Philo's and Paul's Retelling of the Abraham Narrative in *De Abrahamo* and Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4

ID # 260575888
Shekari, Elkanah Kuzahyet-Buki

Faculty of Religious Studies (FRS), McGill University, Montreal
April, 2015

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Religious Studies

ABSTRACT

The Abraham narrative found in Genesis 11:26–25:10 has been retold in different ways by both Jews and non-Jews. All the re-tellers wanted to point out the way in which the Abraham narrative impacted people. The history of research on Abraham in the last century, shows little or no interests in the re-tellers of the Abraham narrative. For example, their primary sources, styles of text selection, and arrangement of the selected data in retelling the story of Abraham. Rather, the history of research shows that scholars were more interested on the reliability of the narrative, the religion of Abraham and his role as the ancestor of the Jews and of the non-Jews. My primary focus is on Philo's and Paul's retelling of the Abraham narrative, their primary source; their selection from the source; their arrangement of the events, and their goals for retelling the story of Abraham.

I used the insights of producing history of Hayden White, a literary critic and philosopher of history. White's insights show how historians select from their primary sources by means of their plot-structure, in order to retell past events by means of the historians emplotment, argument, ideological implications, and use of figurative language (tropes). Therefore, I used White's insights to understand how Philo and Paul used their primary source. This method helps us to see where and how Philo and Paul agree and also disagree.

Both Philo and Paul were not historians; rather, they were interpreters of narrative or history. Philo's selection from his primary source and his arrangement of the data to retell the Abraham narrative resulted in a national portrayal of Abraham, but with universal possibilities. Paul's selection from the same primary source, as Philo, and his own arrangement of the data to retell the Abraham narrative, resulted in a universal portrayal of Abraham but with national implications. Moreover, both Philo's portrait of a national Abraham with universal possibilities and Paul's portrait of universal Abraham were not new. Rather their differing portraits of Abraham raise the question: how did they arrive at two differing portraits?

This was because of their differing goals for retelling the Abraham narrative. This tells the identity of their audiences and their audiences' knowledge of the Abraham narrative. Moreover their differing portraits of Abraham tell some of the challenges, which made them to retell the Abraham narrative. Philo wanted to defend the Jews against their opponents and to introduce his form of Judaism to his readers, Philo's Judaism was by no means unique because it was influenced by Hellenistic ideals. Philo's Abraham lived an excellent life to have made Philo invite his readers/audience to emulate Abraham. Paul, by contrast, wanted to defend his message of justification by faith in both Galatians and Romans. He portrayed Abraham's faith as worthy of the emulation of his readers; this, I argued in the contexts of the patronage system and self-mastery. Hence, Paul's chief interest was to argue that Christianity and not Judaism was the better option for Gentiles (Christians).

RÉSUMÉ

Le récit de la vie d'Abraham que l'on trouve dans le livre de la Genèse du chapitre 11: 26 à 25: 10, a été raconté de plusieurs différentes façons par les Juifs ainsi que les non-Juifs. Tous ces re-raconteurs cherchaient à souligner la manière dont le récit Abraham impacte les personnes qui le lisent. L'étude d'Abraham au cours du dernier siècle, n'a porté très peu – voir même aucun intérêt pour les re-raconteurs du récit. Quelles furent leurs sources primaires ? Leurs approches à la sélection du texte, et la disposition des éléments qu'ils ont choisi de retenir ? Au contraire, les chercheurs se sont montrés plus intéressés à débattre la fiabilité du texte, les croyances d'Abraham et son rôle comme ancêtre des Juifs et des Gentils. Je me concentre surtout sur le récit d'Abraham qu'offrent Paul de Philon ; leur source primaire ; leurs sélection à même cette source ; leurs agencement des évènements ; et le but qu'ils visaient avec leur récit.

J'ai utilisé l'approche de Hayden White sur la production de l'histoire. Il est un critique littéraire et un philosophe de l'histoire. White montre comment les historiens choisissent leurs sources primaires d'après la structure de leurs récits afin de raconter des événements passés par le biais des approches des historiens ; l'ordre de leurs récits, leur argumentaire, les implications idéologiques et leurs usage du langage figuratif (tropes). J'ai utilisé les idées de White pour comprendre comment Philon et Paul ont utilisés leurs sources primaires. Cette approche nous permet de voir les rapprochements et les divergences entre Philon et Paul.

Philon et Paul n'étaient pas historiens ni l'un ni l'autre; ils étaient plutôt des interprètes du narratif ou de l'histoire. Philon à choisit ses sources primaires, et a réarranger les éléments individuels pour dresser le portrait d'un Abraham national qui offre néanmoins des possibilités universelles. Pour sa part, Paul a choisi des éléments de la même source primaire que Philon, mais les a racontés de façon à dresser le portrait d'un Abraham universel, avec des implications nationales. Aucune des deux approches n'étaient nouvelles, mais la différente approche entre les deux nous incite à nous interroger sur la façon dont ils sont parvenus à leur approches particulières.

Ils ont évidemment raconté le récit d'Abraham avec des buts différents, qui nous indiquent des choses à propos de leurs auditoires et de la familiarité de ses derniers avec le narratif. De plus, leurs différents portraits d'Abraham nous parlent des défis particuliers qui les ont menés à raconter l'histoire Abraham. Philon voulait défendre les Juifs contre leurs adversaires et introduire ses lecteurs à sa forme de Judaïsme – un Judaïsme qui n'était pas unique, puisqu'il avait été influencé par les idéaux hellénistes. Pour inciter ses lecteurs à imiter son modèle, Philon nous montre un Abraham qui a vécu une vie excellente. En revanche, Paul dans ses épîtres aux Romains et aux Galates, Paul voulait défendre son message de la justification par la foi. Il dépeint donc la foi d'Abraham comme étant l'objet digne de l'émulation de ses lecteurs, et ceci dans le contexte du patronage et de la maîtrise de soi. Paul cherchait surtout soutenir que le Christianisme était une meilleure option que le Judaïsme pour les Gentils.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

INTRODUCTION:
The Abraham Narrative: A General Introduction

The Abraham narrative has found a home in a variety of settings, including, among others, Judaism, Christianity, Gnosticism, and Islam.[1] For centuries, it has fascinated all kinds of people who have adopted and adapted it as part of their own faith cultures. Philo and Paul were among the early users to use the Abraham narrative, whose writings have been preserved. While they depended on the same primary source (Genesis 11:26–25:10), their retellings of the narrative produced two different Abrahamic portraits that resemble two different branches of the same tree. The fact that they had used the same source yet produced varying portraits of Abraham has since been observed by scholars.[2] I seek to demonstrate not only that their portrayals of Abraham are valid in view of their presuppositions, but also that their styles and approaches to text selection played an important part in building their conclusions. For their text selection, I will use Hayden White's insights into the production of history.[3] However, before that, I will define the problem that the thesis seeks to address, discuss the history of research in order to highlight some of the issues that confront scholars in the Abraham narrative, and to provide a summary of each chapter of the thesis.

01: The Problem Defined

The Abraham narrative in Genesis was written to answer certain questions such as Israel's origin, religion, and God, just as were its different retellings by Philo and Paul. Inquiring why they presented such differing portrayals of Abraham, even when they apparently depended on the same Abraham narrative in Genesis 11:26–25:10 as their source, will help us to understand what informed their selection of text from the primary material. It will also lead us to reflect on their purposes for writing and the world(s) of their audiences. Moreover, the general contexts of their audiences will help us examine the relationship between each of our two authors and their respective audiences. Some of the questions that interest this research are as follows. How did Philo and Paul select from their primary source and rearrange their data in contrast to their main source? How does White's insights on history help us understand Philo's and Paul's retelling of the Abraham narrative? What can we learn from their goals for retelling the

Abraham narrative?

Philo wrote in *the Embassy to Gaius* that he led a Jewish delegation to Rome to plead against the plan to introduce emperor worship in the synagogues in Alexandria. During this kind of visit, it would have been customary for delegates to engage in discussion, and sometimes even debate, with various distinguished audiences in Rome in order to introduce their philosophical thought. According to Maren R. Niehoff, Philo was engaged in such symposia in which he both defended much of his work and introduced Judaism to Greco-Roman audiences.[4] Did Philo intend, and would that be an opportunity for him, to appeal to his Roman audience to consider his form of Judaism? I argued yes, because the act of only writing one's ideas and expressing religious conviction in a winsome way to a targeted audience is certainly an act of seeking and of drawing people to believe or to accept what is offered.

Israel Kamudzandu observes correctly that a national Abraham is nothing unique because that particular portrait of the patriarch was a cultural tradition that was common among Jews in the first century AD.[5] But how widespread was such a portrait among the Jews in Rome? And since Paul was writing not only to Christian Jews but also to non-Jewish Christians in the house fellowships in Rome, we must also wonder whether or not *De Abrahamo* would have played any role at all in introducing to them such a portrait of Abraham. Erwin R. Goodenough made the interesting suggestion that Philo had written his *Exposition* for the non-Jews in order to attract/convert them to Judaism.[6] If this opinion is accurate, some Jews might have been encouraged to engage in vigorous recruitment of non-Jews into Judaism. In my interpretative framework, I placed Paul's Abraham in the Roman contexts of the patronage system and self-mastery.

02: A Brief History of Research on the Abraham Narrative

Scholarly interest in the Abraham narrative has largely focused on the religion of Abraham; the reliability of the narrative; and, closely related to it, the ancestral claim to Abraham. This history of research will address two of the scholarly concerns, namely, the religion of Abraham and the historicity of the narrative.

02.1: The Religion of Abraham

For over a century, scholars have shown great interest in the religious nature of the patriarchs, most notably Abraham, since he was of great importance to several religious traditions. The central question is whether Abraham was a monotheist or a polytheist, since the events in the Abraham narrative are woven together with reports of communications with the divine being of his devotion. For example, יהוה appears at least sixty times in fifty-four verses from Genesis 12–25, while אדני יהוה and other similar forms such as יהוה אלהי אדני occur nineteen times in seven verses in Genesis 12–25. Abraham was also associated with the אל עליון (God Most High, Gen. 14.18, 19, 20, 22), the אל שדי (God Almighty, Gen. 17.1); there were also אל ראי (God who sees, Gen. 16.13) and בית־אל (house/place of God, Gen. 12.8; 13.3) among others. The presence of multiple divine names, contributed significantly to the debate on whether Abraham was a monotheist. Many years ago, Gordon J. Wenham notes that the debate had not yet yielded any clear consensus among scholars about the religious ideas of the patriarchs, and this would appear to remain the case.[7]

In his sermon on Abraham and Isaac delivered on March 9, 1851, the first Sunday in Lent, Frederick D. Maurice, a professor of moral philosophy at Cambridge University, opines that it was wishful thinking to claim that Abraham was a monotheist. He informed his audience that nothing in the "evil" world of Abraham could possibly have kept him from polytheism.[8] In a lecture in the early 1930s, Theophile J. Meek argues that the religion of the early Hebrews, including Abraham, was "polydaemonistic and polytheistic," and was a by-product either of naturalism or of animalism and ancestral worship.[9] Helmer Ringgren's mention of "sacred stones" and "sacred trees" is connected with the naturalistic aspect of the patriarchal religion.[10]

Alt as well argued that the religion of the patriarchs was polytheistic in nature.[11] He argued that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was initially anonymous and that He apparently bore the names of three different gods worshipped by three different clans, namely,

those of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. They arrived in Canaan at different times, each with their god: "the god of Abraham," "the Fear of Isaac," and "the Mighty One of Jacob." Each one was only known to its clan. Albrecht Alt suggests that as the three clans continued to live together, they were influenced by the Canaanite god, "El," a name which subsequently prefixed the names of the gods of the fathers. Eventually they became united and chose Abraham as the father and grandfather of Isaac and Jacob, respectively, which made Isaac, Jacob's father. Consequently, this arrangement united all three clans and their three gods through their exposure to "El."[12] While Alt saw a discontinuity between the patriarchal deity El who occupied the head of the Canaanite pantheon and YHWH of Israel, Frank M. Cross argues instead for continuity because Israel had worshipped the El of the patriarchs before they turned to the YHWH of Israel. Wenham also argued for continuity when he observed that: "The type of religion portrayed in Genesis has many points in common with later Israelite practice, but … certain aspects of patriarchal religion are so different from later practice …"[13] Nonetheless Cross agrees with Alt that the religion of Abraham and the patriarchs was polytheistic.[14] Cross suggests that YHWH could have separated or even gradually ousted and replaced El to become the head of the pantheon and subsequently to become Israel's God, a process that led to monotheism.[15]

Mark Smith recently argues for a differently-rendered version of the same basic position. He writes that Israel's monotheism belonged to the same class as the myths and rituals of the polytheistic religion of the ancient city of Ugarit.[16] He notes that different gods were worshipped in Ugarit and he argued that the interconnection between them formed a divine family, a sort of pantheon.[17] According to Smith, this divine family led to the formative tradition of Israel's monotheism, implying a relationship between El and YHWH.[18] Scholars have already noted this interconnection.[19]

Wenham has observed an interesting link between Exodus 3.13-15 and Exodus 6.3. He claims that 3.13-15 portrays the pre-Exodus Israelites as ignorant of El Shaddai, the name of their patriarchal God, while 6.3 portrays the patriarchs as also unaware of YHWH as the same El Shaddai, their God.[20] So was YHWH known in pre-Mosaic times? Gordon replied that the primary materials point in two different directions. The "indirect evidence" from Genesis-

Exodus shows that El was well-known while YHWH less so. Meanwhile, the "direct evidence" from extra-biblical sources suggests that El was at the head of the pantheon while YHWH was completely unknown.[21] I think, rather, that Wenham's study shows that both our biblical and extra-biblical sources have contributed to the indirect evidence that portrays a popular El and a less known YHWH in the religion of the patriarchs. The author of Genesis, remarks Wenham,

> identifies the patriarchs' El with Yahweh and prefers to use the latter term when describing divine activity, yet in reporting the words of God to the patriarchs he uses Yahweh very sparingly suggesting that he wanted to transmit the traditional form of the promises, not create divine words *ex nihilo*... The type of religion portrayed in Genesis has many points in common with later Israelite practice ... [He rejected the view that the patriarchal religion and] traditions were invented in the first millennium...[22]

Alan R. Millard argues that there is no cogent reason to refute the view that the patriarchs were monotheists just as their descendants were after them.[23] This is familiar ground for Millard who has already argued elsewhere for the plausibility of a patriarchal monotheistic tradition.[24] Millard's critique of the view that the patriarchs were polytheistic may seem to be a battle between David and Goliath. He begins by introducing Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV), king of Egypt from *c.* 1352 to 1336 BC, whom early Egyptologists such as James H. Breasted (1909), Sir Alan Gardiner (1961), and Cyril Aldred (1975) all referred to as the earliest genuine and unconditional monotheist.[25] If that description of king Akhenaten is reliable, then we are left to consider the differences between his concept of monotheism and that of the Judaeo-Christian-Islamic religious convictions, or at least specifically of early Jewish monotheism. In response, Millard quotes S. Quirke who said that the monotheistic god of Akhenaten did not communicate with people aside from providing them with basic needs such as light and life – but these he also provided for other creatures.[26] This is very different from the relational single god of Judaism. For Millard, the fact that Akhenaten could conceive of a notion of monotheism in the second millennium BC calls for rethinking of the debate about patriarchal religion.[27]

Millard links the monotheistic religion of Akhenaten with that of his father, Amenophis III, who ruled Egypt from *c.* 1390 to 1352 BC through the story of Sinuhe, which he said could have been "created and preserved from the Middle Bronze Age."[28] This means that the notion of monotheism pre-existed any Mosaic form of monotheism; Millard argues that there could

have been, and therefore that there have been, other monotheists.[29] I believe Millard challenges the view that the patriarchs were polytheists, a view mostly supported through extra-biblical sources, by quoting James Barr, who writes: "Now while every attempt to set biblical reports in their ancient context is welcome, those reports should receive due weight themselves. Either the Patriarchs worshipped several gods under various names, or they worshipped one who had several names."[30] He argues that there is no concrete reason to conclude that the patriarchs were not monotheists.[31]

John Van Seters correctly observes that the above discussion about the religion of the patriarchs does not resolve the question of the dating of the materials. He argued that Genesis was written by a Yahwist historian during the exilic period.[32] Thomas L. Thompson reaches a similar conclusion after having analysed the three periods typically suggested for the composition and context of the patriarchal narratives: the early second millennium, the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries BC, the late tenth or early ninth century BC.[33] He decided on the third, the Iron Age view, since "to search beyond this [Yahwistic] source seems to carry us outside of the context in which the traditions had meaning and significance for Israel, that is, beyond their significance as patriarchal traditions."[34] It is no surprise that Thompson has continued to argue for the same position[35] since he is a leading proponent of the minimal historical reliability of narrative in Scripture. If the Abraham narrative was written during the exilic period, the question of whether or not Abraham was a monotheist is irrelevant because Abraham may not have been a real person, but the question of Abraham's historicity remains.

02.2: The Nature of the Abraham Narrative

With the rise and growing influence of historical criticism from the seventeenth century onward, our inquiry into and understanding of biblical writing now leads us to questions about the reliability, history, and origins of the Bible.[36] Our concern now becomes how much of the text's narrative is literary fiction and how much is accurate historical record. Since the rise of historical criticism, this process of analysing the Bible has become common practice. Historical criticism takes into account the human origin of the biblical writings and concludes that they are factually unreliable, and often dismisses the claim of divine inspiration.[37] There are three views on the

historicity of the Abraham narrative, two of which are far more widely held than the third. Some scholars view the narratives as partial historical events, some as historical events, and some as literary fiction. Each one of the views has some valid points. My interest here is to clearly present the views and arguments of all three camps and to state my preference in passing.

02.2.1: Patriarchal Narrative as Unhistorical

In *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives*, a dissertation that was rejected by the Catholic faculty at the University of Tübingen, Thompson argued against the patriarchal narratives in Genesis as historical documents.[38] He went against the then-dominant view, which stated that "the historicity of the biblical traditions about the patriarchs has been validated by the archaeological and historical research of the last half-century [*c.* 1924 to 1974]."[39] Thompson battled against the views of such archaeologists and scholars as Albright and Alt.[40]

Thompson's scholarship emphasises on the areas of the Hebrew Bible and archaeology. He has argued alongside many others, mainly in the Copenhagen school, that biblical history is not verified by archaeology and is thus unreliable. I find some of Hermann Gunkel's influence in Thompson's argument, because for Gunkel, as "literary traditions, no part of Genesis can be assumed to be history unless its literary character can first be shown to be historiographical, at which point the usual norms of validation as to its veracity must still be applied."[41] It seems to me that Thompson applied this thesis when he analysed the names of the patriarchs in their context (their time and place, the place of the Mari document in the patriarchal narratives, the caravan trade of the time, and the migration of Abraham, among others), and concluded that the narrative is better placed in the second half of the second century BC, and that the patriarchal narratives are a reconstruction of several conflicting non-Israelite traditions, even though they were original and matched Israel's environment.[42] He, moreover, states that the patriarchal narratives are unhistorical since "we are not so much involved with the history of Israel as with the history of the development of Israel's literature."[43]

Closely related to Thompson's work is Van Seters' *Abraham in History and Tradition*, which criticizes the view that archaeology proved that Abraham lived in the second millennium BC (Albright), and the view that the patriarchal stories were developed from an oral tradition of

the Pentateuch; this is critiquing Gunkel and especially Martin Noth.[44] On the first issue, Van Seters argued that the age, nomadism, personal names, people, places, and customs of the patriarchs in Genesis are in agreement with a Middle Bronze Age period rather than with the second millennium BC, which had been proposed as the historical context for the patriarchal narratives. Consequently, the tradition that had created the Abraham narrative is no longer recoverable in its primary form.[45] This led Van Seters to argue that the Abraham of history, who appeared in Genesis, "was written from the historical and cultural perspective of a later day"[46] which he placed in the "early premonarchic period."[47] On the second issue, he claimed that the patriarchal tradition was formed over a lengthy period of time since there were successive additions to the form of the tradition available to the storyteller.[48] This challenges Wellhausen's Documentary Hypothesis, namely, that there was a final redactor who edited the patriarchal traditions that developed somewhere between the tenth and seventh centuries BC and during the Persian period *c*. 450 BC.[49] In this way, Van Seters still continued the model of Wellhausen in an altered form.[50]

In a recent publication Van Seters once again argues that the ancient history in Genesis should be understood as belonging to the

> larger world of ancient historiography which sought to historicize myth by systematically incorporating it as prologue or *archaiologia* into the national historical traditions. At the same time, it thereby mythologized the histories by giving to them a universal and paradigmatic orientation.[51]

The historicized myth becomes a national tradition that subsequently also becomes "inherited traditions."[52] Therefore, for Van Seters there was no concrete evidence to support the claim of some scholars for the historicity of Abraham or indeed of any of the patriarchs in the Genesis account. Rather, these were traditions that developed over a period of centuries, beginning from the early pre-monarchic period.

In an essay, Niels P. Lemche argues that to contend for the historicity of the Patriarchal narrative is "to make a bargain with the authors who manipulated this history in their own interest, that is, it would be to continue in the tradition of these authors and to make their viewpoints one's [own]."[53] Interestingly, for Lemche, we have two histories before us, namely,

the histories "of Palestine that is the history of the real world, and ... the history which is found in the OT."[54] As a leading figure in the Copenhagen school, his viewpoint did not come as a surprise to me. Baruch Halpern reacted in an essay entitled "Erasing History: The Minimalist Assault on Ancient Israel."[55] Halpern opines that the minimalist view of the history of ancient Israel is simply "cacophony in scholarship" whose interest is a witch-hunt at best.[56]

02.2.2. Patriarchal Narrative as Historical

Millard, having discussed some methods of studying the patriarchal narratives as ancient texts, argues somewhat unenthusiastically that the patriarchal narratives are historical: "the patriarchal narratives are our only source for knowledge of the earliest traditions of Israel, that traditions can be correct reflections of ancient events, and that they do not pretend to be textbooks of ancient near-eastern history or archaeology."[57] We can say that this is very unlike Albright, Wright, and De Vaux who showed more enthusiasm about the historicity of the primeval narratives in Genesis. For example, Albright believed that the whole picture we see "in Genesis is historical, and there is no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the biographical details and the sketches of personality which make the Patriarchs come alive with a vividness unknown to a single extra-biblical character in the whole vast literature of the … [ANE]."[58] Moreover, he said that archaeology has helped to authenticate most of the primeval traditions of the Israelites, which were transmitted from "oral tradition" to "written documents."[59] Roland de Vaux argues that *Heilsgeschichte* is superior to any history that disagrees with it.[60] In his words, "If … 'Sacred history' is contradicted by 'history' and if this confession of faith does not correspond to the facts, then the faith of Israel is void and so is our own. The place of the Hebrew Patriarchs in history is not just a problem for scholars."[61]

John J. Collins criticizes the views of both de Vaux and G. E. Wright.[62] Thompson, as well, criticizes De Vaux and claims that history is not central to the message of Israel and that the pre-Israel traditions, especially ones found in the patriarchal narratives, are not "essential to Christian faith."[63] In his essay "The Patriarchs in Scripture and History,"[64] John Goldingay was mainly interested in the questions: "Do they [patriarchal stories] have to be fundamentally historical in order actually to be true? Are they more like parable or gospel?"[65] He concludes

that "it is not possible to have the advantages of history without risks. But the Pentateuchal narratives, like the preaching preserved in the book of Isaiah, invite us to take this risk."[66] In other words, yes, the patriarchal narratives do have to be historical to make sense for faith. What is more, there is truth in the statement: "Not to know the way forward is to be lost. To have forgotten how one has come is to be doubly lost."[67]

02.2.3: Patriarchal Narrative as a Partial Historical Account

This view claims that not all biblical history and/or traditions should be taken as fact. The take-off point is Ringgren, who asked the question:

> How much history lies behind these patriarchal narratives?" It is obvious that they cannot be used as historical sources just as they stand [because they] … come down to us through centuries of oral tradition and through literary activity of one or more writers … It is difficult if not impossible to determine what part of the traditional materials is really ancient and genuine. To be sure, the extreme views …, which interpreted the patriarchs as figures out of astral mythology, are rejected ….[68]

Which is to say, to consider the patriarchal narratives as "history" falls short of what is "history." Ringgren calls for a moderate view when he writes that we must neither completely deny the historicity of the patriarchs nor completely hold to it.[69]

Meek continues in the same perspective when he noted that the patriarchal narratives are "in a sense … history, history idealized and personified. It is tradition, but in tradition there is always much history … All of biblical tradition cannot be accepted as fact, but facts do lie behind and within the biblical records, and it is the task of the historian to discover these facts and give them their true setting."[70] Meek highlights the difficulties and ways for recovering history.[71] According to Meek, ancient writings (which I will shorten as "A") had many motives, as of course do other writings. These motives were achieved when "A" was manipulated and sandwiched with other accounts (I will call this process "B"); hence, they were anything but scientific and accurate. This outlines the difficulty in recovering the historical facts, which is, nevertheless, not entirely impossible. It involved a gradual process that began from the end and stretched to the beginning.[72] This process was quite difficult because it sought to untie the cords that bind "A" to "B". It then analyzed the different periods that A had been through to become

"A" while attempting to remain objective in order to recover some historical facts. While I agree that recovering the historical facts of ancient writings is difficult, recovering some, or even most, is not entirely impossible – as Meek showed.[73]

This view receives some new currency (favour) from scholars, including V. Philips Long, Eugene H. Merrill, and Ian Provan who argue that:

> While the nature of the biblical text does not demonstrate entirely the characteristics of twentieth-century history writing, it does, however, represent a major source of information for the reconstruction of the history of ancient Israel that merits consideration and, together with archaeology, comparative material and social sciences, must form the basis for reconstruction.[74]

Long, one of the proponents of the aforementioned view, set out to argue his viewpoint in an essay entitled "What is History?"[75] Long begins by quoting Baruch Halpern: "History … is all fictionalized, and yet history,"[76] and then proceeds to R. Alter who wrote that "prose fiction is the best rubric for describing biblical narrative."[77] In other words, *fiction* is immensely important to biblical history. In direct opposition to Alter, Craig L. Blomberg argues that "a historical narrative recounts that which actually happened; it is the opposite of *fiction*."[78] This means that *history* is reality in the past. Long shows an interesting connection between Halpern's and Blomberg's view on "*fiction*." On the one hand, the latter stressed fiction as *genre* (or *function*), which may refer to "historicised *fiction*" since "the weight of emphasis falls on *fiction*."[79] On the other hand, Halpern's preferred term is "fictionalized history" since the stress is on the *form* of *history* that claims that "the story is a representation of a real event in the past, whatever fictionalizing may be involved in the crafting of the narrative."[80]

Long opines that there should be no distinction between history and fiction since *form* is not enough to describe or classify narratives; hence *function* is required. Moreover, the main difference between a "historian and a poet … is this, that one tells what happened and the other what might happen."[81] According to Long the line between history and fiction is "their overall sense of purpose," which is discoverable by *context*.[82]

Historical writing was representational, which focused on past facts without "too much

detail." It viewed the facts of the past from an aerial standpoint and contained mysteries and was incomplete, so that it can engage its readers.[83] It also possessed "the authority of the One who inspired [the historian]."[84] Moreover, representational writing was creative even though history was concerned with facts about the past. This was done by gaining knowledge of past events, whether by oral or experiential means, and then encoding the factual past in order to communicate it to the targeted audience.[85] Therefore, we can say that historical writing *simplifies*, *selects*, *suggests*, and *shares* factual past events with the targeted audience. We must note that interpretation was involved and was very vital to this process. Ferdinand Deist appears to me to agree with Long's thesis in his comment that "history [is] an explanation of the meaningful connectedness of a sequence of past events."[86] This implies that historical writing involves "ascribing logical relations to sequences of events … by acts of interpretation … of things unknown … in relation to things known … [for the sake of] finding (*i. e.* assigning) meaning … [moreover it requires] a view of the whole by see[ing] things together …."[87] Therefore, history is a narrative told in a perspective.[88]

J. Alberto Soggin views the narratives of the prehistory of Israel in the Hebrew Bible as "confessional history" because

> This kind of history is attested … among all people and societies right up to the present and it will not cease to exist. Indeed, it will continue even where critical-writing has long since achieved a historical-critical stage. Thus it has nothing to do with an alleged "primitive" cultural stage in a people's political, intellectual, and economic development for its purpose, as we have seen, is education within a particular community.[89]

As seen from our discussion above, scholars argued or suggested on the one hand that patriarchal history was an art that reconstructed factual events of the past. The process of composition went through several stages before the work resembled what we now have. It included, for example, the interpretation of data and the historian's thinking about his audience. Hence it is difficult to differentiate what was real history from what was not. On the other hand, it was a confessional history of faith, since it spoke purely of the relationship between God and his chosen people, Israel. So, even though the patriarchal history was said to be neither flawless, nor to answer all the questions, to say that it is unhistorical is subjective scholarship and to say

it is historical is objective scholarship. Therefore, it is safer to say that, with all its flaws, it contains enough history that provides enough data to reconstruct the patriarchal past of Israel.

