A Propos d'un passage enigmatic de Méliton de Sardes relatif a la persecution contre les Chrétiens," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 2 (1956):257-263.

Zeitlin, Solomon, "The Names Hebrew, Jew and Israel," *JQR* 43 (1953):365-379.

Zuntz, G. "On the Opening Sentence of Melito's Paschal Homily," *HTR* 36 (1943):298-315.

———. "A Piece of Early Christian Rhetoric in the New Testament Manuscript 1739," *JTS* 47 (1946):69-74.

———. "Melito—Syriac?" *VigChr* 6 (1952):193-201. Attacks Kahle's theory that the homily was composed in Syriac, and maintains the text was written in Greek.

Hebrew Scripture Index

New Testament

Ancient Authors

Modern Authors