0.2.3: The Importance of a Brief History of Research on the Abraham Narrative

The history of research on the Abraham narrative, presented above, stressed that the degree of importance given to the difference between historical narrative and imaginative narrative are not as crucial as is often thought. I will further show that in chapter 2. The discussion also stressed the following. Firstly, Philo's and Paul's different portrayals of Abraham were caused by their motifs and themes, just as the author of Genesis must also have had his own in retelling the story. This also applies to all the scholars we have discussed above, in the sense that they studied the same literary material on Abraham as well as archaeological discoveries that relate to him and his world, yet they arrived at different portraits of Abraham. Secondly, to succeed in achieving one's own purpose(s) for retelling any event, there is the need for partial and selective use of the primary materials, which consequently directs the way people understand these events. The same applies to the retelling of the Abraham story. We shall see this later in Hayden White's work on/concept of the production of historical narrative.

Thirdly, were Philo and Paul interested in the historicity of Abraham? We cannot be so certain that they had or did not have interest for lack of sufficient information. However, Philo and Paul must had been exposed to the debate about the historicity of the Greek myths, Homer's epics, and Homer's very existence. In response, the Greeks took as literal whatever made sense to them, but as allegorical whatever made no sense. I think, in his handling of the Abraham narrative, Philo adopted the Greek's way of interpreting their traditions. Thus, he used the literal and allegorical methods of interpretation in his exposition of the Abraham narrative in *De Abrahamo*. Paul also adopted the same literal and allegorical method of interpretation of the Abraham narrative in Galatians and Romans. We can see this in Philo's and Paul's use of the primary source, which leads to different portraits of Abraham. Lastly, the Yahwistic author of Genesis, Philo, Paul, and all the scholars we discussed above all relied on past events involving Abraham that survived in the form of chronicles, archaeological discoveries, and rewritten histories, to address a perceived present challenge for a better understanding and to make a

positive impact on the future. Thus, the goal of appealing the past to make an impact on the future underlies the intrinsic nature of the mission of these authors.

0.3: Structure of the Research

In my introduction, I have accomplished two things. Firstly, I defined some of the problems that this thesis intends to address. Secondly, I discussed the history of the research on the narrative of Abraham in order to introduce some of the issues that scholars are confronted with to this day. In Chapter One, I will discuss some of the early depictions of the story of Abraham in both Jewish and non-Jewish literature. I will consult sources such as the *Jubilees*, the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, and the works of ancient writers such as Demetrius the Chronographer, Cleodemus Malchus, and Josephus, among others. In Chapter Two, I will focus on my methodology, Hayden White's form structure of historical narrative. It will be utilised to understand the text selection of both Philo and Paul in their retelling of the story of Abraham, and their respective audiences. Chapter Three will discuss Philo's selection and handling of his source materials and his appropriation and goals in retelling the story of Abraham in *De Abrahamo*, while Chapter Four will present Paul's selection and handling of the source material and his appropriation and goals in retelling the story of Abraham in Galatians 3-4 and Romans. The purpose of the last chapter is to Juxtapose Paul's and Philo's treatment of the Abraham narrative, and to offer some recommendations for further studies.

---

[1] Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews;* Peters & Esposito, *The Children of Abraham*.

[2] For example: Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 15–27; Oegema, "Biblical Interpretation in the Letters of Paul," 266–8; Kamudzandu, *Abraham as a Spiritual Ancestor*, 98–102.

[3] "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact," 81–100. I will also utilize some of his other work, including "The Structure of Historical Narrative," 112–25; *Metahistory*.

[4] Niehoff, "Philo's Exposition in a Roman Context," 1–21.

[5] Kamudzandu, *Abraham as a Spiritual Ancestor*, 98. Jews claimed Abraham to be their father (John 8:39). The event recorded in John 8 occurred in Jerusalem and certainly not in Rome, and it was recorded, approximately, between AD 27 and AD 33, which means it preceded Philo's visit to Rome. The Johannine account of the event was probably written between AD 90 and AD 95, which means over four decades after Philo's arrival to Rome, while Josephus wrote his Abraham account in *The Antiquities of the Jews* during Emperor Flavius Domitian's rule *c.* AD 93/94. Therefore they are a late account of the patriarch.

[6] "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His *De Vita Mosis*," 124; *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 40, 45ff; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (*175 B.C.– A.D. 135*), 3.840–1. Rogers recently supported this view in "Philo's Universalization of the Sinai in *De Decalogo* 32–49," 85–105. However, Bloch observed in "Alexandria in Pharaonic Egypt: Projections in *De Vita Mosis*," 75 that recent scholarship has argued against the above view, see Royse, "The Works of Philo."

[7] "The Religion of the Patriarchs," 161; Williamson, "Abraham," 12–3.

[8] *The Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament*, 86–9.

[9] *Hebrew Origins*, 85–90. Meek argues that the early evolution of the Israel's' religion started because a "family revered its ancestors, thus the clan came to revere its ancestral heroes. These were first exalted and then deified as the tutelage gods of the clan. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob became heroes to the Hebrews" (ibid., 90).

[10] Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 24–6.

[11] Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 4–66.

[12] For an evaluation of Alt's thesis, see Wenham, p. 166–7.

[13] Ibid., 184.

[14] "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," 232–59. For a critique of Cross' thesis, see Wenham, 170–2.

[15] "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," 256–7.

[16] Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 6. Smith intends that this work serves as a continuous of an earlier work that first appeared in 1990 titled *The Early History of God* where he also argued that Israel's monotheism breaks from its polytheistic heritage. For a critique of both Smith's first and second editions, see Parker's review in *Hebrew Studies* 33 (1992), 158–62 and *Review of Biblical Literature* 2 (2004).

[17] Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 27–80.

[18] Ibid., 135–66.

[19] For example, see Cross, 233–4, 250–9.

[20] "The Religion of the Patriarchs" in Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 177.

[21] Ibid., 180–1.

[22] Ibid., 184. William F. Albright had already argued that monotheism was a second millennium BC Mosaic invention (*c*. 1350 to 1250 BC), see *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 12, 200–72.

[23] "Abraham, Akhenaten, Moses and Monotheism."

[24] See "Methods of Studying the Patriarchal Narratives as Ancient Text," 43–58.

[25] "Abraham, Akhenaten, Moses and Monotheism," 122.

[26] Ibid., 123.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid., 124.

[29] Ibid., 123–5.

[30] Ibid., 126.

[31] Ibid., 129.

[32] Van Seters. *Studies in the History, Literature, and Religion of Biblical Israel*, 323–33. He earlier published a work that argue for such view; see *Prologue to History*. Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis*.

[33] Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives*, 315–6.

[34] Ibid., 326.

[35] Thompson, *Biblical Narrative and Palestine's History*.

[36] Baruch Spinoza (1634–1677) and Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) are two examples of those influenced by the historical critical method (Frei. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 42–85.

[37] Ibid., 267.

[38] *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives*, 1–9.

[39] Ibid., 1–2.

[40] One of the areas in which Thompson disagreed with A. Alt is when he wrote: "It is illegitimate … to jump to the conclusion that the patriarchs are representatives of clans, and then to see their movements and actions as nothing more than tribal movements" (ibid., 50–1; Alt's, 4–66, 166–7). I must observe here that Alt considered no blood relation between Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (ibid., 3–8).

[41] Ibid., 3.

[42] Ibid., 17–66, 187–95, 298–325. See also Alt, 5f.

[43] Ibid., 314; Davies "'Ancient Israel' and History: A Response to Norman Whybray," 188–91. Thompson expresses the same view in his *The Bible in History: How Writers Create a Past*; *The Messiah Myth*, (in which he argued that the original audiences for whom the Jesus and Davidic stories were written interpreted and understood David and Jesus not as historic figures but metaphors to fit an already known messianic tradition).

[44] *Abraham in History and Tradition*, 125–53.

[45] Ibid., 7–122. Thompson is also against the view of placing the background of the patriarchal narrative in the second millennium BC (1974: 4).

[46] Ibid., 121.

[47] Ibid., 309.

[48] Ibid., 125–66.

[49] Ibid., 125–31.

[50] Ibid., 125–66, 309–13.

[51] *Studies in the History, Literature, and Religion of Biblical Israel*, 382–3

[52] Ibid., 396–7.

[53] "Is It Still Possible to Write a History of Ancient Israel?" 414.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid., 415–26.

[56] Ibid., 426.

[57] See "Methods of Studying the Patriarchal Narratives as Ancient Text," 56.

[58] *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*, 5, 7.

[59] *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 72–81. It seems reasonable for me to say Alt's view shows that the Fathers of Israel– Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not legendary figures; but actual people (*Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 20–1, 27, 30, 45–66, esp. 46–7).

[60] "The Hebrew Patriarchs and History," 470–9.

[61] Ibid., 479. Sarna also shares the view of the historicity of the patriarchal narrative, see xiii–xvi, 84–8.

[62] "The 'Historical Character' of the Old Testament," 152–4.

[63] "Historical and Christian Faith," ibid., 480.

[64] Ibid., 485–91. This essay was formerly published under the same topic in *Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives*, 1980, 11–42.

[65] "The Patriarchs in Scripture and History," 485.

[66] Ibid., 491.

[67] Long, "What is History," 2.

[68] *Israelite Religion*, 17.

[69] Ibid., 17–9, 25–7.

[70] *Hebrew Origins*, 1–2.

[71] Ibid., 83.

[72] However, whether consciously or unconsciously, Meek shows that it could also be done by starting to unravel the cords that bind from the "A" to "B" (ibid., 83–118).

[73] Ibid. Long opined that the context plays an important role in identifying the different between historical and fictional literature ("History and Fiction: What is History?," 239).

[74] Klingbeil, "Historical Criticism," 404.

[75] "History and Fiction: What is History?", 232–54.

[76] Ibid., 232.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid., 233.

[79] Hence it suggests that "whatever bits of factual information may be included, the story itself is nonfactual" (ibid., 235).

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid., 238–9.

[82] Ibid., 238.

[83] Ibid., 237–40, 243.

[84] Ibid., 245–6.

[85] Ibid., 238–9.

[86] "Contingency, Continuity and Integrity in Historical Understanding," 380–7.

[87] Ibid., 380–3.

[88] Ibid., 385–7

[89] "History as Confession of Faith–History as Object of Scholarly Research," 218.

Chapter 1:

Some Early Depictions of Abraham in Jewish and Non-Jewish Literature

The variety of portraits of Abraham provided by both Jewish and non-Jewish writers generally presented him as a patriarch who had rejected idolatry, the ways of the Gentiles, and astrology, and entered an eternal covenant with God and obeyed Him, following the law and the purity code. As a consequence, Abraham merited righteousness, which gave all his covenantal children a privileged status. Abraham was also portrayed as a great sage who received wisdom and supernatural revelations. His fame was such that other peoples claimed him as well – including the Spartans – and his sons became the first kings of Arabia.

This section will present two portraits of Abraham, one as the father of the Jews, and the other as the father of many, in order to show that the "national" and "universal" depictions of Abraham had their start several centuries before Philo and Paul wrote.[1] I will only concentrate on literature that highlights the "worthy" descendants of Abraham. Given the focus of this thesis on Philo's and Paul's portrayals of Abraham, those portraits that predate them and their contemporaries will be considered as early depictions of Abraham, and I will not include materials written after AD 100. After considering the depictions of Abraham in select Jewish literature of the early Judaism period, I will move on to the works of Jewish writers in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek during the Second Temple period, and of non-Jewish writers who wrote in Greek during the same period. This will allow us to see portraits of Abraham during the period of early Judaism, and to distinguish between Jewish and non-Jewish perceptions of the patriarch. In a recent work, Gerbern Oegema observes that it is a misnomer to differentiate between "traditional" Judaisms and "Hellenistic Judaism." Echoing Martin Hengel, he suggests that "traditional Judaisms … are all, in reality, 'Hellenistic' in one way or another."[2] My brief survey of literature will begin with Genesis, and move into the Second Temple Judaism period, from which I will include such works as 2 Chronicles 20:7, the sections about Abraham in the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, Greek works by Jewish writers including 1 Maccabees 12, and texts by Demetrius the Chronographer, Cleodemus Malchus, Ps.-Eupolemus, and Josephus. Among the works of non-Jewish writers, I will focus on Apollonius Molon, Pompeius Trogus, and

Nicolaus of Damascus.

1.1: Portrait of Abraham in Genesis 11:26–25:10:

The Pentateuch narrative about Abraham in Genesis 11:26 to 25:10 is the oldest primary source we have about his life. Shortly after the events concerning the Tower of Babel in Genesis 11:1–9, the narrator traces the lineage of Abraham from Shem, who was one of the three sons of Noah (Gen 11:10–25). In verses 27 to 32, the narrator turns his attention to the family of Abram, whose name was later changed to Abraham. His was the tenth generation after Noah. Beyond telling us about Abraham's land of origin, the narrator provides details about his family, including his father, his brothers, his childless wife Sarai–whose name was later changed to Sarah–his nephew Lot, and his sister-in-law. We are told that the idea to relocate the whole family from Ur of the Chaldeans to the land of Canaan came from Abraham's father, Terah, even before Abraham encountered YHWH in Genesis 12. This raises questions about the reasons for the migration.[3] Considering the substantial information provided about Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 13:10–13; 18:16–21), we are given surprisingly little about Abraham's environment and his religious life, either prior to his encounter with YHWH or at the end of the narrative.

While still only in partial manner, Joshua's farewell address does provide us with some details about Abraham's environment and religious life prior to his encounter with YHWH. As Joshua said:

> This is what the LORD, the God of Israel, says: Long ago your ancestors, including Terah the father of Abraham and Nahor, lived beyond the Euphrates River and worshiped other gods. But I took your father Abraham from the land beyond the Euphrates and led him throughout Canaan and gave him many descendants. I gave him Isaac, and to Isaac I gave Jacob and Esau. I assigned the hill country of Seir to Esau, but Jacob and his family went down to Egypt.[4]

Joshua's historical summary fills in details on what Terah and his household worshiped prior to the significant moment in Genesis 12:1–6 when YHWH called Abraham to pledge his allegiance to Him. The narrator has introduced his readers to a different portrait of Abraham as an idolater, who migrated with his father's household with the intention of reaching Canaan but settled in Haran (11:26–32), and then responded to YHWH's call to continue towards Canaan

(12:1–6). There is a post-exilic account that also supports the tradition that it was YHWH who called Abraham from Ur to Canaan and not Terah (Neh. 9:7).

YHWH made a covenant with Abraham according to Genesis 15, promising him an heir. The covenant was restated in Genesis 17 with the sign of circumcision. Abraham became the father of Ishmael by Hagar, and then of Isaac by Sarah (Gen 16:15–16; 21:1–7). After the death of Sarah, Abraham married Keturah, with whom he had six additional sons (Gen 25:1–6). God's relationship with Abraham, one of friendship,[5] later became a model for the Israelites, Abraham's descendants.[6] According to the DH, the covenantal relationship between God and Abraham continued through his descendants (Exodus 3:6, 13–15; 6:8). Our investigation of the primary source shows that Abraham fathered Ishmael with Hagar, Isaac with Sarah, and Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak and Shuah with Keturah. Though the Genesis account shows God choosing to work with and through the Israelites who are the descendants of Abraham by Isaac and Jacob, Abraham is also said to have fathered two other nomadic tribes through Ishmael, and the six sons of Keturah.[7]

1.2: Portraits of Abraham by Jewish Writers in the Second Temple Judaism Period:

Having considered the Genesis portrait of Abraham as the ancestor of both the Jews and Arabs, we now briefly turn our attention to Israelite literature from the Second Temple Judaism period to investigate the way Abraham was portrayed in that time. I will begin with 2 Chronicles 20:7, consider the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, and finally some Greek works produced by Jewish writers. The Second Temple Judaism period stretched from *c.* 515 BC to AD 70, during the period after the exile of Judah under Babylonian and Persian rule (*c.* 586 BC to 538 BC).

The Chr. narrated a pre-exilic account about the Moabites, Ammonites, and Arameans coming to battle against Judah, and that King Jehoshaphat sought for help from God. He prayed, "Our God, did you not drive out the inhabitants of this land before your people Israel and give it forever to the descendants of Abraham your friend?"[8] King Jehoshaphat saw the land as God's permanent gift to Israel through Abraham. The fact that the pre-exilic event was described by the Chr. during the post-exilic period confirms awareness of his people's tradition and their

Abrahamic lineage. Though the opposition King Jehoshaphat had faced differed from the one the Chr. and his audience faced, both felt a threat to the descendants of Abraham and to the land they possessed. Although Jehoshaphat and the Chr. were more than 300 years apart chronologically, they nevertheless agreed on the land being a permanent gift from God to His people. While neither specified whether they understood the Arabs to be included in the land covenant, it is unlikely that they did, since their Jewish identity was at stake along with the land. In response to the threat to both their land and their identity, the Chr. and his audience felt the same need to remind YHWH that they stood under his benefaction through their association with Abraham, just as King Jehoshaphat and his people did in the pre-exilic period.

We now turn our attention to the portrait of Abraham in the second century BC *Book* of *Jubilees*. In 50 chapters reminiscent of the book of Genesis, this "rewritten Bible" based on Genesis-Exodus,[9] which the author presents as a revelation from God through Moses, contains instructions about both past and future history. The book describes angels and demons as playing significant roles in the affairs of humans. The Abraham account is apparently of great significance to the past and future, because the author dedicates twelve chapters (*Jubilees* 11–23), almost one-fourth of the material, to him. *Jubilees* portrays Abraham as choosing God over the Chaldean's idolatry in which his father, Terah, had participated.[10] After burning down all the idols in the household, Abraham receives the power of speaking Hebrew and flees to Canaan.[11] God promised Abraham a son, through whom innumerable descendants would come, and ratifies a covenant with him.[12] After Isaac was born and circumcised,[13] the evil prince *Mastêmâ* suggested that God should ask Abraham to sacrifice Isaac, his only son, in order to test Abraham's devotion to God, but *Mastêmâ* was instead put to shame.[14] In a twist in the story, the narrator says that Abraham invited his eight sons (one each from Hagar and Sarah, and six from Keturah) and his grandsons to a farewell speech whereupon he admonished them to pursue righteousness, to continue the practice of circumcision, and to abstain from impurity and idolatry. He concludes by blessing them.[15] Before his death, Abraham met with Isaac, Ishmael, and Jacob, the last of whom he blessed.[16]

The *Book of Jubilees* begins by restricting Abrahamic descent as primarily through

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to whom the author referred as the ancestors of the children of Israel.[17] It seems plausible to think that since Abraham received the ability to speak the Hebrew language, which had been eradicated shortly after the confusion at Babel,[18] those who speak it are his true descendants. The book also portrays God's promised son as Isaac and not Ishmael, even though the latter was born first.[19] The author also notes that while angels take care of the other nations, God Himself takes care of Israel, because of the lineage which started with Abraham[20] that highlights Israel's unique position under God's benefaction. We read that the seed of Abraham through Isaac is to be God's special possession, different from the Gentiles.[21]

Since the author of *Jubilees* tells that Abraham, shortly before his death, met with all his eight sons and their children to admonish them to be righteous, to observe circumcision, and to desist from impurity and idolatry, and even gave them gifts, it would be tempting to conclude from this, that he is affirming them all as privileged descendants. However, shortly after this meeting, Abraham sent away the other seven sons along with their own children from Isaac and his family, and Abraham gave Isaac everything that remained. Importantly, the author shows that the seven children and their families are the Arabs, not the Jews.[22] Moreover, the writer speaks of yet one more meeting where Abraham admonished Isaac against idolatry, the eating of blood, the words of sacrifice and the requirement of washing before sacrifice.[23] In closing, Abraham re-pronounced some of the blessings of Genesis 12:1–4 on Isaac alone.[24]

Again, even though Ishmael celebrated the feast of the first fruits with Abraham along with Isaac and Jacob, it was Jacob who received Abraham's last words and blessings.[25] The writer made it clear that the focus of the patriarchal narrative continued from Abraham to Isaac, and finally to Jacob. Therefore, though the *Jubilees*' portrait of Abraham includes eight sons, only his descendants through Isaac (with Sarah) and Jacob are to be considered "genuine" progenies, whom even chief *Mastêmâ* will not rule.[26]

We now turn our attention to the *Aramaic Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen), discovered in 1947 among the seven scrolls located in cave 1 in the Dead Sea. It is also classified as a "rewritten Bible" among the Qumran Scrolls, and is contemporary with and similar in style to the book of *Jubilees*.[27] It centers largely on the book of Genesis.[28] Since it was found in a tattered

and brittle condition,[29] we have only a partial document and the section about Abraham (cols 20-23)[30] corresponds only to Genesis 12-15, confirming only that Abraham received divine promises and blessings. Studying both 1QapGen and *Jubilees* in parallel,[31] we can reasonably assume that both portraits of Abraham are similar. For example, both exonerated Abraham of wrongdoing in the events leading to Pharaoh's taking Sarah as his wife, and both concurred that Sarah was not defiled by Pharaoh. Another "rewritten Bible" found in the Dead Sea Scrolls is 4Q225, which retells selected portions of Genesis and Exodus. For our present study, the key element in 4Q225 is prince *Mastêmâ's* conspiring against both Abraham and Isaac,[32] reminiscent of the *Mastêmâ* found in Jubilees. This may point to the influence of Jubilees on the producers of the Scrolls at Qumran.

Finally, we turn to the portrait of Abraham contained in Jewish writings produced in the Greek language during the Second Temple Judaism period. We shall first consider 1 Maccabees, an apocryphal work probably written late in the second century BC, although some scholars attributed chapters 14–16 to a post AD 70 date.[33] Our section of interest says:

> From Arius, King of Sparta, to Onias the High Priest. Greeting. A document has come to light which shows that Spartans and the Jews are kinsmen, both being descended from Abraham. Now that we have learnt of this, we beg you to write and tell us how your affairs prosper. Our own response is this: "What is yours, your livestock and every kind of property, is ours, and what is ours is yours." We are instructing our envoys, therefore, to report to you in these terms.[34]

The letter from the Spartan king to Onias revealed that both the Jews and the Spartans are descendants of Abraham. King Arius' claim may appear implausible at face value, but James E. Bowley offered several reasons to appreciate this claim when he stated that it "is by no mean far-fetched in the context of Hellenistic historiography and ethnography [since t]hese draw upon foreign traditions to enlighten native history, and posit genealogical relationships among diverse peoples."[35] Hecataeus of Abdera (late fourth century BC), for example, claimed that Belus who founded Babylon, Danaus, and Cadmus, who were all considered to be important people in Greek antiquity, were Egyptian colonists, and that Heracles (Hercules) was an Egyptian general.[36] For Bowley, if Greeks could share Heracles, their pride, with non-Greeks, then the Greeks could also share the pride of the non-Greeks, for example, Abraham of the Jews.[37]

Moreover since it was discovered in a "written document," Bowley speculates that the meaning of "written document" could be a "generic term … [that] could refer to the work of an ethnographer or to an archived document which had been interpreted to refer to Abraham."[38] Hecataeus could be that very ethnographer since he had accorded divine origin to both the Jewish and the Spartan law codes he wrote about; he had visited Sparta during Arius' reign; and he had mentioned that Moses (founder of Jerusalem), Danaus (founder of Dorian Sparta), and Cadmus (founder of Thebes) were all expelled from Egypt.[39] This connection becomes even more appealing if we speculate further that Hecataeus was aware of Abraham's migration to Egypt.[40] The point here is that sometime in the second century BC, a Jew, writing in Greek, claimed that king Arius of Sparta discovered that the Spartans and the Jews were both descendants of Abraham. The narrator reported on a letter sent by Jonathan, a Judean leader of the Hasmonean period, in reply to King Arius in which he referred to the Spartans as brethren,[41] thereby agreeing with Arius' discovery.

Scholars believe that Demetrius the Chronographer wrote in Greek during the third century BC and used the LXX.[42] Six fragments that are attributed to him have survived in the work of Eusebius of Caesarea.[43] In his apologetic work, *Preparation for the Gospel*, Eusebius utilised the work of Demetrius to portray Abraham as the father of Isaac and his descendants,[44] as well as Keturah's six sons, but he never mentioned Hagar's Ishmael, Abraham's first child.[45] The complete absence of Ishmael from Demetrius' work might be due to the fact that we only have a partial document. However, based on the fragments of the work of Demetrius that do appear in Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel*, the above portrait of Abraham is accurate. The absence of both Hagar and Ishmael from fragment 3 may also indicate that Demetrius only wanted to establish the lineage of Moses' wife Zipporah whom he called "the Ethiopian," and a descendant of Abraham through Keturah.[46] So Demetrius associated Ethiopia with Abraham.

Pseudo-Eupolemus depicts Abraham as being from the lineage of the giants[47] and an expert in astrology who later taught the art to the Phoenicians.[48] However, the claim of Abraham's descent from the giants clashes with the intent of the writer of 1QapGen whose main concern appears to me to be that of protecting the purity of the lineage from Noah to Abram in

order to portray an "extraordinary" Abram.[49] 1QapGen opens with the story of Lamech, Noah's father, who suspects that his wife, Bitenosh, has conceived from an unlawful intimacy with the giants, the Nephilim. Lamech went to his father, Methuselah, in search for wisdom, who in turn went to his own father, Enoch, for answers.[50] Enoch replied that Lamech was the father of Bitenosh's child[51] who was later named Noah. Therefore, Abraham could not have descended from the Nephilim, since Noah his ancestor had not either. Moreover, the writer added another significant detail: Shem, Noah's eldest son, had five sons and five daughters, while he assigns four sons and seven daughters to Ham, and seven sons and four daughters to Japheth. Wise asserts that this detail may seem insignificant, but in reality it is significant:

> For the chosen lineage of Shem, intermarriage with the lines of his brothers might introduce corruption; thus, his sons married his daughters. For the other two sons, intermarriage of their lines was not dangerous, so they had congruent numbers of sons and daughters who could then marry their cousins.[52]

This creates a clash of interest in the portraits of Abraham found in 1QapGen and Ps.-Eupolemus. This may be explained as a case of two different Jews each writing to different audiences at different times. Moreover, the writer of Pseudo-Eupolemus was strongly influenced by his Hellenistic environment, perhaps explaining why it was more prestigious to portray Abraham's lineage with the giants just as the Greeks' Heracles (Hercules) is said to have descended from Zeus. By contrast, however the author of 1QapGen was influenced by a form of Judaism that was more concerned with providing a spotless Jewish identity and origin, which required the creation of a pure Jewish lineage. Finally, the author of Pseudo-Eupolemus could have written to a Greco-Roman audience, while the 1QapGen author most probably wrote to select Jewish religious communities in Palestine.

Let us now consider the portrait of Abraham by Cleodemus Malchus, a Jewish author from the second century BC. We only have one fragment of his work(s) that survived through Alexander Polyhistor, Josephus, and Eusebius. Josephus notes that Keturah bore Abraham six sons who were courageous and wise men. This he cites from Alexander Polyhistor's quote of Cleodemus Malchus: Keturah bore many sons to Abraham, among whom were Surim, from whom the land of Assyria was named; Aphera (Afera), and Japhran (Iafra) from whom Africa

was named. He further informed that those courageous and wise sons of Abraham fought with Heracles against Libya and Antaeus, and that Heracles married Aphera's daughter.[53] But the Genesis 25 account disagrees with the above claim of Cleodemus Malchus. This is another case of a Jew who was influenced by the Hellenistic worldview. Because of it, the author blended both Jewish traditions and Hellenistic mythology to portray an Abraham whose offspring extended beyond the east, into Africa.[54] African matter seems to be the main interest of Cleodemus. This no doubt would have appealed to his Hellenistic audience, but even more significantly, we see yet one more writer who related Abraham's descendants to Heracles.

In contrast to the fragmentary nature of the sources considered above, Josephus offers enough materials to draw a complete portrait of Abraham. Admittedly, Josephus' handling of his sources shows in the details of the story, which share many parallels with other Greek works. Some of his information about Abraham we already have, thanks to his use of Molon, Nicolaus, Malchus and others. Josephus' style of retelling the story shows the following attributes: "He] stress[es] the aggrandizement of Abraham, but he achieves a similar end by diminishing the role of God in the narrative … [*i.e.*] the miracles of Scripture are often toned down." Genesis 18:10 is a good example.[55] Even though Josephus' portrait of Abraham is not particularly important at this stage of the investigation, I will nevertheless mention some of the high points.

Louis Feldman observes that Josephus eulogizes Abraham, portraying him as a national hero, the "ideal statesman" on par with Thucydides' Pericles, one of the most prominent and influential Greek statesmen.[56] Abraham is shown as "the Platonic philosopher-king and the Stoic sage"[57] who was renowned for his rhetoric, logic, philosophy, science and astrology, all of which he taught to the Egyptians.[58] Moreover, as the founder of a nation, he was a general who engaged in military campaigns, as were his sons through Keturah who, Josephus said, engaged in military campaigns in Africa. Their alliance with Heracles, who married from that family descent, showed the relationship between Greeks and Abraham's descendants.[59] Josephus' portrait of Abraham includes his sons through Keturah, making him a "universal Abraham."

Because the Chr. and his Jewish contemporaries felt that their land and identity were at risk, he used the pre-exilic event of King Jehoshaphat to lay claim to Abraham. We may postulate

that this is reasonable since there are others who might claim descent from Abraham and might contend with post-exilic Jews for the land. The *Book of Jubilees* listed Abraham's eight sons from three women; but stated that it is through his son Isaac by Sarah and his grandson by Rebekah, Jacob, that his "true" descendants would emerge. 1QapGen showed Abraham in a similar manner as *Jubilees*, except that it emphasises the need for purity from the line of Noah to Abraham, and by implication, on to Abraham's descendants. Another portrait appeared in 1 Maccabees 12 that claimed that the Spartans and the Jews are both Abraham's descendants. We surveyed the following fragments from Demetrius the Chronographer, Pseudo-Eupolemus, and Cleodemus Malchus. While these writers were Jewish, they were so immersed in the Hellenistic worldview that their portraits of Abraham blended Jewish traditions and Hellenistic mythology. A good case in point might be Abraham's descent from the Nephilim according to Pseudo-Eupolemus and the scattering of his descendants in Syria and Africa. Given the many portraits of Abraham from the above compositions, this survey concurs with Philo the epic Poet about Abraham's renown.[60]

1.3: The Portrait of Abraham by Non-Jewish Writers in the Second Temple Judaism Period:

We shall consider the portrait of Abraham in some non-Jewish works from the Second Temple period. Our point of departure is Nicolaus of Damascus who associated Abraham with the Syrians as the king of Damascus.[61]

Apollonius Molon of Rhodes was a Greek rhetorician born presumably in the first century BC. Eusebius cited from Molon's work titled *Against the Jews*, the claim that there were only three generations between Noah and Abraham. He further claims that Abraham had two wives, one from his own kin and the other an Egyptian. This description left out Keturah, but refers to Sarah and Hagar, who doubled also as Abraham's handmaid and bore him twelve sons whose names he did not provide, but for whom he said that they all went to Arabia and ruled as kings.[62] Interestingly, he said nothing of note about Abraham's son through Sarah; he, however, wrote positively of Ishmael.[63] Therefore, while Molon was "respectful of Abraham, [he] saw the decline of Jewish civilization to have come with Moses."[64] Josephus' *Against Apion* was a polemical work intended as a response to the anti-Jewish activities of his day, seeking to defend

Judaism and Jewish identity. Molon was one of the anti-Semites who Josephus addressed. Josephus' most severe criticism in *Against Apion* was reserved for Molon and Posidonius, who provided material for *Apion*.[65] In the treatise, Josephus notes that there are claims that the Jews were descendants of the Egyptians, but were expelled because they were leprous.[66]

Pompeius Trogus, a first century BC Roman historian and an anti-Semite who was at the receiving end of Josephus' polemic, also held the view that the Jewish ancestors were lepers.[67] Hecataeus of Abdera, a Greek historian in the third century BC, stated that the Jews were aliens in Egypt,[68] which conflicts with the preceding view. Molon could have shared this view as well since he was among those who furnished *Apion* with information.[69]

Our survey from the above authors has shown that the Jews were both descendants of Abraham and the Egyptians, who expelled them from Egypt due to leprosy. The fact that it was believed that Abraham and his Egyptian wife fathered twelve sons who ruled Arabia also made him the father of some non-Jews. Furthermore, Abraham was associated with the Syrians. If the Egyptians were said to be ancestors of the Jews, then where does that leave Abraham? Plausibly, they might argue that he was also Egyptian, especially since he visited in Egypt in his lifetime. It is striking to see how the character of Abraham can be twisted around for different purposes.

<div align="center">

1.4: Summary of the above Portraits:

</div>

On the one hand, our investigation shows that the literature of the Second Temple Judaism period and especially Greek literature written by authors of Jewish and Greek origin more frequently portrayed Abraham as an universal hero, while literature prior to that time that was written in either Hebrew or Aramaic more frequently portrayed Abraham as a national hero. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that, based on the above evidence, the descendants of Abraham extend beyond the Israelites, for he is also the father of Hagar's son, Ishmael (Molon reported that she had twelve sons), and of the six sons of Keturah along with their descendants. Moreover, the evidence seems to show that whenever certain themes such as, God, religion,

identity, and land are introduced, there is a clear distinction between Abraham's descendants through Sarah (Isaac and Jacob) and those through Hagar and Keturah.

Concerning this, the DH recognizes the Abrahamic descendants through Hagar and Keturah, but gives the most prominent place to Abraham's descendants through Sarah. Evidently, the DH was not interested in the descendants of Abraham through Hagar and Keturah, since he neither informed his audience about their world and religion, nor their progress and contributions to the world and humanity, as he did about the Israelites. Moreover, he tells us that God promised a land to Abraham and his descendants, and also later specified that the promise was focused on Abraham's lineage through Isaac and Jacob. By becoming the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, He excluded Ishmael and the others, who gradually fall under the "Gentile" category. This characterization of God subsequently added to the already divided world between the Israelites and the Gentiles (or "the nations"), but also recognizes the *gerim*. Therefore, the Israelites who are descendants of Abraham, who originally came from the idolatrous Ur of the Chaldeans, now have a God, a land, a religion, and an identity. DH operated during pre-exilic times while the Chr. operated during post-exilic times, a more tumultuous period for the Israelites. They now have to return to their God, become more religious even without a Temple, address the issue of their Jewish identity, and protect their land, which was now under the control of the Persians and, significantly, partially occupied by non-Jews. The Chr. had to address their lineage, which goes back to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, even without the mention of Abraham's other children whom the DH had already recognized. Both the DH and Chr. wanted Israel to be different from all the other nations (Gentiles) who were idolatrous.

During the Second Temple period from 515 BC to AD 70, we surveyed both Jewish and non-Jewish writers who wrote in both Hebrew and Greek. We noted that Hellenism had a major influence in that period, making the blending of Jewish traditions and Hellenistic mythology commonplace. Even though some of these writers associated Abraham with the Jews, they also recognized that Abraham had other children, and some actually linked him to other people and nations.

We could speculate that those who laid claim to a "national" Abraham as the father of the Jews may be arguing that Israel forms Abraham's "true" descendants. This preferential designation would be necessary, since they were unlikely to argue that they were unaware that Abraham fathered other children with Hagar and Keturah, and that there was no record of ethnic cleansing or a disaster that had wiped them and their descendants out. So why disenfranchise them from the Abrahamic commonwealth?[70] They become excluded from the commonwealth of Abraham's descendants because they lived as Gentiles and not as Abraham did: this means that they were not all *true* descendants of Abraham. E. R. Goodenough observed that the sections on "repentance" and "nobility" in one of Philo's expositions, *On Virtues*, impressed that true repentance is to conduct one's

> life according to the best virtues [while] true nobility is not a matter of Jewish birth as Cain, Ham, Adam, Esau, and the sons of Abraham other than Isaac shows, but is of the heart, as appeared in the case of Abraham, Thamar, and others. For, by the Law, every man is judged not on the merits of his fathers, but on his own.[71]

Moreover, we will recall that the *Book of Jubilees* had reported that Abraham's farewell had included instructions to all his children and descendants to remain true and faithful to God. Since they went against their patriarch's last wish, they lost the right of being Abraham's descendants.

---

[1] By a "national" portrait of Abraham I mean the view that considers Abraham as the ancestor of only the Israelites, while by "universal" portrait of Abraham, I refer to the view that claims Abraham as the ancestor of both Israel and one or more groups of people.

[2] Oegema, *Early Judaism and Modern Culture*, 2 n. 4. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 104.

[3] Nahum M. Sarna suggests some possibilities (*Genesis*, 87–8).

[4] Josh 24:2–4. The New Revised Standard Version says "… Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel: Long ago your ancestors – Terah and his sons Abraham and Nahor – lived beyond the Euphrates and served other gods" (Josh 24:2).

[5] 2 Chr. 20:7; Isa 41:8 cf. Gen 18:1–8.

[6] Gen 24:12; 26:24; 28:13; Ex 3:6, 15–16; 4:5; 15:2; 1Kgs 18:36; Isa 29:22; Jer. 33:26; Mic: 7.20.

[7] Sarna, *Genesis*, 170–9.

[8] 2 Chr. 20:7; Deut 4:37–39; 7:5; 11:23; Judg. 11:24; Ps 44:3(2).

[9] Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies*, 46.

[10] Jub. XI, 15–24; XII, 1–8.

[11] Jub. XII, 12–4, 25–31; XIII, 1–14.

[12] Jub. XIII.

[13] Jub. XVI, 10–19.

[14] Jub. XVII, 15–18; XVIII, 1–13. *Mastêmâ* appears twice in Hosea 9:7–8, where it is rendered *"hostility."* *Mastêmâ* first appears in *Jubilees* X when God wanted to imprison all the evil spirits who were destroying Noah's

grandchildren. God's action was intended to cut off their negative and destructive influence upon all humans. But *Mastêmâ* asked God to allow take some evil spirits in order to be more effective in leading humans astray. Hence, God ordered one-tenth of the evil spirits to remain with *Mastêmâ* while nine-tenth of them "*descend into the place of condemnation*" (7–11). The role of *Mastêmâ* in the testing of Abraham easily parallels the role of Satan in the temptation of Job and how he was disappointed and ashamed at the same time (Job 1–2). Moreover, another very close similarity between Job and Abraham may be seen in *Jubilees* XVII, 17–18, italics mine).

[15] Jub. XX. *But he still met with Isaac separately to remind him of the decrees regarding idolatry, eating of blood, sacrifices, and the woods to be used and regulations to be observed (Jub.* XXI*).*

[16] Jub. XXII.

[17] Jub. I, 7.

[18] Jub. XII, 25–7.

[19] Jub. XIV.

[20] Jub. XV, 27–9.

[21] Jub. XVI, 16–8.

[22] Jub. XX, 11–3.

[23] Jub. XXI.

[24] Jub. XXI.

[25] Jub. XXII–XXIII,

[26] Jub. XIX, 26-31.

[27] Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies*, 91. Machiela, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 19–20, 32–41.

[28] Machiela said it centers mostly on Genesis 6-15 (ibid., 2, 12–3).

[29] Ibid., 1.

[30] Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 78–84.

[31] Machiela suggests that we keep an open mind on the texts, 41.

[32] Wise et al., 261–3.

[33] Evans, 20.

[34] 1 Maccabees 12:20-23, 1224.

[35] "Compositions of Abraham," 223.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid., 224.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid., 224–5.

[40] Ibid., 225.

[41] 1 Macc. 12:5–18.

[42] Bowley, *Traditions of Abraham in Greek Historical Writings*, 25.

[43] Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies*, 63. There were about five centuries, or more, between Demetrius the Chronographer and Eusebius, the Bishop of Caesarea. It is worth noting that the bridge between Demetrius and Eusebius is Lucius Cornelius Alexander, also known as Polyhistor, who used Demetrius' work from which Eusebius also borrowed. The fragments deal with various periods of Israel's history (ibid., 63).

[44] This is fragment 2 from Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel*, IX. 21. 1–19.

[45] Fragment 3, Eus. *Prep.* IX. 29.1–3.

[46] Bowley discusses and critiques Demetrius' view of Zipporah's descent of Abraham (*Traditions*, 40–7).

[47] Ps.-Eupolemus, frag. 2, Eus. *Prep.* IX. 18.2. This fragment is said to be from an anonymous source.

[48] Ibid., frag. 1, Eus. *Prep.* IX. 17.2–9. This fragment is said to be from Eupolemus in Alexander Polyhistor. Evans dated the quotations in both fragments 1 and 2 in the first century BC (ibid., 64). For an extensive treatment Ps-Eupolemus, see Bowley (*Traditions*, 51–111.

[49] Wise, Abegg, Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 75.

[50] Ibid., (col. 3), 76–7.

[51] Ibid., (col. 4), 77.

[52] Ibid., 75.

[53] *Jewish Antiquities*, I. 15; Eus. *Prep*. IX. 20. This report contradicts that of Plutarch (Bowley, *Traditions*, 187). Bowley thought Cleodemus was out to recreate the Heraclean myth in a Jewish context. For an extensive handling of Cleodemus' portrait of Abraham see Bowley (ibid., 123–92). Feldman suggested that Josephus' reference that Abraham's descendants by Keturah expanded in Africa and Syria points that they were strong and that they impacted world affairs ("Hellenizations in Josephus' Jewish Antiquities"), 148. This is contrary to the claim that the Jews "are the weakest of all the barbarians, and that this is the reason why [they] … are the only people who have made no improvements in human life" (*Against Apion* II. 135–136, 148).

[54] Bowley notes that Cleodemus was less interested in Abraham's other children because African matters seem to be his main interest. Therefore Keturah was quite prominent in the fragments we have (ibid., 189–90).

[55] Feldman, "Hellenizations in Josephus' Jewish Antiquities: The Portrait of Abraham," 145. For some examples of the aggrandizement and diminishing of the roles of Abraham and God respectively, Feldman further comments: "There is less emphasis placed on God's promise of Palestine to Abraham; and, in fact, this promise is omitted in the passage (A I,157) which parallels Genesis 12:7, as well as in the passage (A I, 170) which parallels Genesis 13:14-17, in that (A I, 184) which parallels Genesis 15:18, and in that (A I, 193) paralleling Genesis 17:19–21. On the other hand, Josephus, seeking to build up a picture of Abraham and of his descendants as fighters rather than as mere heirs, has God add (A I, 185) in his promise to Abraham (Gen. 15:13–16) that his posterity will vanquish the Canaanites in battle and will take possession of their land and cities. Similarly, Josephus' version of God's covenant with Abraham in Genesis 17: Iff. is much briefer, with God hardly being mentioned, and with the additional statement that the Israelites will win possession of Canaan by war (A I, 191). Significantly, the fullest statement (A 1,235–236) of God's promise of the supremacy that Abraham's descendants will exercise is found in God's statement to Abraham before the appearance of the ram at the climax of the Aqedah, when Abraham had shown supreme faith and had proven himself worthy of God's blessings. There, too, we find the statement (A I, 235) that they will subdue Canaan by force of arms and thus be envied by all men. Likewise, in speaking of circumcision (A I, 192), Josephus omits its connection with the covenant between God and Abraham as stated in the Bible (Gen. 17:10–11) and instead gives a purely practical reason for this practice, namely, to prevent assimilation" (ibid., 145).

[56] Ibid., 138.

[57] Ibid., 150.

[58] Ibid., 139.

[59] Ibid., 140, 147.

[60] Eus. *Prep.* IX. 20. The Babylonian Berossus, a priest of Marduk and contemporary of Alexander the Great also wrote about Abraham (Bowley, *Traditions*, 234, n. 23; Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism*, 61).

[61] *Antiquities*, I. 158; Eus. *Prep.* IX. XVI. For an extensive treatment of both Pompeius and Nicolaus, see Bowley, *Traditions*, 193–212.

[62] Eus. *Prep.* IX. 19.

[63] Bowley, *Diss.*, 137.

[64] Ibid., 139.

[65] *Against Apion*. II. 79; Hata, "The Story of Moses Interpreted within the Context of Anti-Semitism,"180–1.

[66] *Against Apion*, I. 223–6; II. 8–10, 30–2, 287–90.

[67] Hata, "The Story of Moses Interpreted within the Context of Anti-Semitism," 196, n. 4.

[68] Ibid. Alexander Polyhistor, quoting from Demetrius also concurred that the ancestors of the Jews came to Egypt from elsewhere (Eus. *Prep.* IX. XXI).

[69] *Against Apion*. II. 79.

[70] There is neither time nor space for this discussion; however, it could be seen as a result of the holy seed motif or closely related to their socio-religious culture. For example, to *Jubilees* might assign a socio-religious orientation, while for 1QapGen one might say it was in order to protect the holy seed. I have attempted to briefly respond to this question from a Philonic perspective according to his surveyed works, also see Chapter Three.

[71] Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 53.

Chapter 2:

Methodology: Hayden White's Form Structure of Historical Narrative

My presentation of White's view of the production of history will be largely based on his works "The Structure of Historical Narrative," *Metahistory*, and "Historical Text as Literary Artifact".[1] White noted that the common element between narrative and history is epistemology, not aesthetic. This suggests that what makes the verbal representation authentic is not the structure, but "the knowledge-ability of the person telling the story". The facts must not be made up.[2] Given that epistemology connects narrative and history, White defined narrative as an "account of something that is known or is knowable, or that was once known and has been forgotten and therefore can be recalled to mind by the appropriate means of discourse. It presupposes a 'knower,' who tells or informs us of what he knows ..."[3] This shows that both the narrator and the historian have some kind of relationship with the facts that they are retelling. White wrote that for any credible historical narrative, a connection must be established between the historian and the historical events the historian wanted to retell.

2.1: White on the Production of History

My investigation of White will proceed as follows: the stages of the structure of comprehension of historical narratives and historical narratives as translations of facts into fiction.

2.1.1: The Stages and Structure of Comprehension of Historical Narratives

White's discussion on the production of history focuses a great deal on the artisans of history. This is evident in his discussion of the stages of the structure and comprehension/interpretation of historical narratives. Historical narratives are schema at three levels: story, argument, and plot. The schema is of great importance for the comprehension of the assembled data. White explained the stages of the comprehension of historical narratives as follows.[4]

The first level, story, selects and orders the chronicle's elements into a rough format because, if they are chronologically arranged, then they are no longer a story but a chronicle.[5] For White, this is where interpretation of chronicle begins. The second level, argument, arranges the documents or events into continuing themes and clusters of motifs whose ultimate goal is

to give the readers new understanding of (or "a new pair of eyes" for) the events in which he or she is interested. At this level, the arranged data do not yet form a (compelling) story.[6] The third level, plot, organizes the themes and motifs as they are related to "either components of an argument or as phases of recognizable, traditional story-models."[7] Therefore, "the different levels of organization give to historical narratives different aspects as an explanation of the events in the chronicle. Motific and Thematic organization gives one kind of explanatory effect; argument another, and [also] plot-structure...[8]

2.1.2: Historical Narratives as Translations of Facts into Fiction

White commented that historical narratives flourish when the historical events are emplotted to give them varying meanings. This separates the expert historian who endows events with different meanings from the philosopher of history, who sees, and insists on, one single meaning to the same events. White agrees with the historian rather than the philosopher of history:

> Our understanding of the past increases precisely in the degree to which we succeed in determining how far that past conforms to the strategies of sense-making that are contained in their purest forms in literary art ... Let us imagine that a problem of the historian is to make sense of a hypothetical *set* of events by arranging them in a *series* that is at once chronologically *and* syntactically structured, in the way that any discourse from a sentence all the way up to a novel is structured."[9]

Key phrases in the above quotation such as "set of events," and "series of chronological and syntactical structures" point to the set of events that are emplotted to offer us different meanings. The meanings themselves are encoded in the forms of symbols, agents, chronology, themes, and modes of emplotment. These means of encoding, are universal in nature and fit into the worldview of the historian's audience who is invited to lend context to the historical narrative.

The historical events may be plot-structured by emphasizing certain elements in the events. For example, White presented set of events in the following encodement:

First: a, b, c, d, e, ..., n

While the above encoded set of events is ordered chronologically, White observed that events may also be characterized as being "emplotted with different meanings without violating the imperatives of the chronological arrangement at all."[10]

Second: A, b, c, d, e, ..., n

        a, B, c, d, e, ..., n

        a, b, C, d, e, ..., n

        a, b, c, D, e, ..., n

        a, b, c, d, E, ..., n

For White, the uppercase letters indicate that certain events in the series are endowed with privileged status. This endowment gives them "explanatory force, either as causes explaining the structure of the whole series or as symbols of the plot structure of the series … [to make] as a story of a specific kind."[11] As we have already observed, the characterization of some events does more than attribute a restricted meaning from *vehicle* to *tenor* since it opens the possibility of various meanings. Therefore, a chronological ordering of the events without characterization such as

        a, b, c, d, e, ..., n

implies that its meaning is based upon the inherent order of the events.[12] But if the historian decides to characterize (emphasize) any originating event, let's say, "a" into "A", it changes the series of events into A, b, c, d, e, ..., n. It offers a "deterministic" meaning by showing that all the subsequent events (b, c, d, e, ..., n) have been structured to agree with that opening event "A." But when the structure shows that the last event "e" has received the explanatory power "E" in the series of events, it is presenting an "eschatological or apocalyptical" history.[13] White remarked that there is need to emplot the uncharacterized middle events symbolized as b, c, d and e into the various modes of producing history in order to create a "conceivable meaning."[14] The plot-structure takes this form: 1) a beginning that is either symbolized by "A" to mean 'deterministic' or a plain beginning with "a"; 2) middle tropes of historical representation and modes of emplotment to mean the way in which the historian intends to reinterpret the historical events for a specific interpretation; and 3), the ending that

is either symbolized by "E" to mean eschatological or apocalyptical design, or an "e" to mean chronological order of sequence.

White observes that figurative language makes it possible to emplot the historical series of events in different ways, but without disturbing their chronological order. Figurative language is the means through which historians relate unfamiliar events and interpret unfamiliar themes in the historical events for their targeted audiences.[15] However, the meanings derived from the historical events depend on "the dominant figurative mode of the language" used by the historian "to *describe* the elements of his account *prior* to his composition of a narrative."[16] He identified four tropes of figurative representation: Metaphor, Metonymy, Synecdoche, and Irony. These are followed by four modes of emplotments: Romance, Comedy, Tragedy, and Satire.[17] Historians utilize these tropes and modes to recreate a historical narrative or story based on the series of encoded historical events.[18] This process both decodes and recodes the series of events because "an original perception is clarified by being cast in a figurative mode different from that of which it has come encoded by convention, authority, or custom."[19] This intimates that some sets of relationship that might seem hard to cultivate, could begin, for instance, between the series of events that were encoded in one way and now recoded into another, and between the tropes and modes. White interestingly observed that the chronicle or account is not necessarily either retold in a story format or in a threefold plot-structure with beginning, middle, and ending. This implies that it is the historian and *not* a plot-program that determines the form of the chronicle. The most important competence for the historian is the knowledge and handling of the historical records for the purpose of organizing and characterizing them in a particular mode.

2.1.3: The Archetype Models of Historical Interpretation

White presents four standard models of historical interpretation: prefiguration or trope, emplotment, argument, and ideological implication. He discussed these four models in *Metahistory*, which he built around the work of four influential historians, namely, Michelet, Tocqueville, Ranke, and Burckhardt, and around four influential philosophers, namely, Nietzsche, Marx, Hegel, and Croce. White believed that a story only becomes a story when it is

retold in a way that conforms to the archetype models.[20] White noted that even though his *Metahistory* centers on the historical imagination of nineteenth-century Europe, "one of my principal aims … has been to establish the uniquely *poetic* elements in historiography and philosophy of history in whatever age they were practiced."[21] The archetype model for historical interpretation is a fourfold structural schema from which the historian may choose to retell his story through four modes of prefiguration or tropes, four modes of argument, four modes of emplotment, and four tactics of ideological implications. All these rest upon the conceptual strategies that the historical thinker chose to explain his data. In other words, the historian's main objective is to answer questions, including: "What happened?", "When did it happen?", "How did it happen?", and "Why did it happen?" by utilizing those four models.

2.1.5.1: Mode of Emplotment

Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* was important for White's four modes of emplotment, namely, Romance, Comedy, Tragedy, and Satire,[22] any one of which the historian may choose to retell a story. White discussed historians whose histories were retold with one of the above emplotments: Michelet with the Romantic mode, Ranke with the Comic mode, Tocqueville with the Tragedic mode, and Burkhardt with the Satirical mode. We will briefly consider each of these modes.

Romantic Mode:

The key element in this mode is the "self-identification" with a hero who is identified as the good and virtuous embodiment of light that triumphs over darkness and evil. A contemporary example is C. S. Lewis's fantasy The Chronicles of Narnia, in which the hero Aslan triumphs over the evil queen of Narnia.[23]

Satirical Mode:

The Satirical mode is in direct opposition to the Romantic mode. White said this mode retold a story of separation that is

> dominated by the apprehension that man is ultimately a captive of the world rather than master, and by the recognition that, in the final analysis, human consciousness

and will are always inadequate to the task of overcoming definitely the dark force of death, which is man's unremitting enemy."[24]

Current examples include Wole Soyinka's *The Lion and the Jewel*, *King Baabu*, *A Dance of the Forests*, and *Madmen and Specialists*; C.S. Lewis's *The Screwtape Letters*; George Orwell's *Animal Farm*; Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*; and Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*[25] and *Man of the People*.[26]

Comedic and Tragic Modes:

White commented that the Comedic and Tragic modes "suggest the possibility of at least partial liberation from the condition of the Fall and the provisional release from the divided state in which men find themselves in this world."[27] While similar, their provisional release from the unwanted condition resembles two different branches of the same tree.

Although in Comedy there are trying times, there still is some hope of victory and reconciliation. That reconciliation might be between two people, or two societies, or two races, or even a person and his or her world or society. The story usually ends well in the Comedic mode, even if it is only a temporary triumph. For example, it is Comedic when we view the history of the Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970) from the standpoint of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, because they fought to unite the nation and won. Hence the Republic of Nigeria thought it had squashed the aspiration of the Igbo people of Nigeria to create their own Republic of Biafra. The Nigerian government also thought reconciliation was achieved; but this is far from the truth, as the Igbo people still aspire for Biafra, and so the triumph and reconciliation achieved by Nigeria appears to be temporary.[28]

The concept of release from an unwanted condition and a resulting reconciliation plays out differently in the Tragic mode. There the historian presents a story whose lesson insists that there are limits in society and in the world to which the audience must yield. People cannot rise above certain societal limits, and the world cannot improve as it can in the world of the Comedy. In short, in this world, nothing is perfect and nothing ends well.[29] For two literary examples, see Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* and *No Longer at Ease*.

White notes that other modes of emplotment are dual in nature and function. When a genre meets one of the modes, or vice-versa, the result, according to White, is a "contradiction of representation." This combines a genre with any of the above modes in which it is portrayed. The result becomes Romantic Satire, Satirical Romance, Comic Satire, Satirical Comedy, etc.[30] However, the ensuing relationship between the genre and the mode of emplotment is never the same. For example, if Tragedy or Comedy is the genre while the mode is Satirical, it is never the same as when the genre is Romance while the mode is Tragic or Comedic. We may take the genre to be the *tenor,* while the mode is the *vehicle* through which the *tenor* has a voice.[31]

2.1.5.2: Mode of Argument:

We now turn our attention to the *argumentum* model that deals with the way in which the historian sees how historical units, such as agents/agency and ideas, are related to each other and the larger whole – other words, how history ought to be. White's system of fourfold argument: Formist, Organicist, Mechanistic, and Contextualist, was developed around S. C. Pepper's *World Hypotheses: A Study in Evidence*. At this level of interpretation, the historian uses a "nomological-deductive argument" or syllogism to retell the assembled events of the story.[32]

Formist:

This theory is based on the identification of unique objects by properly classifying, labelling, and categorizing them in the historical field. According to White, the Formist mode is found in any field of "historiography in which the depiction of the variety, colour, and vividness of the historical field is taken as the aim of the historian's work."[33] It tends to be "wide in scope" instead of being exact about the nature and process of the historical field, purpose scene, agent, act, and agency. This is due to its dispersive rather than integrative characteristics.[34] Therefore, some historians use this mode to search for truth by choosing to see individual units in a dispersive characteristics. Even though the Formist, dispersive nature of analytical operation is wide in scope, it nevertheless lacks "conceptual precision." One example is William J. Durant's *The History of Philosophy*.

Organicist:

This second *argumentum* mode of historical explanation is more integrative and reductive because it aims to bring together the whole by means of synthetic processes. White observed that "the Organicist historian will tend to be governed by the desire to see individual entities as components of processes which aggregate into wholes that are greater than, or qualitatively different from, the sum of their parts."[35] In other words, this mode agrees to represent the identified objects through the means of classification, labelling, and categorization. It also differs from the dispersive model of analysis and explaining truth since it is a model that prefers instead to see individual entities as they are, instead of seeing them as components that belong together. Therefore, historians who use this mode tend to begin their structure of narrative with dispersive events, but end up building an integrative component. Since this model of historical writing is goal-oriented, the historian focuses on "the integrative process [rather] than … depicting its individual elements."[36] For examples, see Edward W. Said's *Culture and Imperialism*, and Achebe's *No Longer at Ease*.

Mechanistic:

Like the Organicist, this model is also integrative rather than dispersive, but its analysis and explanation differ from the Organicist. While the Organicist relies on the law of cause and effect to connect its historical process and leans toward a pessimistic conclusion, the Mechanistic looks for principles and ideas that enlighten the historical process and inclines more to an optimistic conclusion. Again, the Mechanistic model is reductive and not synthetic since it relies on its "reflections on the nomological nature of historical being."[37]As White observed, the Mechanistic historian's account is endangered by his inclination to downplay the importance of individual entities by focusing instead on the classes to which such entities belong. Even more, such classifications are not as important as the principles or ideas that regulate them and that ensuing manifestations.[38] Renaissance historians may serve as good examples, such as Abba Bayreh, the sixteenth-century Ethiopian monk, historian, and ethnographer who wrote the *History of the Galla*, and Lorenzo Valar, an expert in Latin, who utilized his knowledge of

philology to refute the claim that in a fourth-century AD document, Constantine the first gave the entire Western Empire to the Roman Church.

Contextualist:

This model of truth-finding relates events to a common background within which they originate. This pushes for "functional interrelationships existing among the agents and agencies occupying the field at a given time."[39] Moreover, the interest or aim of this theory of truth, observed White, is not only to locate events in their "circumambient historical space" but also to connect the "threads" that link them to their "specious sociocultural present."[40] Contrary to the preceding three models of explaining truth,

> Contextualism seeks to avoid both the radically dispersive tendency of Formism and the abstractive tendencies of Organicism and Mechanism. It strives instead for a *relative integration* of the phenomena discerned in the finite provinces of historical occurrence in terms of "trends" or general physiognomies of periods and epochs.[41]

More to the point, the Contextualist historian's account of the events traces their frame of reference, but not their "first, final, and material causes ..."[42]

In conclusion, the *argumentum* model of truth theories has drawn attention to the way historians answer questions about the historical events that are being retold. Professional historians have championed the Formist and Contextualist models and have opposed the Organicist and Mechanistic models, as White observed.[43] The interest in Achebe's writing in the struggle between continuity and change provides us with an example of a Contextualist historian. In *Things Fall Apart* and *The Arrow of God*, for example, Achebe said that change had won but also provided us with the context within which change displaced continuity.

2.1.5.3: Mode of Ideological Implication:

The third mode of explanation, ideology, dwells on the historian's assumptions and ethics concerning life, the world, and the way past events impact our present. It also considers how we might respond to such influence of the past on our present reality. Moreover, though history is not science, this system gives science, reason, or realism an important place in the explanation

of the historical events for their present relevance.[44] Utilizing the thought of K. Mannheim in *Ideology and Utopia*, White discussed the following fourfold ideological implications, namely, Anarchism, Conservatism, Radicalism, and Liberalism.

Anarchist Historian:

This historian views the social state of things as corrupt and in need of redemption. This can only happen through the destruction of the social system, since this is the only way that something new, such as a new community can come to life and develop into the ideal social condition. This is possible "if men will only seize control of their own essential humanity, either by an act of will or by an act of consciousness which destroys the socially provided belief in the legitimacy of the current social establishment."[45] For example, Dorothee Soelle, the feminist theologian, excluded the index from all her works because it is a form of hierarchy, which she disliked in all its forms.

Radical Historian:

The Radical theory holds that the desired utopic social condition is imminent; however, it is also dependent on "cataclysmic transformations" or revolutions before the utopia emerges. The aim of this system is "of reconstituting society on new bases."[46] The recent Arab Spring is a good example of bringing about a desired utopia by means of revolution.

Conservative Historian:

The Conservative historian views history as an object that is always evolving and hopes that this process will lead to an ideal situation or utopia. However, this theory also accepts that that utopic state develops slowly, in a natural rhythm of growth similar to biological evolution. See for example John W. Grant's *The Church in the Canadian Era* and Robert S. Wilson.[47]

Liberal Historian:

The Liberal historian also describes history as a development, or the evolving of social changes by means "of adjustments or 'fine tunings' of a mechanism."[48] This historian seems to welcome change, but through adjustments to law and government rather than through revolution.

Achebe's *There Was a Country: A Personal History of Biafra*, is a good example of evolution by means of changes in a government and its laws.

The Conservative historian is highly "suspicious of programmatic transformations" as a means to effect any social change, while the Anarchist, Radical, and Liberal historians are less concerned about change by any means. Moreover, the

> Conservatives insist on a "natural" rhythm, while Liberals favour what might be called the "social" rhythm of the parliamentary debate … committed to the observance of established laws of governance. By contrast, Radicals and Anarchists envision the possibility of cataclysmic transformations, though the former are inclined to be more aware of the power needed to effect such transformations, more sensitive to the inertial pull of inherited institutions, and therefore more concerned with the provision of the *means* of effecting such changes than are the latter.[49]

2.1.5.4: Tropes as Figurative Language:

We now turn our attention to tropes of historical narrative. "Trope" is here used to mean figurative language that characterizes objects by including words and symbols that repackage the events to be grasped and determined for the present.[50] For example, this theory answers the question: How does the historian describe past events to prefigure the present events and predict their outcome? White offered the following tropes or poetic structures: Metaphor, Metonymy, Synecdoche, and Irony. In my opinion, the historian's act of prefiguration makes him or her a predictor of the future or even a prophet. This gives the historian a form of authoritative status over his or her audiences, especially if he or she retells the events in order to have influence on their views or attitude to life.

Metaphor:

By means of analogy, this figurative language fundamentally seeks to transfer, characterize, compare and contrast the quality of different objects. Moreover, a metaphor "asserts that similarity exists between two objects in the face of manifest differences between them."[51] I. A. Richards portrayed the comparing and contrasting and the transfer of qualities from one object to another as the relationship between *tenor* and *vehicle*.[52] For example, "*my love, a rose*," means that the loved one shares "the qualities of beauty, preciousness, delicacy," of a rose.[53]

Again, metaphor compares, for instance, the Ebola outbreak in West Africa or the AIDS pandemic to the Black Death of the thirteenth century.

Metonymy:

This trope entails substituting the part of an object for another part. This act implicitly reduces the status of one of the objects by giving it that of another. The example, "*my love, a rose*," could also mean that love is reduced to a rose.[54] Moreover, metonymy calls the AIDS pandemic or the Ebola outbreak a "plague" even though it is not nearly as severe as it is portrayed by this mode.

Synecdoche:

This poetic structure functions by using a portion of something to represent the quality of the whole. Again, the example, "*my love, a rose*," will mean to the synecdochal historian that "the essence of the loved one [is] taken to be identical with the essence of the rose."[55] Similar to that would be to say the mystery of Black Death is equal to the mystery of Ebola.

Irony:

Irony negates any attribute from the *vehicle* to the *tenor* because it understands the gap between its literal and intended meaning.[56] For example, the statement, "*my love, a rose,*" negates the transfer of qualities of a rose to my love. Irony also does not compare and contrast *my love* with *a rose* because it operates at the figurative level. Moreover, the transfer of qualities is not needed because the literal meaning has already been obviously affirmed.[57] Another example is: Ebola obviously is not a plague since it was (relatively) quickly contained.

The poetic structures of Irony, Metonymy, and Synecdoche as White observed, are forms of Metaphor. Their main distinctive feature is that they operate at the literal level of meaning in that their impact from the *vehicle* to the *tenor* is either reduced or integrated. The historian who adopts the Ironic model is negational. The one who holds to the Metonymic structure is a *reductionist*. The one who engages with the Synecdoche model is *integrative.* The historian who adopts the Metaphorical structure is *representational*.[58] Furthermore a

Metaphor is representational in the way that Formism can be seen to be. Metonymy is reductive in a Mechanistic manner, while, Synecdoche is integrative in the way that Organicism is. Metaphor sanctions the prefiguration of the world of experience in object-object terms, Metonymy in part-part terms, and Synecdoche in object-whole terms. Each trope also promotes cultivation of a unique linguistic protocol. These linguistic protocols can be called languages of identity (Metaphor), extrinsicality (Metonymy), and intrinsicality (Synecdoche).[59]

2.2: Some Personal Thoughts on White's Insights on the Production of History

My purpose in the previous section was to summarize White's insights into the production of history. Those insights, according to White, apply to all forms of philosophy of history and historiography in whatever age. I will note some areas in which I disagree with White.

Firstly, White developed his thesis around the historical literature of nineteenth-century Europe, but he did not consider the work produced in the twentieth-century and the work of non-European historians such as Chinua Achebe. I admit that it might not have changed his final argument, yet it would have made his argument more solid and comprehensive/inclusive. Secondly, White did not say why he identified only four archetype models when there are clearly others. It is difficult to understand his parameters for deciding which ones made the list and which ones did not. For instance, there are more than four figure of speech. Why and how did he decide on only those four?

Thirdly, White's insights on the production of history focus mostly on the historian's reinterpretation or representation of historical events rather than on the sources of the events. This gives the idea that the authorial or intended meaning of the historical events are no longer important, especially since the expert historian has the responsibility as interpreter of the events. Hence I must state three important observations at this point that I will further explore in the succeeding chapters. 1) Neither Philo nor Paul are historians in the usual sense of the word or in White's understanding; rather, Philo and Paul are exegetes of Scripture who interpreted historical events in the Scripture, for example, the life of Abraham. 2) Philo and Paul differ from White because they valued and also recognized the importance of their source material and showed dependence on it, while White apparently does not to the same degree.

3) The way Philo and Paul utilized their historical events resembles the ways that White outlines above. They chose what they wanted to use from the historical events; they characterized (emphasized) some of those events; and they reinterpreted some of the events to fit their goals.

Lastly, since White has empowered the historian to serve as the main architect of reconstructing historical events (which were to be retold as the historian imagined them in the present), it implies that past events are without a voice of their own. Hence they are answerable to the historian who has ultimate authority on how he or she renders the historical events. On the one hand, White agrees with Ricoeur that authorial meaning is not relevant. On the other hand, White disagrees with Ricoeur on the question of "who determines meaning?" Ricoeur leaves it to the reader, while White leaves it to the historian.[60]

2.3: Conclusion

White's discussion on the production of history is wide-ranging. First, he argues against the age old distinction between fiction and history among scholars by insisting that there are fictive elements in every historical narrative. [61] Secondly, White shows that there are three levels of recreating historical narratives or stories by using a series of events. There is a beginning, a middle, and an ending, which determine how the event will be retold; there is the interpretation and the meaning which the historians intend to pass across to their audiences; and, lastly, there is the question whether or not the historians intend to impress upon their readers an eschatological or an apocalyptical kind of ending. Thirdly, White's main purpose is to return historiography to its origins as literature instead of science.[62] Therefore, the discipline of history is not an objective science. The historian approaches some historical events with presuppositions and a methodology. In the end, the production of history is to White what the second part of what poetry is to Samuel Coleridge: "the art of making the familiar strange, and the strange familiar"[63] – likewise making history familiar to its readers.

---

[1] *The Fiction of Narrative*, 112–25; *Metahistory*; *Tropics of Discourse*, 81–100.

[2] "The Structure of Historical Narrative," 119.

[3] Ibid. White further observed that narrative "is any literary form in which the voice of the narrator rises against a background of ignorance, incomprehension or forgetfulness to direct our attention, purposefully, to a segment of experience organized in particular way" (ibid).

[4] Paul identifies a four-level theory of historical interpretation in White's thought. He begins with the "atomic events," for which he said that White did not provide an explanation, but he in turn thought that it could mean the "'raw data' that historians distil from their sources" (*Hayden White*, 85).

[5] "The Structure of Historical Narrative," 121, 123.

[6] Ibid., 122-3. A story, says White, is "a set of events" that "must be organized in such a way as to inspire a certain type of question in the reader, such questions as: 'What happened next?' or how did that come about?'" (ibid., 121).

[7] Ibid., 123.

[8] Ibid. White described the aforementioned stages of comprehension elsewhere as the three stages of tropology required for composing every historical discourse. He said: "Indeed, it is only troping, rather than by logical deduction, that any given set of the kinds of past event we would to call historical can be (first) *represented* as having the order of a chronicle; (second) *transformed* by emplotment into a story with identifiable beginning, middle, and end phases; and (third) *constituted* as the subject of whatever formal arguments may be adduced to established their "meaning" – cognitive, ethical, or aesthetic, as the case may be. These three tropological abductions occur in the composition of every historical discourse, even those which … eschew storytelling and try to limit themselves to statistical analyses of institutions and long-term, effectively synchronic, ecological and ethnological processes" ("Literary Theory and Historical Writing," 8–9. Moreover White offers three reasons for characterizing those abductions as tropological (ibid., 9–10).

[9] Ibid., 92.

[10] Ibid., 92.

[11] Ibid., 93.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., 94.

[16] Ibid.

[17] White uses uppercase to denote the categories.

[18] Ibid., 93–6.

[19] Ibid., 96.

[20] *Metahistory*, ix–x.

[21] Ibid., x–xi. This aim has been achieved in *Metahistory*.

[22] White observed other modes, for example, Epic (ibid., 7). I could also add Mythopoetic (J.R.R. Tolkien and C.S. Lewis), Erotic, and Tragicomedic.

[23] Moreover, according to White, this explanation "is fundamentally a drama of self-identification symbolized by the hero's transcendence of the world of experience, his victory over it, and his final liberation from it – the sort of drama associated with … the story of the resurrection of Christ in Christian mythology. It is a drama of a triumph of good over evil, or virtue over vice, of light over darkness, of the ultimate transcendence of man over the world in which he was imprisoned by the Fall" (ibid., 8–9).

[24] Ibid., 9 (230–64).

[25] Satire is usually used to address a variety of concerns that are different from context to context. For example, African satirists are more concerned with dictatorship and the encroachment of Western ideals into the African culture while these issues are not very important to the North American and European contexts.

Things Fall Apart is a story about Okonkwo who was haunted by his father's cowardice, weakness, and dishonoured death. Okonkwo vowed to not end like his father. He became a respected warrior, elder, and a wealthy farmer in his Umuofia clan. This implied that Okonkwo had escaped the kind of dishonourable life that his father led. But the coming of missionaries to Okonkwo's village led to the desecration of his traditions, which lost the respect they had commanded previously. As events unfolded, Okonkwo killed a man from his tribe who no longer revered the traditions of the people. Consequently, Okonkwo hanged himself. To kill one's own clan's man is against the earth goddess, and by suicide none of the clan's men could even touch his corpse, let alone bury him. The colonialists brought down Okonkwo's dead body and buried him. This action is considered dishonourable. Thus Okonkwo's struggle to escape his father's weaknesses, failures, and dishonourable death still failed.

[26] I provided all these examples.

[27] Ibid., 9 (163–229).

[28] The Nigerian government started National Youth Service Corp in 1973 as a means to unite the nation. The scheme deploys all graduates from universities and Polytechnic schools to serve, usually for one year, away from their state of origin (Otwin, "Implementing Deployment Policies in the National Youth Service Corps of Nigeria," 397–436.

However the same history of the Nigerian Civil War will qualify as a Tragedy when viewed from the standpoint of the "self-proclaimed" Republic of Biafra by the Igbo people who lost their war for secession from Nigeria. For example, Achebe's *There was a Country: A Personal History of Biafra*. I provided the example.

[29] Moreover, White wrote that Tragedy intimates "of states of division among men more terrible than that which incited the tragic agony at the beginning of the drama. Still, the fall of the protagonist and the shaking of the world he inhabits which occur at the end of the Tragic play are not regarded as totally threatening to those who survive the agonic test … The reconciliation that occurs at the end of the Tragedy are more somber; they are more in the nature of resignations of men to the conditions under which they must labour in the world. [Man cannot change t]hese conditions … but must work within them" (ibid).

[30] Ibid., 10. White groups the modes of emplotment into pairs to highlight two other functions. While Romance (Michelet) and Comedy (Ranke) characterize *diachronic* emplotment, Tragedy (Tocqueville) and Satire (Burkhardt) are *synchronic*.

White explained *diachronic* as the meaning of a narrative in sequence which underscores the "emergence of new force or conditions out of processes that appear at first glance either to be changeless in their essence or to be changing only in their phenomenal forms" (ibid., 11). *Synchronic* is a static narrative without succession because it always returns to the same conclusion even in a different situation (ibid). Therefore, for every history, no matter its contexts and modes, it must be emplotted either in one of the modes or in a contradiction of representation.

[31] *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 98ff.

[32] "The nomological-deductive argument" (or the deductive-nomological model – DN model) holds that when the premises are adjudged to be true, so is its conclusion. For the sake of context, syllogism is a system of argument with two premises and a conclusion. White stated that "the major premise of which consists of some putatively universal law of causal relationships, the minor premise of the boundary conditions within which the law is applied, and a conclusion in which the events that actually occurred are deduced from the premises by logical necessity" (ibid., 11).

[33] Ibid., 14.

[34] Ibid., 14–5. The example below is mine.

[35] Ibid., 15.

[36] Ibid., 16. White further stated that Organicist historians are interested in principles and ideas because they do not restrict the human capacity by functioning as laws but are integral to human freedom (ibid). While a Formist historian aims at individual elements of a whole and is dispersive in the analytical process, an Organicist historian is integrative and rather sees individual elements in a comparable whole. I provided the examples below.

[37] Ibid., 16, 15–7. The Mechanistic historian understood this law of cause and effect to govern the processes of human activities in the historical field. Succinctly, according to White, "a Mechanistic …, *studies* history in order to divine the laws that actually govern its operations and *writes* history in order to display in a narrative form the effects of these laws" (ibid., 17).

[38] Ibid. I also provided the examples below.

[39] Ibid., 18.

[40] Ibid. Therefore the functional interrelationship between the events and "their circumambient historical space" points to the origin of the events, while the one between the events and the "specious sociocultural present" points to its influence on ensuing events (ibid: 18). Moreover even though this interrelationship is ongoing, there is, however, a process of transition from one event to the next. White noted that the treads that cause the interrelationship are sometimes absorbed into the context of another event it united to influence the emergence of another event (ibid., 18–9).

[41] Ibid., 18.

[42] Ibid. White wrote that this approach "can be regarded as a *combination* of the dispersive impulses behind Formism on the one hand and the integrative impulses behind Organicism on the other" (ibid., 19).

[43] Ibid., 19–20. Although White seems to agree, he nevertheless called for cautiousness (ibid., 20–1).

[44] Ibid., 21–9. White observed that ideologies, including the Apocalypticism of religious sects that did not recognize the authority of "science" and "realism" prior to the Enlightenment period, were authoritarian. He claimed that there is no such thing anymore as "authoritarian" ideology (ibid., 23).

[45] Ibid.,: 25, 22–5. To put it in another way, the Anarchist is interested in "abolishing 'society' and substituting for it a 'community' of individuals held together by a shared sense of their common 'humanity'" (ibid., 24). I provided the example below.

[46] Ibid., 24.

[47] Prof R. S. Wilson once commented that the church in the western world is presently going through a cycle that will eventually regain its importance in Christendom and so it is evolving. Wilson is a Church History professor at Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, Canada. I was in his Church History class in 2011.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., 24–5. Therefore "Radicals share with Liberals a belief in the possibility of studying history 'rationally' and 'scientifically,' but they have different conceptions of what a rational and scientific historiography might consist of. The former seeks the laws of historical structures and processes, the latter the general trends or main drift of development. Like Radicals and Liberals, Conservatives and Anarchists believe, in conformity with a general nineteenth-century conviction, that the 'meaning' of history can be discovered and presented in conceptual schemata that are cognitively responsible and not only simply authoritarian. But their conception of a distinctly *historical* knowledge requires a faith in "intuition" as the ground on which a putatively 'science' of history might be constructed. The Anarchist is inclined toward the essentially empathetic techniques of Romanticism in his historical accounts, while the Conservative is inclined to *integrate* his several intuitions of the objects in the historical field into a comprehensive Organicist account of the whole process" (ibid., 26).

[50] Ibid., 31–4.

[51] Ibid., 34.

[52] Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 89–112.

[53] *Metahistory*, 34.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid. White observed that "absurd expressions (catachresis), such as 'blind mouths,' and of explicit paradox (oxymoron), such as 'cold passion,' can be taken as emblem of this trope" (ibid).

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid., 36.

[60] Ricoeur, *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, 29–47; Thiselton, *New Horizon in Hermeneutics*, 351–8.

[61] *Metahistory*, 92, 99.

[62] Ibid., 99; *Metahistory*, 1–5.

[63] Paul, *Hayden White*, 93.

Chapter 3:

Philo's Retelling of the Abraham Narrative in *De Abrahamo*

This chapter will discuss Philo's selection and handling of his source materials in his retelling of the Abraham narrative in *De Abrahamo* (*Abr.*) and will utilize H. White's insights on the production of history to understand how Philo crafted and intended to pass his message along to his readers. This discussion will also introduce Philo's goals for retelling the Abraham narrative in *De Abrahamo*. Unlike White, Philo was not a philosopher of history, nor was he writing history in *De Abrahamo*. Rather, Philo was an exegete of Israel's Scripture and some of his works interpret stories found in that Scripture, *De Abrahamo* being a case in point. Nevertheless, White's insights will shed light on Philo's interpretation of the Abraham narrative, which forms a part of Israel's story.

3.1: Philo's Use of Primary Sources in *De Abrahamo*

David A. Runia commented that Philo is now generally considered as "primarily an interpreter and expositor of Scripture and this treatise [*De Abrahamo*] … fits in perfectly with such aims."[1] In the seventies and eighties of the previous century, Valentin Nikiprowetzky, Irmgard Christiansen, and Thomas H. Tobin had already made a similar observation. For example, Tobin commented that Philo was first and foremost an interpreter of Scripture because out of thirty-three of his surviving works, twenty-six were interpretations of Scripture.[2] Tobin again observed that Philo as an exegete operated within a tradition; as a result, students of Philo must differentiate between his exegesis of Scripture and traditional materials.[3] But prior to Tobin's compelling monograph, Robert G. Hamerton-Kelly saw the need to compare different texts in order to "reveal the layers of sources and traditions … [to] give some [more] insight …"[4]

Using Tobin's and Hamerton-Kelly's insights, I will consider Philo's use of his primary sources (mainly, but not exclusively, Genesis 11:26–25:10) by identifying those sources in his quotations, paraphrases, and direct allusions to the Abraham narrative. Then I will continue with Philo's selection and arrangement of events in the Abraham narrative that are essential to Philo's goals for writing *De Abrahamo*. Moreover this process will compare Philo's selection and

arrangement of the Abrahamic events in *De Abrahamo* with the account found in Genesis 11:26–25:10. Finally, I will consider Philo's goals for retelling the Abraham Narrative, but only after I have considered it through White's insights into the production of history.

3.1.1: Philo's Use of Primary Sources by Quotations, Paraphrases, and Direct Allusion

De Abrahamo centers on the lives of people of virtue who lived before the Mosaic Law yet embodied it (*Abr*. 1–3). Philo stated that Moses recorded their virtues in the books of the Law (4) and that he, in turn, would speak of their virtues in two triads. Philo gave less attention to the first group of three of virtue, namely, Enosh, Enoch, and Noah (7–46), than to the second group of three, namely, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Unfortunately, his treatises on Isaac and Jacob are lost. I depend on Runia's analysis of Philo's adaptation of the Abraham narrative from Genesis 11:26 to 25:10.[5] In the text below, "Q" stands for quotations, "P" for paraphrases, and "A" for direct allusions.

Sections of *De Abrahamo*	Scripture	Reference to Scripture	Theme of Reference
§9	Gen 5:1	Q (5 words)	Enosh
§13	Lev 19:24	Q (4)	Tetrad
§§17[6]-19	Gen 5:24	Q (12)	Enoch
§§31-36	Gen 6:9	Q (15)	Noah
§51	Ex 3:15	Q (14)	Patriarchs
§56	Ex 19:6	Q (6)	Israel
§67	Gen 11:31; 12:5	P	Abram leaves Chaldea
§§77[7], 80	Gen 12:7	Q (6)	God appears to Abram
§108	Gen 18:6	Q (6)	make three cakes
§112[8]	Gen 18:12	Q (7)	response to Sarah
§§131-132[9]	Gen 18:3, 10	Q (12+17)	proof single visitor
§166	Gen 19:20	A	proof fifth city

§173	Gen 22:7	P	Isaac's question
§175	Gen 22:8	P	Abraham's reply
§224	Gen 13:9	A	not living with Lot
§241	Gen 24:10	P	Kings in well
§258	Gen 23:3	A	Abraham moves from corpse
§261	Gen 23:6	Q (7)	Abraham king among us
§262	Gen 15:6	Q (3)	Abraham's *pistis*
§270	Gen 24:1	A	Abraham called *presbyteros*
§273	Gen 22:16	Q (3)	God swears oath to friend[10]
§275	Gen 26:5	P	Abraham obeys ordinances

From the above analysis, Philo made thirteen quotations (totaling one hundred and seventeen words in the Greek text), five paraphrases, and four direct allusions. These bring the total to twenty-one references, direct and indirect, to the Torah in *De Abrahamo*. At least ninety percent of them are from Genesis. Moreover, Philo's dependence on other sources and traditions is obvious since there was, already in *Jubilees*, the claim that Abram migrated from astrology creation-worship and polytheism to creator-worship and monotheism.

3.1.2: Philo's Use of Primary Sources: Philo's Selection and Arrangement

Philo begins *De Abrahamo* with an introduction concerning those who become the νόμος ἔμψυχος (living law) by observing the νόμος φύσεως (natural law) (1–6). In *De Abrahamo*, Philo answered an important question: How did people live righteous lives before the γράφος νόμος (written law)? To answer this, he first used the first triad of the νόμος ἔμψυχος, namely, Enosh, Enoch, and Noah, whom he said represented hope, repentance, and righteousness respectively (7–46). This first group of three is not as perfect as the second set that consists of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whom Philo said represented (48) Graces (54), virtues (54), and the fact that God joined "His special name to theirs" as "… one combined of the three" saying: "… 'my eternal name – the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob'" (51).[11] In his eulogy on the

second group of three, Philo noted that they descended from Noah and lived by the practice of nature (52–54). They also become ancestors of a holy, royal, and priestly race known as the Israelites (56–57).

To summarize Philo's narrative on Abraham, I will, mostly, group together his literal and allegorical interpretations of each section of that narrative. In contrast to Philo's selection and arrangement of these events, Philo's primary source, the Genesis account of Abraham, has this order:

Primary Source (Genesis)	*De Abrahamo*
Born: 11:26	
Married Sarai: 11:29	
Migrated from Ur to Haran: 11:31	Abram's migration: 60–88
Called and blessing: 12:1–5, 18:18–19, 22:18	
Promise to the Seed: 12:7, 13:15, 15:5, 24:7	110–113?
Went to Egypt: 12:10–20	King of Egypt threatened Abram's marriage: 89–106
Separated from Lot: 13:7–11	Abram's bravery in war: 208–224
Rescued Lot: 14:13–16	Abraham rescued his nephew: 229–234
Abram believed God: 15:6, 22	Abram trusted in God: 262
God's covenant with Abram: 15:18; 17:1–21	
Ishmael is born to Abram: 16:15–16	A son for the handmaiden: 254
Abram to be father of many nations: 17:5	
Covenant of circumcision: 17:10–11, 24	
Barrenness of Sarah's womb: 17:17; 18:11	Childless and barren: 147–149
Abram entertained angels: 18:1–21	Abram's hospitality: 107–132
Abram interceded for Sodom: 18:22–33	133–146?
Isaac is born: 21:1	A son was born to the couple: 168, 254
Isaac was weaned: 21:8; 25:5–6	

Hagar and Sarah: 21:9	
Abraham banished Hagar and Ishmael: 21:9–21	
Abraham offered to sacrifice Isaac: 22:1–14	Sacrifice of Isaac: 167–207
Sarah's death & burial: 23	Excellence of the sage when Sarah died: 255–261
Abraham married Keturah: 25:1–6	
Death of Abraham: 25:7–10	

The two arrangements differ in many ways. From the above, it is evident that Philo considered some of the events as inessential. For example, the Genesis account considered Abraham's family background, especially his brothers and their wives, as important (Gen 11:26–29), but Philo did not. He also thought of Abraham's marriage to Keturah and their six sons after Sarah's death as equally inessential. The call of Abram and his response (Gen 12:1–5) were particularly important for Philo and he embellished that account in both his literal and allegorical interpretations (*Abr*. 60–88). There are other examples of embellishments in *De Abrahamo*, for example, Sarah's role in the sexual relations between Abraham and Hagar (Gen 16; *Abr*. 245–254). In fact Philo included many embellishments in so far as he provided both literal and allegorical interpretations of almost all the events.

In addition, I found that some of Philo's literal interpretations are not consistent with the Genesis account. For example, he said that Abraham's "emigration was one of soul rather than body, for the heavenly love overpowered his desire for mortal things" (*Abr*. 66). He also commented that Abraham and his servants were people of worth, reputation and peace, while Lot and his servants were insignificant, disreputable, and not peace-loving (208–216). Therefore, I agree with Samuel Sandmel's assessment that "the connection between Philo's Abraham and the Abraham of the earlier Hellenistic Jews is very tenuous."[12] I think there is merit in the view that Philo's literal interpretation contained some aspects of allegory in order to educate his philosophically unsophisticated readers and listeners, whether they were Jews or non-Jews.[13]

3.2. White's Insight into the Production of History

We shall test White's insights on Philo's retelling of the Abraham narrative. This will involve the prefiguration of the historical data by emplotment, argument, ideological implication, and the tropes. According to White, this is the historian's way of repackaging historical events.

3.2.1. The Mode of Emplotment:

Philo's mode of emplotment is best styled as Romantic because he told of a hero, in effect, who triumphed over an "evil" system or condition. Satire would not be an appropriate mode of emplotment because that would mean that the hero was held captive in that "evil" system until he died. Furthermore, the emplotment could not be Tragedy, because this would mean that the hero failed and had resigned himself to live within that evil system. Neither would Comedy fit, because there was no need to call for a temporary harmony between natural and social orders among people and societies; Philo's Abraham focused more on his relationship with God than with people and societies.

I think Philo's emplotment in *De Abrahamo* suggests two heroes: Abraham and Sarah. The hero Abraham lived a life of excellence: he displayed a deep piety for God and showed love and kindness to people (*Abr*. 60–67, 89–107),[14] while the hero Sarah was portrayed as "the darling of his [Abraham's] heart and gifted with every excellence" (245). Philo claimed that Sarah's act of giving Hagar to Abraham was an example of her virtue (247–254).

Philo used both literal and allegorical interpretations to show the heroes' triumph over an evil system or condition. Regarding the literal interpretation, Philo characterized Abraham's attachment to his people and land as an evil condition that required self-sacrifice, specifically the need to make difficult but right choices, which included emigrating from Chaldea to Canaan (60–67). Consequently, Abraham lived an excellent life. Another evil condition was the couple's childlessness,[15] over which they triumphed when Sarah bore him a son of "excellence of soul" (167–168, 177, 254). This triumph resulted in the founding of a great nation (98). Philo believed that both the birth of Isaac, and especially his restoration to Abraham after Isaac was bound for sacrifice, vindicated Abraham's choice to respond positively to God (177). By allegory, Philo's

evil system included astrology, which required an emigration of the soul to triumph over it. The result of Abraham's emigration was self-knowledge and the knowledge of God as the Creator and Ruler of both the physical and intellectual worlds (68–88). Moreover, he became the first-ranked human being (272). Another evil condition to be overcome was self-centeredness, which Philo described in the allegory on the four kings against five (the four passions and the five senses all of which "are corruptible and the sources of corruption") (244, 236–244). They were all destroyed in both their literal (133–146) and allegorical portrayals (244). Abraham triumphed over this evil condition by sacrificing Isaac, which Philo considered as Abraham's "greatest action" of piety (167). Philo understood this as an act of self-sacrifice on the part of Abraham because he surrendered his joy, Isaac, in obedience to the Creator and Ruler (200–207).

Philo further portrayed the theme of the battle between good and evil in his discussion on the separation of Abraham and his nephew Lot (Gen 13). Philo's literal treatment of that separation appears in *Abr*. 208–216, and his allegory in *Abr*. 217–224. Philo commented that in the literal sense this battle was a struggle between Lot's weaker servants and the servants of Abraham who are "more distinguished in strength and number," and more peaceful (213, 216). Allegorically, it seems that the conflict stems from the different opinions of Abraham and Lot about what is the "most important thing in life … and what are the true goods" (222). In Philo's mind, Abraham had the highest view of these things because he desired "wisdom and temperance … justice … courage and virtue, [and he was a] lover of moral excellence" (219–221). However, to Philo, Lot had the lower view of things because he was more interested in wealth (silver, gold, and raiment), self-made security, and power (220–221). Therefore, since a man with higher standards cannot live with one of lesser standards, Abraham and Lot could not live near each other (224).

Philo's audience could also be heroes if they choose to emulate Abraham's life of excellence. They only needed to triumph over the evil, namely, their way of life, which was contrary to the Jewish constitution, and to triumph over their wrong perception of the Jewish people by emulating the virtuous life of Abraham. This potentially makes Philo a mediator between his audience and the utopian condition he wishes to see them in, which requires that

61

they should get rid of all impure admixture and begin to love only the Father and Maker, be hospitable to guests, and be kind to people as Abraham was.

3.2.2. The Mode of Argument:

I think Philo's argument corresponds to at least two of White's modes, namely, Organicist and Contextualist. How might the Organicist mode fit Philo's argument? Although Philo's retelling of the Abraham narrative in Genesis offered only individual part of the whole events, it ended with an integrative element. For example, even though Philo's readers might have expected a detailed account of how Abraham journeyed to his life of excellence (*Abr*. 60–88), *De Abrahamo* focused only on some events in Abraham's life of excellence (89–276). Such a conclusion is anticipated, because although this mode classifies, categorizes, and labels scattered and separated individual historical events, it focuses on aggregating those individual units into a larger whole.[16] Therefore, the integration of the units becomes quite important

Furthermore, this Organicist mode is goal-oriented and portrays ideas and themes that are central to the narrative's larger whole, which becomes the historian's goal or purpose. Philo dealt with the following ideas and themes in *De Abrahamo*. Firstly, there is harmony between the law of nature and the Mosaic or written law. Those who lived a life of virtue prior to the written law became "living laws" (*Abr*. 1-6). Thus Philo described Abraham as "a law and an unwritten statute" (276). Secondly, as someone who obeyed the law of the cosmos, Abraham lived a life of excellence in the form of holiness and piety toward God, and to people he showed hospitality, selflessness, and peace (60, 107–118, 208–216, 262–276). Thirdly, Abraham's journey in search of God included a series of crossroads: whether or not to believe God by emigrating from Chaldea to Canaan (60–88); whether or not to sacrifice Isaac (167–207); whether or not to show hospitality to unknown guests (107–132); and whether or not to show kindness to Lot (208–224). Fourthly, keeping the Mosaic Law was possible and was the right way to live because it was in harmony with the νόμος φύσεως and those who adhered to it become ἄγραφος νόμος and νόμος ἔμψυχος.[17] Lastly, God rewarded or punished people on the basis of whether or not they aspired to a life of excellence as Abraham did. For example, the Sodomites chose evil, impiety, and the disruption of the natural order of creation, a choice that

subsequently led to their punishment (133–166).

How might the Contextualist mode fit Philo's argument? In *De Abrahamo*, Philo linked Abraham's life of excellence to the first group of three, although Philo considered the first three less perfect than Abraham. So the place of excellence rightfully goes to the three patriarchs (36–38). Philo showed that Enosh, Enoch, and Noah lived by the natural law prior to Abraham and that he only continued in their trajectory, except that he was even better than they. Philo was admonishing his audience, both Jews and non-Jews, both those with much philosophy and those with little,[18] to emulate the life of excellence of Abraham. Just as Abraham's life of excellence found its origin in the first group of three, Philo's audience could also have theirs in Abraham's. Philo choose Abraham as the model of excellence, since he and not the first group of three represented a suitable example for Philo's audience. The Contextualist mode is also supported by the fact that Philo's allegorical meaning is closely followed by his literal meaning. This suggests that the preceding literal account provides *context* for the succeeding allegory.

White noted that the Contextualist mode views history by establishing a connection between a present condition, or desired present condition, and a past condition. This mode traces a state, whether already actualized or desired in the present, to its origin. In this case, Philo's intended outcome was that his audience seek after a life of excellence through the life of Abraham.

3.2.3. The Ideological Implication:

Philo's utopia and desired condition in *De Abrahamo* is Abraham's life of excellence. This life of excellence, according to Philo, is attainable to all of his readers and listeners if only they learn from Abraham. This shows that Philo believed the past, in this case Abraham's life of excellence, could impact his audience in the present.

I think that the Liberal ideology (which is the adjustment or fine tuning of the present through changes in law and government) corresponds to the way Philo re-presented the narrative because of the following. Firstly, Philo noted a need that required a change. Abraham had to change his religious orientation and affiliation from that of the Chaldean, since it was

based in astrology and polytheism, to focus on the Creator and monotheism (60–88). Secondly, the natural law is required to traverse the unwanted condition to the desired state of utopia (4–6). Thus there was a transition from the Chaldean institutions and law to the natural law. Philo led the Jewish embassy to Rome to argue that Alexandrian Jews should be exempted from emperor worship. This suggests that he preferred change through the government and law over force or apocalyptic diatribe.[19] For Philo, this means of change is possible only "in God our Savior (σωτῆρα) who has often saved the nation (ἔθνος) when in helpless straits (ἀμηχάνων καὶ ἀπόρων)" (*Leg.* 196). This means that Philo saw that Israel had a unique position under God's beneficence through his covenant with their ancestors. Thirdly, Philo strongly supported the change in *De Abrahamo*, from astrology-worship to Creator-worship and from an ordinary life to a life of excellence. However, the desired change is not imminent but rather future. The Liberals think that, if the desired utopia is to be imminent, then Radicals within the group might revolt in order to hasten the desired utopian condition or institution.[20] Philo believed in change but not by radical means. This may corroborate with the view that the Jews in the Second Temple period did not engage in (aggressive) proselytizing of the Gentiles.[21]

3.2.4. The Trope (Figurative Language):

Philo sees a twofold interpretation of the Bible, namely, the literal and the allegorical. Philo commented that the former benefits all those whose "souls … are still in a body" while the latter benefits only those whose "souls … are incorporeal and are [so] occupied in His [God's] worship [that] it is likely that He should reveal Himself as He is, conversing with them as friend with friends."[22] Philo stated that both kinds of souls are worthy of our affection and, importantly, that God is their Creator and Ruler.[23]

White explained that whenever historians are not able to render historical events in "unambiguous prose," they prefigure the events in one of the tropes (Metaphor, Metonymy, Synecdoche, and Irony). The allegorical method of interpretation arose for a similar reason. D. Winston noted that allegorical interpretation may have been developed by the Greek allegorist Theagenes of Rhegium in 6 BC for the defence of Homeric theology, as there were those who accused Homer of inventing the names of the gods. In response, Theagenes commented that

the names of the gods referred to the various moods of the souls and their internal conflict with nature.[24] This goes to show that allegorical interpretation was originally designed to answer questions and difficulties arising from literal understanding.

There are several reasons why Philo's prefiguration can be understood as White's trope of metaphor. Mary E. Shield portrayed allegory as a type of metaphor. She quoted Jacques Lacan, who wrote that "all sorts of things in the world behave like mirrors,"[25] to describe the important relationship between allegory and metaphor.

> Allegory is extended metaphor and concerns relationships and process rather than simple one-to-one correspondence … [so] what has been said of metaphor may also be said of allegory and vice versa. Like metaphor, 'the heart of allegory is a focus of multiple interpretations rather than *a* meaning.' [Moreover, as] an extended metaphor, allegory presents a re-description of reality … [and] carries a storyline or plot.[26]

Shield sees allegory as a type of metaphor, which makes *De Abrahamo* metaphorical in nature because it has seven (7) literal explanations, each of which is succeeded by an allegorical explanation.[27]

We know of other Jewish allegorists prior to Philo. Among them were Aristobulus (175 BC) and the author of *Pseudo-Aristeas* (130 BC).[28] This places Philo in the second generation of Jewish allegorists. A. Thiselton observed that Philo's allegorical interpretation of the Bible was based on the "theological implications especially of the doctrine of God," namely, that God is both the Creator and Ruler of the physical and intellectual worlds (*Abr*. 88) and that God directly enforces good, not evil (hence God did not destroy the Sodomites) (143–144). Also Philo used allegory to rescue the text "from apparent logical contradictions," from anthropomorphic expressions, and from "angelomorphic revelation" (113, 118); finally Philo universalizes texts that are mainly focused on Jewish culture, as when, for example, Philo commented that the gift of priesthood and prophecy that the nation of Israel received was for humanity in general (98).[29] Philo used a twofold method of interpretation so that both his readers and listeners with either corporeal or incorporeal souls could better understand and appreciate his narrative about Abraham.

Allegory is functionally a metaphor in another way. A metaphor transfers, characterizes,

compares and contrasts the qualities of one thing with another by means of simile or analogy, and we can see how this works in *De Abrahamo*. Philo commented that the Abraham life of excellence led to many results, most notably that he is "himself a law and an unwritten statute" (276) because he observed the natural law. This connects the unwritten law and the Mosaic laws by stating that Abraham and, by implication, other men of virtue are the originals on which the Mosaic laws were based (3). Moreover, "in these men we have laws endowed with life and reason," because such men "followed the unwritten law with perfect ease" (5). Consequently they became a law themselves. Philo noted "that the enacted laws are nothing else than memorials of the life of the ancients, preserving to a later generation their actual words and deeds" (5). The qualities of the unwritten law are metaphorically transferred to the patriarch.

Philo's allegory is also like metaphor in that his allegory has *tenor* and *vehicle*.[30] Philo wrote "we say with all truth that belief in the former things is disbelief in God, and disbelief in them belief in God" (269).[31] Philo asked "in what else should one trust?" (263). He suggested some things, including high office, fame, wealth, noble birth, health, strength, and beauty, but refuted them all and concluded that one trusts only in "faith in God" (263–269). To Philo, this was reasonable because people like Abraham depended on the former things before they believed in God, and to return to those former things is to disbelieve God. The *tenor* is "belief in the former things" and the *vehicle* is "disbelief in God." Similarly, the *tenor* is "disbelief in the former things" and the *vehicle* is "belief in God." We may remember Philo observed that Abraham left the former things behind in Chaldea.[32]

3.3. Philo's Goals for Retelling the Abraham Narrative in *De Abrahamo*:

Ellen Birnbaum noted that "Philo may have several aims in mind here [for writing his *Exposition of the Law*,[33] namely,]: to reclaim the alienated Jews, [to] educate the less knowledgeable ones, [to] assuage non-Jews who may be hostile, and [to] appeal to those who may be interested."[34] Among several, we now consider three reasons why Philo retold the Abraham narrative: to correct wrong perceptions among non-Jews on the religion of the Jews and their contributions to humanity, to recruit non-Jews to Philo's Judaism, and finally to present a portrait of Abraham that supported Philo's schema for writing his treatise. To avoid misconception, Philo's Judaism

was a form of Judaism and not a unique one because it was essentially Hellenistic.

3.3.1. To Correct Wrong Perception among Non-Jews on the Jewish Religion and Contributions to Humanity:

Sylvie Honigman developed three layers that can help identify the authorial intent for writing the *Letter of Aristeas*. The layers are: *Alexandrian*, *biblical* or *Exodus*, and *Homeric*. On the *Homeric* layer, which directly relates to this section, she noted that the *Letter of Aristeas* was written in the second century BC when Alexandrian scholars like Zenodotus were compiling and editing the epics of Homer in Alexandria. She argued that the Jewish communities in Alexandria were challenged by that compilation and editing, a task that honoured their Greek neighbours. Hence, *Aristeas* wrote to show that the Septuagint was not translated for pragmatic needs but for the sake of prestige of the Jews.[35]

  Philo used the character of Abraham to change Gentile attitudes towards the Jews and to give Gentiles a greater appreciation of the Jews, their religion and laws, and their contributions to humanity. Especially if we consider that Philo wrote in a world where there was significant interest in the gods and an even greater interest in exploiting divine-human relationships as a means of achieving immense prosperity and prestige.[36] There was also interest in religion, philosophy, and morality and in their interaction. For example, while the Epicureans noted that the gods were not very interested in humanity, the Stoics, who had much influence on Philo, maintained that the chief goal of humanity is to aspire to become like gods. They believed that this goal was to be attained by means of contemplating the gods and their activities. Malcolm Schofield observed that the Stoics were also interested in ethics and virtues, and that they embraced the four cardinal virtues of Plato, namely, φρόνησις (wisdom), ἀνδρεία (courage), σωφροσύνη (moderation), and δικαιοσύνη (justice).[37]

    We now briefly turn our attention to the way Philo's Abraham was a model for contemplation. Philo saw the emigration of Abraham from Chaldea to Haran and then to Canaan as a journey of the "soul in its search for the true God" (*Abr*. 68). According to Philo, Chaldea was also the allegorical place of exploration for Abraham because it opened the eyes of his soul

to the deep darkness that had ruled over him (68–71). Haran represented "the seat of our senses … the invisible mind" (72–73). For Philo, "the mind's migration from astrology and the Chaldean creed …" resulted in the knowledge "that the world is not sovereign but dependent, not governing but governed by its Maker and First Cause" (77–78). Abraham contemplated nature, which led him to God. Abraham became the only one in the Hebrew Bible to merit the title of "friend of God" (273). Thus there was the commencement of a divine-human relationship between God and Abraham. This was different from that of the Greeks and Romans, even though the devotion of Plutarch's Numa to the gods resulted in his "coronation in Rome," which "was guided by the gods."[38] But in the case of Abraham, God initiated the friendship and also spoke with him as a friends does. This changed the way in which people understood and experienced the divine-human relationship. Those Greek and Roman leaders, for example, who deified themselves did so without divine approval, and their recognition remained entirely human. In the case of Abraham, however, it was the divine being who chose Abraham and who initiated the divine-human relationship.

Philo's Abraham was also a model of Stoic virtues. Philo commented that the features of Abraham's soul were innumerable and could be grouped into "higher and senior" vs. "lower and junior." The higher and senior ones, φρόνησις, ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη, and δικαιοσύνη (Abr. 219), were the four cardinal virtues of the Stoics.

Philo believed that the contributions of the Jews to humanity were numerous. The Jews set a standard to which other peoples could aspire as they sought divine-human relationship. The Jews understood that contemplation would be futile if it did not lead to the First Cause and Maker of nature. Moreover, Philo set Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac as a standard for how people should respond to the divine being (167–207). Philo stated that the sacrifice event of Isaac attracted φιλαπεχθήμοσύνη "hostile criticisms" from people who διαβάλλω brought on it "disrepute or filled it with suspicion and resentment" because they thought that there was nothing unique about it (178–199). In that section, Philo differentiated between the sacrifice of Isaac and other similar stories of child sacrifice and then underscored the following. On the one hand the other stories were based on the desire to observe the customs of people, love of

honour, fear of eminent disaster (178–187) - all of which center on the self and on people. On the other hand, the sacrifice Abraham initiated was different because his allegiance was to God, whom he sought to obey, and furthermore Philo claimed that Abraham was not familiar with human sacrifice as his hostile critics claimed (188–199).[39] To Philo, this means Abraham was "the first … to initiate a totally new and extraordinary procedure" (193). Thus he counseled the misinformed critics of Abraham "set bolt and bar to their unbridled evil-speaking mouths, control their envy and hatred of excellence and not mar the virtues of men who have lived a good life, virtues which they should rather help to glorify by their good report" (191).

3.3.2. To Recruit or Appeal to his Audience to Consider his Form of Judaism:

In an important essay, Glen W. Bowersock argued that in order to strengthen the patron-client relationship, the Roman Empire had developed the strategy of cultivating royal elites from countries Rome had vanquished. Nicolaus of Damascus, Seneca, and Josephus were among the elite who immigrated to Rome on the short or long term as part of this strategy. The immigrants' contributions to Rome were wide-ranging, touching the fields of philosophy, historiography, conflict resolution, and public office.[40] Moreover, the younger Seneca wrote that immigrants who came to Rome did so for several reasons, namely, to gain a Roman education, to seek public office, to serve on an embassy (*legatio*), and to enjoy friendship.[41] Niehoff noted that during the *legatio*, ambassadors were offered "a platform to express previously conceived ideas, but also an opportunity to meet the city's intellectuals, access new literary sources, and engage Roman audiences on the their turf."[42] Philo led a five-man Alexandrian Jewish delegation to Emperor Gaius in Rome.

Harker argued that both the Greek and Jewish embassies left Alexandria in the winter of AD 38/9. He reasoned that since Gaius briefly met with the Jewish delegation in AD 39, the emperor heard both embassies between September 30, AD 40, and before January 24, AD 41, but could not deliver a written ruling due to his assassination on January 24, AD 41. Since the accession of Claudius most probably occurred before February AD 41, he would have heard both embassies in March-April of AD 41. Therefore, Harker suggested that Philo could have spent

three years in Rome.[43] This afforded Philo more time to write some of his *Expositions* and to present them before his Roman audiences.

Niehoff has argued that Philo wrote his *Exposition on the Law* towards the end of his life while he was still in Rome, and so she placed the treatises within the political and intellectual context of Rome. In particular, she used, especially, *The Life of Moses* and the life of *Joseph* to make her case. She pointed out that Philo's audience for his *Exposition on the Law* did not possess prior knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures, thereby making the texts a kind of introduction for his readers/hearers. She essentially argued that Philo's *Exposition on the Law* was written in a Roman context and for a non-Jewish audience.[44] Goodenough had already made such an observation, an observation with which Sandmel concurred, except that he added that Philo could also have written his *Exposition* to "uninformed Jews on the threshold of apostasy."[45] This view may be subsumed into Birnbaum's who maintained that

> The *Exposition* does not necessarily assume any familiarity with Scripture at all. Instead his presentation here … like Creation, Abraham, Moses … might serve equally well for people at different levels of knowledge about the Bible. In addition … he may also be addressing people with a varied range of familiarity with philosophy. More to the point, Philo's occasional exhortations about disloyal Jews, apologetic remarks defending the Jews and their practices, and welcoming attitude toward proselytes suggest that the *Exposition* is probably aimed primarily at Jews and non-Jews – whether hostile or friendly – who know little about Jewish beliefs and practices.[46]

Whether or not Philo's audience included both Jews and non-Jews does not change the idea that Philo may have been seeking recruits into his form of Judaism. The presence of *De Abrahamo* in Philo's *Expositions* leads to a reasonable argument that Abraham is a means through which other people might come to appreciate Philo's Judaism and be part of it.[47] Goodenough commented that Philo portrayed Abraham in *De Abrahamo* as one who received from God mercy, grace and the "abiding power to benefit" mankind.[48]

McKnight has argued that, while there was during the Second Temple period a welcoming attitude among the Jews towards proselytes and proselytism, the Jews were not involved in active evangelism.[49] McKnight's investigation showed that Philo was largely in favour of proselytes and proselytism.[50] He concluded that while the Second Temple period witnessed

the conversion of Gentiles to Judaism through literature and some sort of missionary activity, the most efficient way of evangelism was the attractiveness of the individual lives of Jews, since the Judaism of that period was not a "missionary religion."[51] However, since McKnight also included forceful conversion as part of the Jewish proselytization program[52] his conclusion seems too optimistic. A balanced conclusion, I think, is that "among the Jews there were different ideas, attitudes, and activities at work in receiving or bringing non-Jews into the Jewish religion."[53]

Harker's conclusions appear more convincing to me. He argues that Philo stayed in Rome for at least three years, and that his *Exposition of the Law* was primarily written for non-Jews. Niehoff maintains that delegates were usually given opportunities to share their ideas before distinguished audiences, an act that could lead to the changing or strengthening of the audience's attitudes. Therefore, the way in which Philo wrote an attractive biography of the Israelite leaders (patriarchs) was meant to appeal to his Roman audience. Clearly, then, Bird's conclusion that even though Philo accepted proselytes and proselytism, he did not "seek them out"[54] should be questioned. It may not have been the more aggressive kind of missionary effort practiced by the early Christians,[55] but the act of writing one's ideas and expressing religious conviction in a winsome way to a targeted audience is certainly an act of seeking and of drawing people to believe or to accept what is offered. In the case of Philo, he took advantage of the Roman system of his day to positively portray a life of excellence through the lens of his Judaism.

In *De Virtutibus* (*Virt.*), Philo further showed three ways in which Gentiles might become proselytes; Borgen categorized these as religious, ethical, and social conversions.[56] Regarding conversion, Philo explained that

> The incomers [proselytes] too should be accorded every favour and consideration as their due, because abandoning their kinsfolk by blood, their country, their customs and the temples and images of their gods, and the tributes and honours paid to them, they have taken the journey to a better home, from idle fables to the clear vision of truth and the worship of the one and truly existing God (*Virt*. 102).

The fact that the "incomers" abandoned their temples, and forsook the worship of other gods, as well as the payment of tribute to them, to embrace "the One and truly existing God"

underscores their religious conversion. Their social conversion is also underscored by their abandonment of blood relations, homes, countries, and custom. Philo further explained that

> The proselytes become at once temperate, continent, modest, gentle, kind [χρηστός, Cohn trans as *honest*], humane, serious [σεμνοι or *reverent*], just, high-minded, truth-lovers, superior to the desire for money and pleasure, just as conversely the rebels from the holy laws are seen as to be incontinent, shameless, unjust, frivolous, petty-minded, quarrelsome, friends of falsehood and perjury, who have sold their freedom for dainties and strong liquor and cates and the enjoyment of another's beauty, thus ministering to the delights of the belly and the organs below it–delights which end in the gravest injuries both to body and soul" (*Virt*. 182).

Philo portrayed the "incomers" as abandoning their immoral lifestyle and embracing a moral lifestyle in a kind of ethical conversion. Philo was clear that since it is both the body and the soul that are affected by any chosen change in lifestyle, such a step affects people, nature, and God (*Abr*. 68–71).

In *De Abrahamo*, Philo utilized the life of one Jewish "citizen of the cosmos" who went through religious, ethical, and social conversions in order to invite non-Jews to take similar steps into his Judaism. Therefore, the way in which Abraham migrated from astrology and the deep darkness of Chaldean religion to embrace the Maker and First Cause (68–78) displays what Borgen saw as religious conversion. The idea of a social conversion is evident in Abraham's obedience and allegiance to the One true God. Philo commented that

> The moment he was bidden, depart with few or even alone … for the heavenly love overpowered his desire for mortal things. And so taking no thought for anything, either for his fellow-clansmen, or wardsmen, or schoolmates, or comrades, or blood relations on father's or mother's side, or country, or ancestral customs, or community of nurture or home life, all of them ties possessing a power to allure and attract which it is hard to throw off, he followed a free and unfettered impulse and departed with all speed first from Chaldea, a land at that times blessed by fortune and at the height of its prosperity, and migrated … (66–67).

As for the ethical conversion, it is quite evident in Abraham's virtuous life. When contrasting Abraham's and Lot's respective households, for example, Philo said that Abraham was a strong conqueror, and yet remained a humble, peaceful, wise, temperate individual who loved justice, virtue, and moral excellence (216, 219–220). Philo allegorized the battle between four kings

against five (Gen 14:1–2) or five kings against four (Gen 14:8–9) as a battle between the four passions and the five senses (*Abr*. 236). The nine overlords are "invested with sovereignty and are our kings and rulers but not all in the same way. For the five are subject to the four, and are forced to pay them the tolls and tributes determined by nature" (237). They "are corruptible and the sources of corruption" (244). Philo further commented that Abraham attacked the nine overlords, defeated them, and won the battle against the tyrant rulers who controlled the unconverted (242).

Thus it was that Philo narrated the superior character of Abraham as a tool for recruiting or inviting non-Jews into his form of Judaism. As Sandmel says, "Philo's use of Abraham as illustrative of the progress that you and I can potentially make, and which Philo feels that he himself has made" showed that just like Abraham we "can mate with Hagar … as a preliminary to our mating with Sarah."[57] However, although the excellence of Abraham was important to Philo, he stressed the importance of the Mosaic Laws as *particularistic universalism*.[58] This means, in his view, the Mosaic Laws were meant for both the Jewish nation and all other nations (*De Vita Mosis* [*Mos*.] 2.9, 14, 25–27). This is further stressed in *Mos.* 2.25-40 where we are told that Ptolemy Philadelphus III, who had "conceived an ardent affection for" the Mosaic Laws (2.31; Jos. *Antiquity of Jews* [*A. J.*] 1.10–13), sanctioned the translation of the Laws into Greek for the Greeks, because he recognized their immense value for both the Jews and non-Jews.[59] Philo was optimistic that all nations would eventually live by the Laws (*Mos*. 2.43-44). He also portrayed the *universalism* of the Mosaic Laws in *Abr*. when he commented that men, such as Abraham, lived virtuous lives by obeying the natural laws. Moses wrote about them not merely for "their praises but for the instruction of the reader and as an inducement to him to aspire to do the same" (4). It is vital to note that the written/ enacted laws are consistent with the natural laws that men like Abraham lived by (5). Therefore, to achieve the kind of life of excellence practiced by Abraham, who lived the Mosaic Laws one needs to look at the lives of those who become the enacted laws. We need to recall that Philo's aim was not to recruit his audience to his belief by aggressive means, rather, as an exegete of the Jewish Scripture, he seized the opportunity that was created during the embassy to introduce to his audience his ideas on Judaism, some of which he shared in his *Exposition*.[60]

3.3.3. The Portrait of Abraham:

I will now proceed to use the ideas of Tobin according to which we must note the patterns of dependence in Philo's interpretation all the while we ought to bear in mind Hamerton-Kelly's observation that we must compare Philo's texts with one another to understand his style and exegesis. This leads us to see Philo's portrait of Abraham in *De Abrahamo* as national, but with universal possibilities. Moreover I will consider how Philo portrays Abraham in his other works, especially in the *Exposition*.

3.3.3.1. Philo's Portrait of a "National" Abraham with "Universal" Possibilities:

Philo retold the story of Abraham without any interest at all in the family's origin, except for the mention of the single fact that he was a descendant of Noah the just (56). The marriage of Abram and Sarai is not discussed, either because he considered it of less significance or because he was avoiding the discussion of their blood relationship that some of his target audience may have seen as problematic. Goody argues that the Western Roman Empire was into close-kin marriage until Christianity became a state religion in the early fourth century and subsequently banned such unions.[61] This implies that Philo's audience would have had little or no trouble with close-kin marriage. But Shaw and Saller disagree with Goody, arguing that exogamy had been a part of the Western Roman Empire since before the inception of Church in the first century AD and that, contrary to Goody's claim, exogamy had given "pagan" aristocrats the possibility of adding to their wealth, an advantage which endogamy did not provide. Hence close-kin marriages were unpopular among aristocrats, and this ideology spilled over to influence the lower classes also.[62]

Strong notes that Roman law considered unions between close relatives as *nefas*, which means "sacrilegious to the gods … and also illegal." Moreover such unions are "against the *ius gentium*, the common set of moral and legal doctrines that bound not only Roman citizens but all civilized people." She also mentions "several Roman prosecutions for cases of incest"[63] in the records that have survived. Roman law tabooed such unions along with human sacrifices.[64] Strong also mentions that in the first century AD both Emperors Tiberius and Nero executed Roman citizens for incest.[65] She does observe, however, that even though there was a law

against close-kin union, the practice did not substantially stop until over two centuries later.[66] It is reasonable to surmise that though the Roman law on the subject was flexible, Philo sided with the traditional Roman morality that was against close-kin union and chose to omit the detail from his discussion of the relationship between Abraham and Sarah. Moreover, Philo wrote that in emigrating from Chaldea Abraham left behind both his paternal and maternal blood relatives (*Abr*. 66–67). Also he did not mention the link that Abraham shared with his wife Sarah and presented them both as unmarried before their emigration began. He therefore implied a marriage after they had left behind any close relatives. It is difficult not to conclude that Philo may have feared that including this detail might have sullied Abraham as a model of one who lived with moral excellence worthy of emulation and lead his audience to brand the Israelites as a sacrilegious race.[67] Josephus also reworked the close-kin marriage between Abraham and Sarah because he saw the potential negative impact this would have on the excellent character of Abraham (*A. J.* 1.161–165).[68]

Philo also left out one of the very important parts of the story: the calling of Abraham, which included God's promise to him to become a channel of blessings to humanity as a whole, not just to a single race (Gen 12:3). This could be part of Philo's agenda to utilize Gen 12:7 for the construction of a national Abraham to whom God appeared to promise descendants and the possession of the land of Canaan. We could say that, for Philo, that promise in Gen 12:7 covered the promises in Gen 12:1–3 about Abraham's descendants. However, it is still difficult to make sense of the reasons for which Philo would exclude Gen 12:1–3 from his national portrait, since the promise of blessings to non-Jews could easily have been explained to be the result of Abraham's life of excellence.

Philo's agenda dictated the way in which he retold selected events in the narrative. He was deliberate in including the detail about Sarah's son, Isaac, while excluding mention of Hagar and Ishmael. This suggests that, in Philo's agenda for retelling the Abrahamic narrative, Isaac was necessary and Ishmael was not. Even when Philo addressed the excellence of Sarah, who handed her maid to her husband in order to produce a child for the aged couple, references to Hagar and to Ishmael remain obscure (245–254).[69] The centre stage was reserved for Sarah,

rather than for Hagar and her son Ishmael. Moreover, Philo embellished the character of the maid when he noted that she was "an Egyptian by birth, but a Hebrew by her rule of life" (251). The motif that emerges seems to portray an approved descendant of the saintly Abraham, whose household was in perfect condition. In this way, even though Philo hardly said anything good about Egyptians (95, 103, 107), he reported that Sarah's Egyptian maid was somehow converted to Hebrew conventions.[70] From his handling of the whole matter of Hagar, Ishmael, and Egypt, we find the antipathy that Philo might have had to the Egyptians.[71]

Since Philo also left out the covenantal relationship between God and Abraham (Gen 15 & 17), it appears that the sign of circumcision (Gen 17), which distinguished the descendants of Abraham from other nations, was unimportant for Philo's agenda. Along with that, he also left out the six sons of Abraham and Keturah and their descendants. We could postulate that circumcision did not strengthen Philo's claim of Abraham for Israel, since the Genesis account shows that Ishmael and all the males in Abraham's household were circumcised even before Isaac (Gen 17:23–27). According to the *Book of Jubilees*, the six sons of Abraham and Keturah were also circumcised and Abraham gathered these children and charged them to pursue righteousness, to keep observing circumcision, and to abstain from impurity and idolatry. He also proceeded to bless all of them.[72] It could be that the mention of the sign of circumcision would have created an opening for others to claim Abraham as their ancestor as well. Philo may well have been seeking to avoid creating the suggestion of any kind of relationship between the Jews and other nations, particularly the Egyptians, whom he greatly disliked (95, 103 & 107).

Succinctly, Philo portrayed Abraham as a descendant of the just Noah who fled from idolatry and astrology to express allegiance to the Father and Maker of creation. Philo noted that Abraham walked with God and lived virtuously. Consequently, the Laws of Moses were fashioned after him and other virtuous people. Moreover, Philo draws an extremely positive portrait of Abraham's household and of his offspring (Isaac). This underlined the fact that God promised a land to Abraham's descendants. Therefore we can safely say that Philo's portrait of Abraham in *De Abrahamo* was a *national* one with nevertheless *universal* possibilities and importance. This universal nature involves the mention of another son for Abraham by a

handmaid, and this mention was there to show that non-Jews could learn virtuous living from Abraham.

3.4: Conclusion

Even though White is a literary critic and philosopher of history while Philo was an exegete of Israel's Scripture in a world influenced by Hellenistic ideals, White's insights have proved to be illuminating, as demonstrated, for example, in Philo's use and arrangement of his primary sources. Moreover Philo's portrait of a national Abraham with universal possibilities was successful because of the way he edited the events of Abraham's life from the primary sources to fit his agenda for writing the treatise.

In the portrait of Abraham in *De Abrahamo*, Philo redacted and depicted the birth of Ishmael and Isaac in a rather telling way. He failed to mention the names of both Hagar and Ishmael, and also embellished and modified the portrait of Hagar so that she could easily be misunderstood to be a nondescript Egyptian maid. He also said that Ishmael was born to the handmaiden while Isaac was born to Abraham and Sarah (254). Philo thereby excluded Abraham from fathering Ishmael, which also agreed with his interpretation of Genesis 25:5–6 where he said the sons of the concubines, Hagar and Keturah, were "fatherless" (*Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin* [*QG*] 4.148). Philo's arrangement and use of the primary source led him to leave out some important details. However, this approach and outcome were understandable since his exposition on Abraham was "extensively allegorical and more philosophical in nature than historical, even when compared to other Greek biographies ... [for example] the *Bioi* of Plutarch."[73]

Therefore, part of Philo's agenda was to portray Abraham as the perfect example of piety, wisdom, and as a national figure before his largely Gentile readers.[74] Moreover, according to Philo, he was responsible for fathering only Isaac, which implies that the other children he fathered, according to Genesis, were illegitimate and do not count. This may appear to be a double standard because we have seen that he declared Jacob's concubines, Zilpah and Bilhah, and their children as legitimate. So why not Hagar and Keturah? For Philo, a condition for converting to Judaism was to staunchly abandon polytheism for monotheism and to conduct a

virtuous life of nobility as did the patriarchs, and, in so doing, to become equal with natural Jews. Interestingly, they could even become superior to those Jews who did not live in accordance with the virtues of the patriarchs.[75] This implies that, for Philo, both Hagar and Keturah as well as their descendants, did not fulfil the above requirements, and thereby failed to join the league of Tamar, Zilpah, Bilhah and their children. This failure excluded the children and descendants of Hagar and Keturah from the commonwealth of Abraham.

---

[1] "The Place of *De Abrahamo*," 138.

[2] "*The Creation of Man*," 2. Christiansen and Nikiprowetzky already made such observation (ibid., 2–4).

[3] Ibid., 5. Moreover, according to Tobin, anyone studying Philo's works must recognize the pattern of dependence in those works. For example, even though Philo interpreted the events on man's creation and fall in his *De Opificio Mundi* and *Legum Allegoriae*, he nevertheless offers another interpretation on man's creation in his *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin* 1.4-22 (ibid., 7–8).

[4] "Sources and Traditions in Philo Judaeus: Prolegomena to an Analysis of his Writings," 19.

[5] Runia's analysis does not include "parallels in vocabulary ... which are inevitable when one is recounting and adapting biblical material" ("The Place of *De Abrahamo* in Philo's *œuvre*," 139, n. 24.

[6] For a discussion on §17 see J. R. Royse's "The Text of Philo's *De Abrahamo*," 157–8.

[7] Royse suggested that in §77 Philo had in mind the paraphrase of Genesis 18:1 and not the quotation of Genesis 12:7 as Runia stated (ibid., 158–60).

[8] Among other observations, Royse noted that the Genesis text Philo had used shared the same source as the one printed in Rahlfs' Genesis in the Göttingen LXX (ibid., 162). For further discussion on §112 (161–3).

[9] Royse has some interesting observations on §132 (Gen 18.10) (ibid., 163–4). For all of Royse's discussion on the text of *Abr*. 151–65.

[10] I think that the reference to Abraham's friendship with God is taken from either the following texts that highlight such a relationship: 2 Chronicles 20:7, Isaiah 41:8, or a similar tradition. The Genesis text refers to the event in which Abraham attempted to sacrifice Isaac, and in response, God renewed his covenant with Abraham, because he did not withhold his only son from God.

[11] There are many references to the expression the "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" for example, Gen 24:12, 26:24, 28:13, 32:9, 31:42, Ex 3:6,13,15,16, 4:5, 15:2, Judg. 13:22, Josh 24:2,3, 1Kg 18:36, 19:13, 1Chr 29:18. There are also a few references to the "God of our ancestors" in 1Chr 5:25, 2Chr 20:6, Ps 44:1 cf. Gen 17:5. This could be some kind of formula or ritual incantation that invokes God's covenant and his promises to Israel's ancestors and their descendants. God has continued to remain faithful to his covenant and promises; the real question, however, is would Israel remain faithful to him?

[12] *Philo's Place in Judaism*, 104.

[13] Birnbaum, "The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes," 58–9.

[14] Jesus said this sums up all the Law and the Prophets (Matthew 22:37–40). Philo dedicated little attention to Abraham's journey to a life of excellence (*Abr*. 60–88) when compared to the attention he gave Abraham's life of excellence itself (*Abr*. 89–276).

[15] Childless people, most especially women, were objects of mockery, for example Sarah (Gen 16:1–6) and Hannah (1 Sam 1:6). Moreover, evidence shows that a man was also scorned for childlessness in Egypt, see Baden, "The Nature of Barrenness in the Hebrew Bible," 13–28.

[16] *Metahistory*, 25.

[17] Martens *One God*, *One Law*, 83–95; Runia, "The Place of *De Abrahamo* in Philo's *œuvre*,",149.

[18] Birnbaum, The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes," 54–69.

[19] Sandelin maintained that "Philo was not an apocalypticist" even though some of his "ideas concerning the future of Israel and other themes … create points of contact to apocalyptic literature" (Sandelin, "Philo as a Jew," 46.

[20] White, *Metahistory*, 25.

[21] McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles*; M. Goodman. *Mission and Conversion*; Bird, *Crossing Over the Sea and Land*.

[22] *De Somniis* I. 232; I. 186–91; II. 8ff.; *Abr*. 68f and 200f. According to Philo, in the literal sense, God only reveals "Himself [in] the likeness of angels, not altering His own nature, for He is unchangeable, but conveying to those which receive the impression of His presence a semblance in a different form, such that they take the image to be not a copy, but that original form itself" (ibid).

[23] *Abr*. 88. This might introduce us to Philo's thoughts on the worth of humankind in general.

[24] Winston, "Philo Judaeus," 7106.

[25] *Circumscribing the Prostitute*, 71.

[26] Ibid., 79 and 80ff. There are three other types of metaphors that historians may utilize as the main trope of figurative language for their prefiguration of historical events.

Firstly, Judith H. Anderson refers to "catachresis," as another type of metaphor which means "a wrenching of metaphor or an extravagant use of it, in any case as a violent (mis)use of language" (*Translating Investment*), 129. Cicero subsumed "catachresis" under metaphor (ibid., 136). Anderson observed that about a hundred years after Cicero, Quintilian distinguished between "catachresis" and metaphor under questionable ground (ibid., 138). Anderson also sees "catachresis" as irony since, to John Hoskins, "*Catachresis* … is something more desperate than metaphor. It is the expressing of one matter by the name of another which is incompatible with it, and sometimes clean contrary" (Ibid., 164). Moreover, Anderson notes that it is the phrase "clean contradiction" that supplies the idea of "catachresis" as irony (ibid., 165).

Secondly, Sallie McFague T. observed that the structure of metaphor has the characteristics of "parable." Scholars such as Norman Perrin, Robert Funk, and John D. Crossan have viewed "parables" as extended metaphors (*Speaking in Parables*), 72–3. She pointed out that biblical "parables" have three important operational layers, namely, the *source*, the *object* and the *effect*: Jesus is the *source* of the "parables" since he is the narrator; the "parables" are the *aesthetic objects* since they are the means for getting at the listeners with the desired *effect* (ibid., 73). Further, she sees parables as allegories (ibid.).

Thirdly, Ruth Herschberger discusses another helpful category of metaphor. She understood "Paronomasia" or "pun" as a type of metaphor since it is "a superficial likeness between predominantly unlike things. Like these, an abstract word also has multiple reference[s]…" ("The Structure of Metaphor,") 434. Importantly, this type of superficial likeness indicates that it is not taken seriously. This marks a significant difference from metaphor, whose transference or analogy between two different things or images are goal-oriented rather than frivolous.

[27] Runia, "The Place of *De Abrahamo* in Philo's *œuvre*," 137–8.

The Cohn-Wendland's edition contains twenty-three (23) chapters of two hundred and seventy-six (276) verses while the F.H. Colson in the Loeb Classical Library contains forty-six (46) chapters and the same number of verses as above.

[28] Ibid.; Sandelin, "Philo as a Jew,"45.

[29] Thiselton, *New Horizon in Hermeneutics*, 160.

[30] For *tenor* and *vehicle*, see my discussion on "tropes as figurative language" in the previous chapter.

[31] The desired effect of the statement may be better understood as a metaphor that compares two conditions and their results, especially if we begin from 262ff. where Philo rounds up his encomium of the patriarch.

[32] There are also other metaphors such as "virtue seemingly ranks as wife" (*Abr*. 101), "virtue is male" (102), "the wife … was virtue" (99), "the king is invisible" (74), and "the greatest of the cities, this world" (71).

[33] Philo's treatises may be grouped into "exposition on the Law," "apologetics," and "philosophy," but such fine distinctions leaves me wondering if it is possible. For example, one finds element of all three categories in all his treatises. *De Abrahamo* has been grouped as an exposition, but I think it also contains some elements of apologetics.

[34] "The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought," 59.

[35] *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*, 120. Honigma explained the other paradigms as follows. Firstly, on the *Alexandrian* layer, that the King's emissary to Eleazar the High Priest in Jerusalem indicated the authorial intent to attach royalty to the process that produced the translation (ibid, 41-63, 81-4). Secondly, the

biblical or *Exodus* layer argues that the *Letter of Aristeas* seeks to present the Greek translation on the same level of importance as its Hebrew parent text (ibid., 41–64, 76, 81). Philo even ascribed a divine origin to it, and calls it a 'sister' to the Hebrew Bible with equal rights (Müller, *The First Book of the Church*, 63–64. Note also *Flaccum* 25–40.

[36] There are both Greek and Roman leaders and individual who claimed divine relations. For example, Heracles was the son of Zeus in Greek mythology, Antiochus Epiphanes IV, and in the Roman context we have Julius Caesar who was deified as "divus Julius–the divine Julius", Octavian (Augustus) was named "divi filius–son of God", and in the late first century AD Domitian was deified as "dominus et deus–master and god."

[37] "Cardinal Virtues: A Contested Socratic Inheritance," 11–28. Schofield observed that the Stoics replaced Plato's *Sophia* with their *phronêsis* (ibid, 12–3). For the influence of Stoic philosophy on Philo, see Winston "Philo Judaeus," 7106–7.

[38] Niehoff, "Philo's Exposition in a Roman Context," 15.

[39] We can only assume that those "hostile critics" were Philo's older or younger contemporary (or even both) because they would have spoken or written against Abraham to have made Philo to counter their claims.

[40] "Foreign Elites," 53-62.

[41] Ibid: 55-56.

[42] "Philo's Exposition in a Roman Context", 1. Moreover these encounters usually altered or strengthened the previously conceived ideas of some participants (ibid).

[43] Harker, *Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt*, 1, 13–5, 18–9.

[44] "Philo's Exposition in a Roman Context", 3–21.

[45] Goodenough, *Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 40, 45; Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 47.

[46] Birnbaum, 58–9.

[47] Goodenough also stated that "Philo can lead the gentile into his Judaism" (ibid., 40).

[48] 1940: 47.

[49] *A Light among the Gentiles*, 48; Bird, *Crossing Over the Sea and Land*.

[50] Ibid., 38–40, 43–4.

[51] Ibid., 117; Bird, 77–109, 149–52

[52] McKnight, *A Light among the Gentiles*, 68.

[53] Borgen, "Proselytes, Conquest, and Mission," 58.

[54] *Crossing Over the Sea and Land*, 107.

[55] In my view, the NT data portrays the early Christians in the first century AD as actively engaging in outreach. For example, after the persecution in Acts 8, Christians spread all around telling others about their faith in Christ. The Church at Antioch (Acts 13) sent out Barnabas and Paul as missionaries. Epaphras, one of Paul's associates, was instrumental in starting the fellowships in Colossae, Laodicea, and Hierapolis. Another example is Apollos from Alexandria.

[56] Borgen, "Proselytes, Conquest, and Mission," 63–64. These may sum up the condition for emulating Abraham as an ideal Jew who lived according to the Mosaic Law (Sandelin, "Philo as a Jew"), 19–42.

[57] Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 63, 85-6.

[58] Borgen, "Proselytes, Conquests, and Mission," 59.

[59] Ibid., 60.

[60] Birnbaum, 58–9.

[61] Shaw and Saller, "Close-Kin Marriage in Roman Society?" 432–44; Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*, 48–102.

[62] "Close-Kin Marriage in Roman Society," 432–44; Strong, "Incest Law and Absent Taboos in Roman Egypt," 31–41.

[63] Strong, "Incest Law and Absent Taboos in Roman Egypt", 32.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid., 33–4.

[66] Ibid., 39.

[67] Philo wrote elsewhere that "The lawgiver of the Egyptians...bestowed on bodies and souls an evil promiscuity and gave full liberty to marry sisters of every degree, whether they belonged to one of their brother's parents or to both....These practices our most holy Moses rejected with abhorrence as alien and hateful to a

government free from reproach and as encouragements and enticements towards the most shameful of customs" (*De Specialibus Legibus* 3.22–5).

[68] Reed "Abraham as Chaldean Scientist and Father of the Jews: Josephus, *Ant*. 1.154-168, and the Greco-Roman Discourse about Astronomy/Astrology," 130–1.

[69] Philo mentioned that Sarah whom he called "virtue or wisdom" handed Hagar to Abraham because she had an "immature soul" at the time, considering that she was still Sarai and not Sarah (*De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratia* 1–19, 71–3).

[70] For an interesting discussion on Hagar in both Christianity and rabbinic traditions, Zucker and Brinton, "'The Other Woman': A Collaborative Jewish-Christian Study of Hagar," 339–83.

[71] Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism*, 135–6. Again, for Philo, Egypt represents the first step to perfection after leaving Chaldea (*Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* 315–6), and so it represents imperfection.

Goodenough argued that Philo's treatise *on Joseph* was intended to present the Egyptians in a bad light by stating that Joseph, a Jew, was an ideal standard for justice, peace, prosperity of all people in Egypt and environs and not an Egyptian. Thus whenever the Romans need an ideal prefect for Egypt, history tells that they will be glad should they appoint a Jew (*The Politics of Philo Judaeus, Practice and Theory*; *Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 48).

[72] Jub. XX.1-11.

[73] Bowley, 1992, 239. Sandmel observed similarly that there is a tenuous relationship between Philo's Abraham and the one in his primary source (*Philo's Place in Judaism*), 104.

[74] Goodenough noted that Philo wrote his *Exposition of the Law*, which included *Abr.* and *De Virtutibus* among others works, to Gentile audience (1940: 45).

[75] Ibid., 53.

Chapter 4:

Paul's Retelling of the Abraham Narrative in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4

This chapter will examine Paul's use of his primary source (Genesis 12–13; 15; 17–18; 22; 24–25) in his quotation, paraphrase, and allusion in retelling the Abraham narrative in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4. I will also consider Paul's selection and arrangement of events in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4. I will draw from White's insights on the production of history to categorize Paul's retelling of the Abraham narrative and finally consider some of Paul's goals for retelling it. I do not suggest that Paul was a philosopher of history as is White, or that Paul was writing a history on Abraham. I rather argue that Paul had interpreted some events in the Abraham narrative in response to those who preached and those who believed in justification by works of the Law in both the Galatian and Roman congregations.

4.1: Paul's Use of the Primary Source in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4

This section will focus on Paul's quotation, paraphrase, allusion, selection, and arrangement of the primary source to enhance his argument. Although Paul was a Jew, he reached out and wrote more to the Gentiles than the Jews. This does not imply lack of interest in the Jews, their situation, and their Scripture. Richard Hays, Gerbern Oegema, and Craig Evans have portrayed Paul as an interpreter of Israel's Scripture and have also shown the importance of adopting an intertextual approach for the study of Paul's letters.[1] Hays observes the gap between "what Scripture teaches the readers and what the hermeneutical context of the author makes necessary that Scripture is thought to have said."[2] In support of intertextuality, Evans rightly noted that since "the older Scriptures of the First Testament find expression in the later Scriptures of both the First and Second Testaments … it would seem that the very forms and structures of the Old Testament have influenced the shape of the portions of the New Testament."[3]

Paul's interpretation of Israel's Scripture reveals a source of his biblical and theological imagination and also tells us how Paul valued Judaism and Israel's Scripture.[4] For example Paul wrote in Romans 15:4: "For whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction, so that by steadfastness and by the encouragement of the Scriptures we might have hope." This

made Hays comment that "the Scriptures of Israel were embedded deeply in his [Paul's] bones."[5] This, according to Hays, shaped even Paul's moral vision,[6] as the section on Paul's goals will demonstrate.

4.1.1: Paul's Use of the Primary Sources by Quotation, Paraphrase, and Direct Allusion

To investigate Paul's use of quotation, paraphrase, and allusion, we shall begin with Galatians 3–4 and proceed to Romans 4. Note that in what follows, "Q" stands for quotation, "P" for paraphrase, and "A" for direct allusion.

4.1.1.1: Galatians 3–4:

Paul begins Galatians with some very important questions that include "Who has bewitched you? Did you receive the Spirit by [doing] the works of the law or by believing what you heard?" (3:1). He asserts that the observance of Jewish laws and customs is not ground for inclusion of Gentiles into the family of God, calling on Abraham as witness. For Paul, non-Jews are only justified by faith rather than by the works of the law. According to Paul, non-Jews who believed in Christ have become descendants of Abraham and are not the children of the bondwoman.

Regarding Paul's use of his source material in Galatians, Oegema observes that "the highest concentration of biblical citations in Paul's literary corpus is in Gal 3:6-14" and that Paul quoted "according to the Septuagint."[7] It is very important to note that in the middle of the first century AD, according to Oegema, there were still different manuscript traditions of the Septuagint and that its literary status had not been fixed.[8] For the sake of consistency, I will cite the following Codices: Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus, and others, as edited by H. B. Swete[9] for my analyses and discussion below.

Galatians	Genesis	Status of Adaptation	Theme of Adaptation
3:6[10]	15:6	Q (9 words)	Abram believed God
3:8	12:3; 18:18; 22:18	Q (6 words)	Blessings to all nations
3:16	12:7; 13:15; 24:7	Q (4 words)	Promise to Abram's seed

4:1-2[11]	21:8; 25:5–6	A	Underage heir
4:22	21:9	A	Free woman and her son/ Bond woman and her son
4:23	21:1	A	God fulfilled his promise to Sarah
4:30	21:10	Q (17 words)	Get rid of the other son

From the above analyses of Paul's use of his primary source, I found that Paul's Gal 3:6 (Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην) was a direct quotation of Gen 15:6 (καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Αβραμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην). The two are identical except for the substitution of "Abraham" for "Abram," the absence of καί, and the change in position between Ἀβραάμ and ἐπίστευσεν. Gen 12:3 (καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς), Gen 18:18 (καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς), and Gen 22:18 (καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς) were Paul's source of Gal 3:8 (Ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). The first section for Gal 3:8 (Ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ) appeared exactly in that form in Gen 12:3, and the second section of Gal 3:8 (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) appeared exactly as in Gen 18:18 and Gen 22:18. Paul may be only quoting by heart from Gen 12:3; consequently, it did not appear exactly as in the text. On Paul's use of Scripture, Oegema observes that "authors like Paul feel relatively free in quoting scriptural verses, which they can cite from a manuscript, quote by heart, paraphrase, or even change if the rhetorical context makes it necessary."[12]

Paul's quotation from Israel's Scripture in Gal 3:16 (Καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου) was from either Gen 13:15 (ὅτι πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, ἣν σὺ ὁρᾷς, σοὶ δώσω αὐτὴν καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος) or Gen 24:7 (Σοὶ δώσω τὴν γῆν ταύτην καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου) because the four words of Gal 3:16 also appear in both texts. The quotation begins with a καί and concludes with σού while in between are τῷ and σπέρματι. Both Gen 13:15 and Gen 24:7 were drawn from Gen 12:7 (Τῷ σπέρματί σου δώσω τὴν γῆν ταύτην). W. T. Wilson defines a "Pauline parallel" as "the similarity of specific terms, concepts, and/or images between passages. These represent the sort of cross-

references familiar to students from study Bibles, commentaries, and other basic research tools …"[13] Moreover, Wilson notes that

> Key words and word forms that the paragraph has in common with the parallels are italicized in the latter … The capitalization of text in the New Testament of the NASB … as used 'to indicate Old Testament quotations or obvious references to Old Testament texts' has been retained yet with small caps changed to full caps."[14]

However, he does not do that, for example, in Gal 3:16 (Καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου), which he wrongly paralleled to Gen 22:17 (τὸ σπέρμα σου) and Gen 17:19 (καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ).[15] Here he follows the NASB, though it puts the words in quotation marks and fails to italicize "and to your seed." Also, he seems to be influenced by the presence of "covenant" in the Galatian text; hence he sees Gen 17:19 and Gen 22: 17 as more appropriate parallels than Gen 13:15 and Gen 24:7. I should point out that Gen 22:17 has no mention of covenant. Wilson also should have acknowledged Gen 12:7; 13:15 and Gen 24:7 as the most qualified parallels for Gal 3:16. All three texts (Gen 13:15; 22:17; 24:7) point to the blessings that Abraham received because he agreed to walk with the God who called him into a divine-human relationship.

Wilson rightly identified Gal 4:30 (Ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας) as a parallel of Gen 21:10 (Ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης ταύτης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Ισαακ). However Paul saw the need to edit out a few things, such as ταύτην and ταύτης from the Galatian text to slightly alter the meaning. Plausibly this could also be the result of Paul's quotation by heart, as Oegema had observed. Paul also exchanged μου Ισαακ with τῆς ἐλευθέρας for the sake of context in order to underscore the distinction between the son of the slave woman and the free woman (Gal 4:21-31). He also introduced μή to negate strongly the important verb, κληρονομήσει, in v. 10.

4.1.1.2: Romans 4:

Paul begins Romans 4 by rejecting the teaching that the Gentile people become God's children by observing the Mosaic Law (4:1-2). He called the patriarch Abraham as a witness to argue that

his justification was neither by circumcision nor by keeping the Law but by faith in the promise of God, that is, by faith in Christ, who is the seed (singular) of Abraham.

Romans	Genesis	Status of Adaptation	Theme of Adaptation
4:3	15:6, 22	Q (9 words)	Abram believed God
4:11	17:10–11, 24	A	Abraham's Circumcision
4:17	17:5	Q (6 words)	Father of many nations
4:18	15:5	Q (4 words)	Promise to Abram's seed
4:19	18:11; 17:17	A	Deadness of Sarah's womb

Rom 4:3 (Ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην) is quoted directly from Gen 15:6 (καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Αβραμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην). Paul's choice of δέ over καί strengthens the adversative. Paul quoted six words in Rom 4:17 (καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι Πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε) from his source text Gen 17:5 (ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε). Finally, the phrase (Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου) in Rom 4:18 is a direct quotation from Gen 15:5.

4.1.2: Paul's Use of the Primary Source: Paul's Selection and Arrangement

We shall now consider the events he selected from his source material and his arrangement of them to retell the same events in a different way and for different audiences in Galatia and Rome.

Primary Source (Genesis)	Galatians	Romans
Born: 11:26		
Married Sarai: 11:29		

Migrated from Ur to Haran: 11:31		
Called and blessed: 12:1–5, 18:18–19, 22:18	3:8 (Q)	
Promise to the Seed: 12:7, 13:15, 15:5, 24:7	3:16 (Q)	4:18 (Q)
Went to Egypt: 12:10–20		
Separated from Lot: 13:7–11		
Rescued Lot: 14:13–16		
Abram believed God: 15:6, 22	3:6 (Q)	4:3 (Q)
God's covenant with Abram: 15:18; 17:1–21		
Ishmael is born to Abram: 16:15–16		
Abram to be father of many nations: 17:5		4:17 (Q)
Covenant of circumcision: 17:10–11, 24		4:11 (A)
Barrenness of Sarah's womb: 17:17; 18:11		4:19 (A)
Abram entertained angels: 18:1–21		
Abram interceded for Sodom: 18:22–33		
Isaac is born: 21:1	4:23 (A)	
Isaac was weaned: 21:8; 25:5–6	4:1–2 (A)	
Hagar and Sarah: 21:9	4:22 (A)	
Abraham banished Hagar and Ishmael: 21:9–21	4:30 (Q)	
Abraham offered to sacrifice Isaac: 22:1–14		
Sarah's death & burial: 23		
Abraham married Keturah: 25:1–6		
Death of Abraham: 25:7–10		

In Gal 3, Paul seems to be more interested in the events in the Abraham narrative in Gen 12 and 15, while in Gal 4 the main interest is in Gen 21 which he quoted from three times and alluded to once. In Rom 4, Paul's interest is in those events mentioned in Gen 15; 17; 18. The way that Paul selected from his source material and arranged the events that interested him in the Galatian and Roman epistles show the following features. Firstly, Paul was not interested in

narrating a detailed account of Abraham. Rather, he wanted to tell enough about Abraham in order to argue that Gentiles, whether believers or non-believers in Christ, need not observe the works of the Law to have peace with God. Secondly, in Galatians and Romans, Paul preferred to quote rather than to allude and paraphrase from his primary source. Thirdly, Paul arranged the selected events in the following sequence: in Galatians, it is Gen 15; 12; 12; 21; 21; 21; 21, but in Romans, it is Gen 15; 17; 15; 15; 18. This means that some chapters were more important than others to Paul because he repeated them. However, the most important chapter for Paul's goals in Galatians and Romans is Gen 15.

4.2: White's Insight into the Production of History

We shall use White's insights to understand Paul's main argument in Gal 3–4 and in Rom 4. Paul's presented two main argument. Firstly, that Gentile Christians should neither be subjected nor subject themselves to circumcision and Mosaic Law as a means to achieve peace with God. Secondly, that since believers are justified by faith, they joined the commonwealth of Abraham.

4.2.1: Emplotment:

Paul's mode of emplotment in Romans is best styled as Romantic because he portrayed Abraham as a hero who found his "true" self by obedience and belief in God rather than by circumcision, the Mosaic Law, or his own efforts. Moreover, the result of his faith in God is the birth of Isaac, which, Paul said, was "against all hope" (Rom 4:18) because Abraham's "body was as good as dead–since he was about a hundred years old–and Sarah's womb was also dead" (Rom 4:19).

The evil that the heroic Abraham conquered in Romans 4 is childlessness, which according to the "J" source was caused by Sarah's barrenness (Gen 11.30); the "E" source simply says that Sarah was childless (Gen 15:2) but later had a son (Gen 21:7); the "P" source points out that the childlessness was due to the age of both Abraham and Sarah (Gen 16:1; 17:17).[16] Paul's argument that Abraham was justified by faith means that the most significant evil that

Abraham conquered in Romans was the efficacy of human power to get to God. James Dunn observes that

> [F]aith is strong precisely because it looks solely to God and does not depend on human possibilities … It is not that faith ignores or denies the historical realities …; rather, says Paul, Abraham took them fully into account (thinking presumably of Gen 17.17); that is why his faith can be called strong … By implication too the insistence of making faith depend in any degree on what man can do (works of the law) is not the faith of Abraham.[17]

If Paul's mode of emplotment had been Satire (the opposite of the Romantic mode) then Abraham would have been a captive of the evil condition of childlessness and the evil system of earning justification until his death. Comedy would mean a harmony or reconciliation between human power and faith in God. In Tragedy, Abraham would have accepted Ishmael as his heir, and Ishmael would have turned against his father, or perhaps Abraham would have returned to the system of self-dependence as a means to get to God.

We now turn our attention to Paul's retelling of the Abraham narrative in Galatians 3–4. Paul also used the Romantic mode in chapter 3 to portray Abraham as the hero who was justified by faith rather than by his own works. The evil he defeated was less clear but was in general what had blocked Abraham from obtaining God's promise. Paul argued that Abraham was never justified by observing the Mosaic Law because it was introduced 430 years after him, and pointed out that his Galatian readers were also justified by faith as was Abraham.

Paul continued with the Romantic mode of emplotment in Gal 4 to show that Abraham was still the hero who triumphed over the evil condition of childlessness and justification by observing some works of the law. The choice of this mode resulted in the fulfilment of God's promise of an heir and God's having credited him with righteousness by reason of his faith.

However, even though the main hero of Paul's exegetical narrative is Abraham, Paul also thought of the Galatians at one time as heroes of faith without works (e.g. Gal 3:1-6). We know this because Paul mentioned that they were justified by faith in the same way as Abraham was before some of them were "bewitched" (e.g. Gal 3:1, 7; 4:28, 31). This gives us two portraits of Paul's Galatian readers. On the one hand, in Paul's past, they were heroes, and on the other, in

Paul's present, they were villains. Hence with regard to Abraham, the Romantic mode works well; but with regards to the Galatians, the Satirical mode works well in their present context. In the future, their story could be styled in the Tragic mode if they continued to opt for earning their way to God, but it could also be styled in the Romantic mode if they returned to Paul's message of faith in Christ alone. This shows a sad development: Paul's readers in Galatia had turned from heroes to villains because they subscribed to a justification through "some works of the law." Therefore Paul's use of the Romantic mode in Galatians 3–4 portrayed two past realities and a present one:

The Remote Past: Abraham was justified by faith

The Immediate Past: Galatian believers were justified by faith

The Present: Some Galatian believers were seeking acceptance into God's wider family by observing "some works of the law."

The Future: Those Galatian believers should return to Paul's teaching of justification by faith by being linked to Abraham's faith and to believe in his seed, who is Christ and who makes justification by faith possible for the Galatians.[18]

The combination of the second past and present may suggest that Paul also utilized the Satirical mode in his emplotment of the Abraham narrative. Both schemas show that even heroes are still captive to the world or to certain ideas until they die, no matter how hard they fight against an evil system. It may also be Tragic to suggest that heroes never rise above the "evil" system (of thought) they seek to destroy. Moreover, it may also be argued that Abraham himself was a victim of both modes, particularly the Satirical one. These are some examples: when he failed to trust God enough concerning the promise of an heir and when he lied about his relationship with Sarah. These are modes of emplotment within the Genesis narrative. Nevertheless, the Romantic mode is best for Galatians and Romans because the events Paul retold and edited in his exegetical narrative portray Abraham as a man of faith in God rather than works of the law. Also, Paul's reference to Hagar and her son, Ishmael, as Abraham's son "according to the flesh" (Gal. 4.23) was not retold to point out that Abraham did not show

perfect trust in God at all times, but rather it was to show that Hagar's son was not the promised one.

4.2.2: Argument:

Paul's argument in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4 is best fashioned after the Organicist and the Contextualist modes of argument. The Organicist mode applies, since Paul focused on some events of the Abraham narrative but not others (for example, see 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 above). Paul makes the selection on the basis of his goals. Moreover, since this mode of argument is goal-oriented, integrative, and reductive, Paul retold only some of the events.[19]

The Contextualist mode also applies because Paul was explaining to his audience the relationship between the way in which they were made righteous and the way in which Abraham was. This underscores a "functional interrelationship" between Abraham of the past and Paul's audience in the present. It also traces the background of Paul's gospel message of faith without works, and links the faith of Paul's audience to its origin: Abraham was justified by faith in God without works. Paul intended that these connections would help his audience make a decision that would positively affect their faith.

4.2.3: Ideological Implication:

Paul's portrayal of Abraham in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4 is not best understood in the Anarchistic mode because this would require Paul to have severed the past from the present in order to have a fresh start (a new community of faith that is devoid of the faith of the historical Abraham). It is also not constructed in the Conservative mode, because that would mean the result of Paul's law-free gospel would require time to affect the lives of adherents instead of having immediate impact. The same applies to the Liberal mode. Therefore, I consider that Paul portrayed Abraham in the Radical mode, which says that the utopic spiritual or religious condition is made possible by a transition from the old life to the new one. But this imminent and desired change requires revolutionary means. Paul had argued consistently that this ground-breaking means that ushered in the desired state of utopia came not by human efforts

but by God's grace through Jesus Christ. Therefore the revolution required was the sacrifice of Christ and his resurrection.

Moreover, Paul's audience in Galatia must undergo a "cataclysmic transformation" in order to achieve their desired utopic, namely, peace with God and membership in the family of faith. The expected revolution was one of thought and practice. By implication, the Galatians ought to return to Christ who is the seed of Abraham and to do so by faith and not by works.

4.2.4: Tropes (of Figurative Language):

Paul's mode of emplotment in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4 is best styled as metaphor because of the following. Firstly, he contrasted Abraham before and after his justification in order to ascertain whether he was justified by faith or works (circumcision and the Law). Secondly, Paul connected the faith of his audience with that of Abraham. This makes Abraham a universal ancestor. Gal 3–4 supplies more examples of metaphor. Paul commented that the seed refers to Christ (3:16). Paul understood the law to be both as temporary and $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$, a "custodian for a period of time"[20] (3:19, 24). According to Paul, those who were justified by faith in Christ are the seed of Abraham (3:29). In chapter 4:24-25, Paul explained that Hagar and her son Ishmael represented the earthly Jerusalem, a covenant that was ratified on Mount Sinai. The promised son, Isaac, represented a covenant that was ratified in the heavenly Jerusalem. Therefore there is more metaphor than simply the Hagar-law allegory.

4.3: Paul's Goals for Retelling the Abraham Narrative in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4:

For many centuries, Paul's readers and students have found his use of Abraham in Galatians and Romans very puzzling. For example, how did the call of Abraham relate to that of Paul and his ministry to the non-Jews?[21] Does Paul's Abraham add to our understanding of Galatians 3–4 and Romans 3–4?[22] Was the relationship between Paul's Abraham and Gentile Christians one of kinship or analogy? [23] Was Paul's theology and teaching congruous with first century AD Judaism?[24] How did Paul's two accounts of Abraham differ and how did those differences enrich his argument in both cases?

I will begin with how Paul utilized Abraham in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4 and then discuss the portrait of Abraham in both Galatians and Romans. Before doing so, I wish to emphasize the differing contexts of the two portraits of Abraham. In Galatians 3–4 Paul used Abraham to defend his gospel message and to call back those Gentile believers who had accepted the "other gospel." By contrast, in Romans 4 Paul's Abraham did not defend or admonish but supported everything he had said up to that point, especially in Romans 3:27–31.

4.3.1: Galatians 3–4:

The new perspective on Paul has been very influential in Pauline studies. For example, this new perspective argues that the "works of the Law" in Galatians do not mean earning salvation or peace with God through legalistic means, such as circumcision and food laws. Instead, such work referred to "specific Jewish boundary makers, like circumcision, Sabbath, and food laws, that separate Jews from Gentiles. Gentiles were being excluded from full participation in the community until they converted to Judaism [by observing those works of the Law]."[25]

Barcley calls this "a narrow Jewish nationalism" that excludes Gentile believers.[26] Since some Gentile believers already yielded to the views of "narrow Jewish nationalism," Paul desired to reunite this subgroup with the other group in that still held to justification by faith. When a house is divided, the logical thing to do is to unite it or else it will be destroyed. We will consider how this narrow Jewish nationalism crept into the Galatian congregations. This will lead us to Paul's missionary model in Galatians 3–4, which is best represented by a patron-client relationship, as I will later show.

4.3.1.1: The Goal: To Unite the Galatian Believers.

Paul had visited the Galatian region during all three of his missionary journeys (Acts 14; 16:1–6; 18: 23), where he had preached about justification by faith in Christ alone as the emblem of God's grace. Paul and his associates also visited the congregations to nurture the Gentile believers in their newfound faith that made them "equal members of the communities of the righteous, on the basis of faith in Christ, apart from proselyte conversion…"[27] However, later, the communities of Jews in the Anatolia region did not consider that the Gentile believers'

newfound faith and status made them equal members of the communities of the righteous. It may appear, as the new perspective argues that only their new status was challenged, but I would argue that in reality their faith in Christ alone was also involved, since it was the foundation of their new status in Christ.

Ben Witherington III is correct when he said that identifying Paul's opponents in Galatia is not as easy as some scholars have suggested. He notes that it cannot be correct that the "false believers" (Gal 2:4), were the "men who came from James" (Gal 2:12) and also not those "who have bewitched you" (3:1).[28] Scholars who argue that those leading the Galatian believers into circumcision were friends of James are implying that James and/or his group and Paul were divided over how Gentile believers were incorporated into the family of God.[29]

In my view, Paul's opponents were those he referred to in the third person as the "outsiders" (Gal 1:6; 6:13). Since they presented a different gospel than what Paul preached (Gal 1:6–9), they must have arrived after Paul had left Galatia. Again, since Paul referred to them as οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι (Gal 6:13), we know that they practiced circumcision as did the group to which they belonged. Were they proselytes or Judaizing Christians?[30] The proselytes seem the most plausible subgroup, given that fit Paul's description of οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι (the Gerim) (Gal 6:13)[31] since they "are the most natural contacts for education and social integration [between Gentile Christians and Judaism in the region]."[32] If the conversion of proselytes required the observance of certain Jewish religious practices such as circumcision, then the Galatian believers neither qualified as full members of the proselytes' subgroup nor the Jewish communities. This condition makes the Gentile believers merely "candidates for proselytism–as liminals [who are] on their way from idolatry to righteousness."[33]

But how was the "narrow Jewish nationalism" view carried into the Galatian meetings to influence subsequently some of the members to practice circumcision? Plausibly, through the visits of some proselyte evangelists. Such visits would probably have been quite unnerving to the believers because they would have been told that Paul's gospel was not enough, and that they needed to do more before the Jewish communities in the region would recognize them. In Antioch, a similar unnerving incident occurred that intimidated Peter so much that he

abandoned fellowship with his Gentile Christians (Gal 2:11–14). Moreover, the incident of Acts 14:19–20 intimates that there was a strong Jewish presence in the region of Anatolia. The text also tells us the extent to which some members of the Jewish communities would have gone to protest any incongruous religious claims.

The evangelists must have promised the congregations full integration and membership into both the proselyte subgroup and the larger Jewish communities, among other things. An example is, they would no longer be liminals or marginals but would "overcome the ambiguity and uncertainty of their identity by conforming to the larger community's behavioral membership criteria."[34] Due to this, some Gentile believers had already yielded and might even have thought of the "other" view as a continuation or an extension of Paul's teaching. But we must also recognize that they were in a difficult situation because they had abandoned idolatry and other pagan practices, yet were not accepted by either the proselyte sub-group or the larger Jewish communities as Paul and other Jews had accepted them. It was even worse to return to their former (pagan) associations.[35]

Paul's arguments in his Galatian letter had to do with Jewish beliefs and practices such as covenant, circumcision, and law. However, Paul was neither targeting Jews outside of the Christian group nor Jewish beliefs and practices. Paul targeted "things Jewish" in the Galatian congregations but not in the larger Jewish communities. He also aimed at the proselyte evangelists who breezed in from the outside to preach the message of proselytism and who, as a result, influenced some believers in the Galatian congregations.[36] Moreover, Paul wanted to unite those who had yielded to the views of the "narrow Jewish nationalism" and those who were still holding to justification by faith in the Galatian house churches.

4.3.1.2: How Could Unity be achieved among the Galatian Believers?

I will consider the following: Paul's Abraham as the missionary model for uniting the believers in the house fellowships in Galatia and Abraham in the context of a patron-client relationship.

4.3.1.2:1: *Paul's Abraham as a Missionary Model for Uniting the Galatian Believers (Gal. 3–4)*

Krister Stendahl and Alan Segal disagree on the nature of Paul's call. Stendahl draws largely from Acts and Galatians to argue that Paul's vision and his mission were interconnected right from the beginning. This resembles the call of prophets such as Isaiah and Jeremiah, except that Paul's vision was of the risen Christ and his mission was to preach God's grace to the Gentiles, a message that included Gentiles in the plan that God had for the Jews.[37] Therefore, for Stendahl, Paul's call both in Luke's account in Acts and in Paul's own account in Galatians show

> A greater continuity between "before" and "after." Here is not that change of "religion" that we commonly associate with the word conversion. Serving the one and the same God, Paul receives a new and special calling in God's service. God's Messiah asks him as a Jew to bring God's message to the Gentiles. The emphasis in the accounts is always on this assignment, not on the conversion.[38]

Stendahl's view challenged the dominant view that Paul underwent a unique conversion experience from (Pharisaic) Judaism to Christianity. Eisenbaum notes that researchers have understood Stendahl's view of Paul's "call" as the trigger for the "new perspective" on Paul.[39]

Segal, in his critical response to Stendahl's view of Paul's call, thought that Paul converted from Pharisaic Judaism to another form of Judaism, namely, Christianity. For Segal, conversion means a change of religious community. For example, for Paul it was change from the Pharisaic religious subgroup to the Christianity subgroup, although both subgroups were under Judaism.[40] The impact of Paul's conversion, according to Segal, displaced the value of the Law as the center of Paul's life and informed his ministry among the Gentiles.[41] He also notes that Paul disagreed with the Jews on what Gentile converts should observe in the "Noahide Laws."[42] Hence it was Paul's opinion of the Law, what laws were to be observed and how they were to be observed that resulted into conflicts with the Jews.

Stendahl connects Paul's call (vision and mission) with those of Isaiah and Jeremiah, while Eisenbaum argues rather that Abraham's call more closely resembled Paul's. With a view to testing Stendahl's and Eisenbaum's views of Paul's call, I briefly analyse below the call of four people, namely, Abraham, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Paul, all of whom were related to Israel and Judaism in one way or another.

	Agent of the Call (Vision)	**Texts**	**Scope of the Call** (Vision)	**Displacement as a Result of the Call**
Abraham	God	Gen 12:1–4	A land (for a great nation) "All the families of the earth"	Leave your family
Isaiah	Lord/ Lord of Host	Isai 6:6–13 Isai 49:6	"This people"[43] "Nations"[44]	"Go to this people"
Jeremiah	Lord God	Jer. 1:4–11	Nations & Kingdom[45]	Go to this people
Paul	Risen Christ God of our ancestors Risen Christ God	Acts 9:4–6, 15 Acts 22:4–16[46] Acts 26:9–19 Gal 1:11–17[47]	Gentiles & Israelites[48] Witness to all the world Gentiles[49] Gentiles	Sent away

The above analysis shows that their caller was the same, except that Paul mentioned twice that it was the risen Christ who appeared to him. Their scope was both specific and general, except that the scope of Abraham's call was not as clear as with Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Paul. However, both Abraham and Paul suffered dislocation. We know that Paul was born a Jew but his mission made him live among the Gentiles as a Gentile. By contrast, Isaiah and Jeremiah were Israelites from the Southern Kingdom and, although their prophetic utterances also targeted a wider audience than Israel, they were still Israelites living among the Judahites. In the case of Abraham and Paul, God's call led them away from their religious communities to new ones since, their call was to benefit humanity in general.[50] These similarities and others

made Eisenbaum call Paul the new Abraham. Philo and Josephus recognized Abraham as the first Gentile to become a proselyte (*Virt*. 212-17; *Ant*. 1.7; 2.159-60). Therefore Eisenbaum stated that

> The notion of Abraham as one religiously transformed could well have functioned paradigmatically for Paul's self-understanding. Abraham's life as popularly conceived in Paul's time constitutes the closest biblical paradigm to Paul's experience. … Abraham provides a model internal to Jewish tradition for a kind of religious transformation that results in sojourning among Gentiles and thus helps us to explain how Paul can sound so Jewish and yet so removed from his fellow Jews. … Insofar as Paul establishes this newly constituted family of God, Paul functions as a founding father, just like Abraham [the ancestor of Israel].[51]

Paul answered some important questions in Galatians. Since people are sinners how can they come into a right relationship with God? How can people be accepted and forgiven by God? How can people be righteous before God? According to Paul, the answer to all these is the death of Christ on the cross, which, redeemed people from the curse of the Law by Christ becoming a curse in their stead (Gal 3:10, 13; Rom 3:23-36). God's promise of universal blessings was given to Abraham (Gal 3:16), to Christ who is the seed of Abraham (Gal 3:16), and to all those who believe in the seed of Abraham (Gal 3:22). God's promised that Abraham would bless all the people of the world was fulfilled in Jesus Christ through the work of the Spirit (Gal. 3:14).[52] Paul said that it is the Spirit that makes people children of God and children of Abraham (Gal 4:6). Barcley observes that "the Spirit's task is to empower mission (Acts 1:8) and to create children, ultimately fulfilling Jesus' Great Commission … Furthermore, since the promise is the promise of the Spirit, it is an eschatological promise."[53] Paul again stated that the Galatian believers were children of the free woman, namely, Sarah, and not the children of the slave woman, namely, Hagar (Gal 4:21-31).

Eisenbaum notes that "the relationship between Abraham and believing Gentiles … [was not] one of analogy … [but] one of kinship."[54] Moreover, she argued rightly that biology was not the only ground for determining kinship since proselytes were not Jews by birth and even male Jews were not considered true Jews without circumcision. Finally rabbis fathered "children" through religious instruction (the teaching of the Torah) rather than through fertility alone.[55]

After Paul had left the Galatian congregations, some outside evangelists came with a different message. Some of the Gentile believers had already given in to the pressure to conform to it. Paul uses the figure of Abraham to challenge those believers who had accepted the new message of circumcision and to encourage those who refused to cave in to proselytism to remain strong. Moreover, it seems that Paul used Abraham to armour the Galatian believers against οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι. This means the Galatian congregations could use Abraham as their defense against the unnerving encroachment of οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι.

4.3.1.2.2: Paul's Abraham in the Context of Patron-Client Relationship.

From the nature of the mission, we move to the relationship Paul had with his converts as a result of that mission. When Paul wrote his letter to the Galatian congregations, Roman society was deeply involved in the patronage system. I will explore the patron-client relationship to determine how it applied to Paul's Galatian congregations. I wish to argue here that Paul brought Abraham into the conflict within the Galatian congregations to remove the internal divisions. This conflict could harm Paul's gospel message, compromise Paul's Galatian congregations, and even infect Paul's other congregations.

In ancient Roman society, the ruling aristocrats, priests, magistrates, judges, legal counselors, and generals, for example, were benefactors. They were counted in the hundreds in the ancient Roman society, while the recipients were in the hundreds of thousands.[56] The patron-client system flourished largely due to the failure of those in power, who controlled resources and security, to develop the economy. Consequently, they failed "to alleviate poverty, hunger, and debt." Instead they exploited the situation for their own gains, to the people's detriment.[57] Pliny's statement that even the emperor was not an efficient administrator supports the fact that the patronage system of governance emerged where there was failure in leadership.[58] Garnsey and Saller note, however, that the patronage system was not altogether oppressive because it was both an instrument of social control and social cohesion.[59] I am going to suggest that the patron-client relationship is a neglected resource for understanding Paul's dealing with his Galatian congregations.

Scholars who have studied this kind of hierarchical system in order to understand the obligations between patrons and clients have noted that the system is mutual, involving trading one person's kindness for another's services. For example, a client served his patron by forming "crowds at the door for the morning *salutatio* … or by accompanying him on his rounds of public business during the day and applauding his speeches in court."[60] When the emperor was the patron,[61] clients showed him respect and loyalty, and even included him in their wills. Suestonius reported that Emperor Augustus alone "received 1.4 billion sesterces in bequests over the last twenty years of his reign."[62]

In general, the patron expected proper conduct from his clients, and such conduct would include recognizing and promoting their benefactors' generosity and power. However, some clients did not show such proper conduct, but, because of the climate of honour and shame, hid their patrons' kindness to avoid exposing "social inferiority."[63]

Scholars have also noted that by 27 BC the patronage system had entered other cities and kingdoms outside of Rome but within the empire. Thus "in the complex web of patronage, the more formal patron-client relationships between Rome and the subject … [cities] or … [kingdoms] was 'supplemented by numerous informal patronal links between members of the local elites and the members of the Roman elite.'"[64] For example, we have an inscription to honour Julius Spartiaticus, a respected tribal patron of Calpurnia. The monument, dated in the middle of the first century AD, showed a link between Spartiaticus, a tribal patron in Corinth, and the Roman emperor.[65] This system revealed how it was possible for the Roman Empire to govern such a large territory with a small administration.

In an interesting essay, a scholar of ancient history, Glen W. Bowersock, argued that the presence of Josephus in Rome was "part of a larger trend" orchestrated by Vespasian to lure "foreign elites to the city within the context of patron-client relationship."[66] Other notable foreign elites that Flavian Rome welcomed included Nicolaus of Damascus, who worked for King Herod the Great as his court historian, and the Jewish Queen Berenice.[67] There were other foreign elites who came to Rome in other roles, including embassy, public office, entertainment, and education. For example, Seneca the elder moved to Rome from Spain because of its

educational opportunities and later became a resident philosopher and counselor for Emperor Nero.[68] Since foreign elites were interested in Roman education, Rome cultivated a patron-client relationship with the elites. Rome later appointed them to serve within or outside of Rome.[69] Herod Agrippa was another example.

Bowersock observed that such foreign elites were also expected to provide some service to the empire. For example, he stated:

> Such persons were often of high birth and high literacy. They had the potential of glorifying the career of their patron and illuminating his world for contemporaries and posterity. Sometimes the families of these transplanted elites would take root in Rome, and in subsequent generations their presence would fall into Seneca's category of the necessity of holding public office …[70]

Bowersock argued that Josephus was the most famous of all foreign elites in Rome, partly because Josephus produced a new kind of historiography, "which portrayed Roman values within the context of Judean history and vice-versa."[71] Moreover, some of the foreign elites supported Rome even against their own countries of origin. For example, Josephus supported Rome during the Jewish War, and King Antiochus sent some of his troops to fight alongside Roman soldiers against the Jews.[72] The point here is that, in order to hold firm and to unite an empire of diverse people and demands, the empire sometimes saw the need to invite foreign elites to Rome in order to achieve its agenda of unity. This sometimes required the elites to sacrifice their own people and country for Rome.

Garnsey and Saller noted that aristocrats were effective mediators between the emperor and his clients. For example, Pliny served as such a middleman. We can understand the patron-client relationship in the Galatian letter to be as follows: God in Christ was the patron of the Galatians because he rescued them and gave them his Spirit (1:4; 3:1, 5, 14), the clients were the Galatian congregations (3:1, 5, 14), and Paul was the intermediary since he was the agent who portrayed the crucified Christ before them (3:1).

The intermediary, Paul, informed the clients of how God in Christ, their patron, had benefited them by grace. These benefits include the sacrificial offering of Jesus Christ for the Galatian congregations and for all mankind (3:1), the consequent giving of God's Spirit, and the

working of miracles (3:5). The clients, the Galatians, received gifts from their patron, but later, some among them were trying to earn the gift that they had received by grace (3:1–3). As a result, Paul was angry. What is more, some of them had already suffered for receiving their patron's gifts (3:4).[73] In response, Paul introduced his missionary model, Abraham, to correct their error and to unite the congregations. There are some striking similarities between Paul's model, Abraham, and the patron of the Galatians. For example, God, the patron, made promises to Abraham and to his seed and Abraham believed in the gift of the patron. According to Paul, God in Christ became that seed of Abraham in whom the Galatians believed. Moreover, Paul wrote that Abraham's scope of influence encompassed all nations (3:8), which makes the Galatian congregations the children of Abraham (3:7–9).

Paul argued that the clients did not have to observe the Law (3:15–20) because God's promise to Abraham and to his seed came 430 years before the Mosaic Law was given (3:17). Thus Abraham did not observe the Law because the covenant relationship he had with his patron, God, was not based on the Mosaic Law but on grace received by faith (3:18). Similarly, Paul stressed to the Galatians that observing the Law would not justify them (3:10-14) because justification was only attained by faith (3:11–12) through Jesus Christ (3:13–14). The patron also offered both Abraham and the Galatians gifts in response to their faith in him. To Abraham, God credited righteousness and also fulfilled his promise to him (3:18). As regards the Galatians, God made them his children (3:26; 4:6–7) with the giving of his Spirit (3:2–3; 4:6) and also made them Abraham's seed and heirs (3:29). In this relationship, Paul stated that the patron, God, knows his clients, the Galatians (4:9).

The other intermediaries presented a message that urged the Galatians to observe the Law in order to attain their "goal by human effort" (3:3).[74] They also wanted the Galatians to observe the requirements of the Law such as special days/events and circumcision (4:10; 5:2-3). Scholars think that the other preachers claimed Paul was also preaching circumcision.[75] Paul claimed that, in so doing, the Galatians would operate in the realm of the old covenant, which is represented by Abraham, Hagar, and Ishmael (4:21–31) instead of the new covenant represented by Abraham, Sarah, and Isaac (4:21–31). Paul's argument against the other

mediators is that they wanted to turn the Galatians back to the old covenant.

Therefore Paul used Abraham's example to show the Galatians why they must follow him rather than the other intermediaries. Paul agreed in 4:19-20 that the message of the Law was important to sensitize people about sin, but he argued that it only offered a temporary solution until the seed appeared. Moreover, Paul noted that there was a unique difference between the giver (angels) and the mediator (Moses) of the Law on the one hand, and the giver and mediator of the promise or the new covenant on the other hand. Since the Law pointed to Christ who had already come, the Law is no longer required and cannot offer justification to the Galatians. Only faith in God's gracious acts of love is needed (4:21-25).

When we utilize the model of patronage, it helps us understand the following: (1) Both Paul and the other potential intermediaries work for the same patron; (2) this is not a battle of patrons but of intermediaries who understand the message of the patron to the Galatian congregations differently; (3) apparently, the Galatian congregations would ultimately have to decide the intermediary to follow, but no matter whom they chose, they would still have ended up with the same patron; (4) White's insights above tell us that we do not know of their decision, but I think that we can postulate that they went with Paul because some years later Paul used this same missionary model for the church in Rome.

Paul modifies the practice of the patron-client relationship, for example, when he noted that (1) the patron of the Galatian congregations knew them (4:9). Paul's qualification in v.9 clearly stated that it was God's initiative that the Galatian congregation know him; this is also true in the case of Paul's "foreign elite" or missionary model, Abraham. This means that God was not motivated to reveal himself to the Galatians for their services as was the case with Roman patrons. (2) Paul mentioned that he was in pain for his children and wished to be with them in order to show them love (4:19–20). This also shows selfless interest and his willingness to offer them more service even though in birth pangs, which is a metaphor for their spiritual reformation.[76] (3) Paul also called them "brothers" (3:15; 5:13; 6:1), an act that is against the hierarchical system of patronage. A protest against the hierarchical system may be in Paul's mind in Gal 3:28–29.

4.3.2: Romans 4[77]

I have been talking about patronage in Galatians as a means of uniting the Galatian believers and equipping them against proselytes' evangelists. I am now moving to Paul's portrait of Abraham in Romans within the cultural context of self-mastery and Paul's use of Abraham to show how Gentiles could achieve self-mastery without Judaism.

Since Luther and Calvin, Protestant students of Paul have not emphasized the importance of self-mastery as much as grace and sanctification in Pauline theology. This has changed since the early 1990s, due to C. E. Glad's work on Epicureans and early Christianity,[78] and S. K. Stowers's rereading of Romans. Stowers argues that commentators have interpreted Romans without considering how Paul's Roman readers would have understood the epistle.[79] He relied on Glad's work (and the rhetorical and cultural contexts of Paul's world). However as impressive as his *Rereading of Romans* is, I found his persistent challenging of the traditional interpretation of Romans 4 unjustifiable. He argues rightly that Romans 4 is better understood "as God's way of adopting whole peoples as his own by using the generative trust of Abraham and Jesus to work procreative miracles that founded new families."[80] But he disagrees that Romans 4 is to be read as a model of the believers' faith against "the false religion of works" because it was "God adapting to Abraham's level than having Abraham first come up to God's standards."[81] Is Stowers suggesting that Paul wanted his Roman readers to emulate the faith of Jesus Christ rather than of Abraham since he interprets the phrase "διά πίστεως Ἰησου Χριστου" as "faith or faithfulness of Jesus Christ" and since Abraham's faith is not a model for true faith?[82] For all what it is worth, it opposes the current of Paul's argument in Romans 1–4. I am convinced that Paul intended his readers to have understood Romans 4 as it is: to understand Abraham as a model of faith in God against works, and to believe in the seed of Abraham.[83] Moreover, I think that Paul's readers' cultural context offers a good ground to understand Paul's Abraham in Romans 4 in the context of self-mastery. I am convinced that Stowers neither adequately show how Abraham fits that context nor how he was a model of self-mastery for Gentile Christians.

4.3.2.1: The Goal: Gentiles (Christians) to Attain Self-Mastery:

Self-mastery is the practice of self-control over passions and desires. A life of self-mastery was both personal and social for the ancients, because moral values occupied a very important place in the world of Paul. After explaining the concept of self-mastery in the Greco-Roman world and after showing the presence of self-mastery in the Roman epistle, I shall then discuss the question: How might Gentile people (Christians) attain self-mastery according to Romans 4? Therefore, in this discussion, I wish to argue that one of Paul's main agendas in his discussion with the imaginary interlocutor, a self-defined "Teacher of Gentiles," is to show that his Christianity is a better form of Judaism for all Gentiles.

In the ancient Mediterranean world, self-mastery (ἐγκράτεια) functioned as a means through which people could practice self-restraint by limiting their behaviours.[84] The Greek noun ἐγκράτεια first appeared in the works of Socrates' students: Isocrates, Plato and Xenophon.[85] Socrates, according to Xenophon, was the greatest model of self-mastery.[86] F. D. Caizzi notes that Antisthenes saw Odysseus as "the mythical antecedent of Socrates, interpreting him as a paradigm of the capacity for endurance and self-control ('have endurance, my heart: you have suffered worst pain,' *Od*. 20.18, was to become a sort of motto of Cynic-Antisthenean Socraticism) in pursuit of true goodness."[87] The lack of self-mastery (ἀκρασία) lead to indulgence in the impulse of pleasure rather than the practice of sound reasoning. Stowers states that when such a "psycho-ethical conflict" led to the victory of irrational passion over reason in the "inner man;" we find something similar in Rom 7:15, 19, 22.[88] Stowers cited Plato and the Stoics for his detailed discussion on ἀκρασία where he pointed that out that "[m]astery of oneself to the degree possible, given one's 'natural' endowments, places a person on the social hierarchy, indicating whom one is fit to rule and by whom one is ruled."[89] So the presence of ἐγκράτεια and ἀκρασία introduced inequality, which creates

> a hierarchy of the more self-mastered who are fit to rule others and those without enough mastery to rule or fully rule themselves: for example, mind/body, human/ animals, men/women, soft men/hard men, free/slaves, Greek/Barbarian, Israelites/ Canaanites, Judeans/Galilean.[90]

Roman imperialism used the hierarchical function of self-mastery to interpret their conquest of other nations, theorizing that the conquered nations recognized their own inferiority and "willingly relinquished self-rule in order to be ruled by the Roman people [who had superior mastery of themselves]."[91] Therefore it was a tool to achieve a superior ethical lifestyle also a tool to intimidate people.[92]

Stowers argues that Paul like his other Jewish counterparts, namely, Philo and Josephus, considered "the law as the religious-social-political-legal constitution of the Jewish people, a basis both for the temple state in Judea and for the Jewish people in the diaspora which also contained universally applicable teachings."[93] By implication, the law is everything to the Jewish people and is also the "ideal constitution" for ethics and religion for the Gentile people.[94] Thus the perceived universal influence of the law gave made Judaism a superior religion with a superior school of self-mastery to which non-Jews could join in order to achieve self-control over immoral lifestyles.[95] Jews such as Philo interpreted Judaism as a philosophy and a school of self-mastery.

The Jewish concept of self-mastery was already evident in some apologetic works, for example in 4 Macc. 1:2–6, where "the highest virtue" is "rational judgment," which led to self-mastery over gluttony, lust, injustice, malice, anger, fear, and pain. Moreover, to be rational was to observe the Torah since it "teaches self-control [$\sigma\omega\phi\rho\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$, self-restraint or self-mastery] so that we master all pleasures and desires, and it also trains us in courage …"[96] Josephus stated that "Jewish tradition is marked by high ethical and religious ideals [in that] Jews came into conflict with Rome only when they had abandoned their traditions, and the result of their actions could have been predicted by anyone who understood their past."[97] He also added that it "is most profitable for all men, Greeks and barbarians alike, to practice justice, about which our laws are most concerned, and, if we sincerely abide by them, they make us well-disposed and friendly to all men" (*Ant*. 16.177). The ethical dimension of Josephus' comments showed an effort to invite all to achieve the desired moral life by means of the Jewish $\pi o\lambda\iota\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$.

Philo also used self-mastery in his apologetics addressed to the Gentiles. For example, he mentioned that "[t]he law holds that all who conform to the sacred constitution laid down by

Moses must exempt, then, from πάντὸς ἀλόγου πάθους ['every unreasoning passion'] and πάσης κακίας ['every vice'] in a higher degree than those who are governed by other laws …" (*Spec. Leg.* 4.55). This argues that Judaism as a school of self-mastery was superior to all others. He showed in *Virt.* 211–227 that Gentiles could also attain self-mastery through the Jewish ἱερὰ πολιτεία (sacred constitution), which was crafted after the νόμος ἔμψυχος (living law) and νόμος φύσεως (natural law) (*Abr.* 1–6). For example, although Tamar was ignoble (ill-born) because she was a non-Jew, which meant she had inferior parentage, she nevertheless attained an excellent life by her devotion to monotheism (*Virt.* 220–222). Such devotion is the basis for the Jewish constitution (πολιτεία). Jacob's concubines, Bilhah and Zilpah, also attained such an excellent life (*Virt.* 223–225). For Philo, those who emulated Abraham's life of excellence would attain self-mastery.[98]

Philo further stated that the lifestyle of the Israelites was another reason that made the Jewish school of self-mastery superior to others. He began with the religious leaders who must have attain self-mastery by meeting certain requirements.[99] Philo also observed that Moses trained the members of the sacred community of Israel in the "practice of self-control [ἐγκρατείας]" over what they ate and drank, and in the practice of curbing of excesses (*Spec. Leg.* 4.92–101).

Paul was also interested in the theme of self-mastery. For example, in Gal 5:23, Paul listed it (ἐγκράτεια) with other virtues. In 1 Cor. 7:9 as well, Christians who lacked self-control (οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται) over sex should marry. In 1 Cor. 9:25 it appeared in the context of athletes and the exercise of self-control (ἐγκρατεύεται). In Titus 1:8 the quality of (ἐγκρατῆ) appeared with the attributes δίκαιον (upright) and ὅσιον (pious, devout) in the context of the conduct of bishops in the church at Crete. Its opposite, ἀκρασία, (lack of self-mastery) appeared in 1 Cor. 7:5 in the context of sex and marriage. This theme of self-mastery also appeared in Romans, for example, in Paul's use of πάθη/πάθος (passion/emotion) and σωφροσύνη (moderation/restraint) in Rom 1:26, 7:5, 8:18, 12:3, and importantly in Rom 2–4 and 7, which was his discourse with his opponents in the letter.[100] Paul stated that in the case of those Gentiles who chose to worship created things instead of the Creator, God gave them over to their disgraceful passions (πάθη

ἀτιμίας) (Rom 1:26). He also blamed the flesh and the Law for arousing "our sinful passions" (παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν) (Rom 7:5).[101] In Rom 12:3, Paul called upon his readers to restrain (σωφρονεῖν) themselves by living according to the grace they received from God.

Some have identified Paul's opponent in Rom 2:17–29 as the Jewish people while others have identified the opponent with a specific, albeit a fictitious Jewish interlocutor.[102] I agree with the latter view because it resembles a typical diatribe of Greek philosophers and moralists such as Epictetus, Plautus, Maximus of Tyre, and Euphrates. For example, Plautus wrote about a pretentious person who boasted of what he or she did not possess; Epictetus and Maximus attacked those who wanted to be philosophers in name but not by principle.[103] Thus Stowers rightly noted that

> Paul was not a philosopher, and the Jew in 2:17–29 does not represent a teacher from some Hellenistic philosophy. Nevertheless, a combination of rhetorical forms and thematic motifs makes it clear that 2:17–29 parodies the philosophical teacher's admonishing censure of a pretentious would-be philosopher. Paul has created an interlocutor who is a fellow Jew and with whom he will conduct a diatribal dialogue. Although the particularity of the characterization in 2:17–29 stands out sharply, the echoes of philosopher-talk and of the pretentious would-be philosopher still break through.[104]

Prior to Paul's dialogue with a fictitious Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:17–29, he had already dialogued with a fictitious Gentile interlocutor in Rom 2:1–5, as he would also do in Rom 7, according to Stowers. The dialogue between Paul and his fictitious Jewish teacher did not end at 2:17–29 but went on to Rom 4:23.[105] The main question of the dialogue between Paul and his fictitious counterpart was: How could Gentiles master their immoral passions and become righteous before God? In response, Paul's fictitious Jew believed the Gentile Christians needed training in self-mastery by observing the law even while he had not mastered his own passions. Paul's reply to this Jew may be re-worded as thus: "How dare you possess the arrogance to teach Gentiles that they can obtain moral improvement through the law when you do not even keep the ethical teaching of the law yourself?"[106] So Paul continued his argument that both the Jews and the Gentiles were unrighteous (3:9–18) and have sinned (3:23). Then, he argued that the sacrifice of Christ is sufficient for all who believed (3:21–22, 24–30).

Therefore, a central point of self-mastery is the source of virtue. The Greco-Roman and the Judaic schools both taught that the fount of virtue was external and it was the duty of the 'self' to achieve self-mastery. The Judaic school, however, differed with the Greco-Roman ones on the grounds of the Jewish Scripture. As we shall see below, Paul viewed the fount of virtue as internal and self-mastery only achievable through Jesus Christ and the work of the Spirit.[107]

How Could Gentiles (Christians) Attain Self-Mastery (Romans 4)?

I will briefly analyse Rom 1:18–2:16 and 4:1–25 in order to understand Paul's argument on the better way for Gentile peoples to attain self-mastery. This analysis will also trace the origin of the concept of self-mastery in Paul's Roman epistle. In his *Rereading of Romans*, Stowers rightly traced the context of self-mastery in Paul's world but failed to trace its origin. I will argue that, according to Paul, since creation God created people and put in them the desire for self-mastery over ungodliness (Rom 1:18–2:16) and that Abraham was a model of self-mastery for the Gentiles (4:1–25). Stowers disagrees, however, mainly because of the absence of the following: Adam, the universal impact of the fall, and the natural law in Rom 1:18–3:20.[108]

Rom 1: 18–20 supported the need to trace the origin of self-mastery back to creation (this by implication includes Adam and Eve). This is logical for two reasons. First, Paul directed the entire section of Rom 1:18–32 towards Gentile peoples. These Gentiles were more associated with Adam than with Abraham (Luke 3:24–38). Second, ἀπό, "since," specified the point in time at which God revealed his eternal power and divinity to humankind: this time was creation. Paul introduced an oxymoron: God's revealed attributes were both ἀόρατα, "invisible," and καθορᾶται, "visible". This oxymoron displayed that God had already revealed everything that humankind needed in order to know Him through, not in, created things. Hence Paul argued that since the creation of the world, people knew God in their conscience (Rom 1:18); people knew God's divine nature and eternal power through nature (Rom 1:19–20); and people also knew God's truth (Rom 1:25) and His knowledge (Rom 1:28). However, according to Paul, God expected the Gentiles to know Him even though the knowledge that they had of God was limited.[109]

Therefore Paul conceded that the Gentiles did not receive a revelation of God as did the Jews (Rom 1:23, 25, 32), yet he argued that their limited knowledge of God should have led them to acknowledge God. Instead they were idolaters; they were corrupt in their minds and hearts; they were unable to control unnatural passions; and they were deep in every kind of wickedness, they regulated their conscience only to allow them to gratify their passions (Rom 1:18–32). Hence God gave them over to their evil desires and He was angry at them. Stowers rightly understood that state as a loss of self-mastery, but did not see the importance of (Rom 1:18–20 in) connecting self-mastery and its loss since the beginning of creation.[110] Paul's use of the aorist tense in Rom 1: 18–28 strongly supports my view that those who lost self-mastery were both in Paul's past and present.[111] We can postulate that since the creation of the world, God expected Adam and Eve to recognize Him as He is and to live by a certain rule (Gen 2:16–17, 3:1–7). But the events in the preceding Genesis 2:16–17, 3:1–7, drew attention to the need for self-mastery. Adam and Eve seemed to have mastered themselves well until they failed, when Eve could not resist the forbidden tree because it was pleasing to her (Gen 3:6). I think Paul's statement in Rom 1:32, in part, applies to both Adam and Eve since they knew God's righteous decree for self-mastery against their desire for the forbidden fruit and that there was a penalty for failure, yet they obeyed their passions.[112] Moreover, after the fall, God expected people to curb unnatural passions and corruption in their minds and hearts by recognizing God alone. In Gen 4:7, God cautioned Cain before he killed Abel to תִּמְשָׁל-בּוֹ (rule over his passion). So Cain must watch "the dangerous potentialities inherent in his present mood. The underlying idea is that man is endowed with moral autonomy, with freedom of choice. He can subdue his primitive passions by an act of will; otherwise, they will control him."[113]

According to our brief discussion of self-mastery in the Greco-Roman world, the Roman Empire demanded self-mastery of people by deciding how they lived. For example, the empire saw itself as self-mastered and superior to those they had conquered. So the empire helped those they conquered to attain self-mastery by controlling them. Rome was not always successful in getting them to live by Roman ideals, but it still exercised some level of influence in, for example, Palestine and Alexandria. The Greeks had done the same and were more successful with their scheme (Hellenism) than the Romans. I am not claiming that the Romans

attempted to Latinize the Hellenized world, but that Romans used self-mastery as a tool to dominate people they conquered or wanted to. I think if we can agree that the goal of every world power prior to the Romans was world domination (this includes the Greek scheme of Hellenism), then we can see that the Roman Empire was no any different. However we can postulate that, just as every other world power prior to the Romans, the Romans also employed a scheme to compliment the Hellenistic ideals they took over.

Why did God hand the Gentiles over to their evil minds and hearts? It was probably for their reformation.[114] Paul stated that not all Gentiles neglected the evidence of nature and conscience, even though they had limited revelation. We see in Romans 2 that some Gentiles used their conscience and nature as effective means to acknowledge God and to do His demands. My focus in Romans 2 is on verses 12–16 where, although Paul's main target was the Gentiles, the fictitious Jew was his "hidden target."[115]

I agree with Stowers that Rom 2:12 is better understood God's impartial judgment; the reward of both Jews and Gentiles will be based on living according to the Law because this reading agrees with vv. 14–16.[116] This is against Moo's understanding of the same v. 12, in which he sees as universal human sinfulness because he connects his reading with Rom 3:23.[117] Verse 12 argues that all people will not be judged by the standard they have not known but by the standard they have known. God would judge the Jews according to the standard of the Mosaic Law, and agreeing with rabbinic teaching, Paul stressed that the chief goal was obeying the Law and not teaching it or listening to it (v. 13, Mishnah Tractate, *Aboth* 1:17). Thus, in theory, Paul agrees with Judaism that justification was possible by Law, but disagrees that doing the Law perfectly was possible due to the power of sin.[118] However, the Gentiles would be judged not according to the Mosaic Law but by the moral law written on their hearts (vv. 14–15). By a different standard, the Gentiles were also able to do what the Law demanded. Paul used φύσις, "natural characteristic," to show the means by which some Gentiles were able to keep the demands of the Mosaic Law. Some of these Gentiles could probably be among those whom God had given over to their evil passions in Rom 1:24, 26, and 28 for reformation. If so, then Cranfield's view as stated above is vital for understanding how some of the Gentiles in 2:14–15

were able to have observed the Mosaic Law even without it. Those Gentiles were able to regain the self-mastery they had lost since it was a *natural endowment* but was lost and then regained. If not, then I could argue that those Gentiles mentioned in vv. 14–15 did not fall under the category of those who had lost their self-mastery (Rom 1:24, 26, 28), but were among those who had never lost it.

There is an interesting similarity between Paul's statement that the Gentiles "are a law to themselves" (v. 14) and Philo's statement that Abraham was "himself a law" (*Abr.* 276). It seems to me that both Philo and Paul used Abraham and the Gentiles, respectively, in the context of embodying the teaching of the Mosaic Law. However, Philo believed that the virtuous life of Abraham and others like him were consistent with the written Law. Paul saw the Gentiles embodying the Law in the context of their need for a new form of self-mastery that would enable them to do what the Law required not by nature but by the Spirit residing in them (Rom 8:4). Therefore Paul did not say that those Gentiles lived a perfect life, because they were still under the tyranny of sin. This also shows that the Law is not able to justify the Gentiles, a theme Paul will later return to in Rom 4.

The origin of self-mastery can be traced back to the creation of the world and the endowed moral autonomy. Originally, self-mastery helped humankind recognize God and respond to Him in obedience. Later, it was needed to curb all manner of ungodliness. The Greco-Romans understood the self to be able to control both the self and others who were unable to control themselves. Paul understood self-mastery as a means to acknowledge God and to treat people in a way that was pleasing to God (Rom 1:18–2:3).[119] For Paul, at this point in Romans and later on, justification by faith and life in the Spirit had become the key for self-mastery.

With the aim of arguing that Paul's Abraham was a model of faith for non-Jews, I will turn my attention to Rom 4. The fictitious Jewish teacher must have been shocked to hear Paul's view on the law (2: 17–24) (specifically circumcision, 2:25–29) and must have been scandalized by his statement that the Jews are not any better than the Gentiles (Rom 3:9–20) and that God will accept all by faith in Christ (3:21–22, 24–30). Paul then imagined his opponent arguing that if Abraham, a Gentile, was justified by his works, why should the process be any different for

Paul's Roman Gentile Christians (4:2)? Paul replied that his teaching on justification by faith alone was not new; rather, it "has been promised before [προεπηγγείλατο and] "has been attested [μαρτυρουμένη]" (Rom 1:2; 3:21; Gal 3:8). Paul demonstrated this by arguing that Abraham was justified by faith without works. He is the father of all those who believed, both Jews and Gentiles. Therefore, Paul's means for achieving self-mastery was different from the one's taught by his opponent. Paul discussed three aspects of Abraham's life. He argued that Abraham was not justified by his good works (4:1-8), circumcision (4:9-12), and the law (4:13–17); rather, Abraham was justified by faith alone (4:17–22) and became a model of faith for Gentiles (4:23–25).

4.3.2.1:1: Abraham was not Justified by his Good Works (4:1–8):

Origen stated that Paul wanted to show two different means of justification, namely, by works and by faith.[120] There are several Jewish sources that portrayed Abraham as someone who observed God's commandments.[121] They understood Abraham's faith or trust in God in Gen 15:6 in the light of Gen 22; for them, his faith was an act of faithfulness or obedience. That is Abraham's faith was a work. Thus the fictitious Jewish teacher had argued that Abraham was justified by works (Rom 4:2). Paul appealed to the same Gen 15:6 but arrived at a different conclusion, namely, "Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness." The relationship between "faith" and "righteousness" in Rom 4:3 did not mean that God saw Abraham's faith as an act of righteousness, rather that God credited to Abraham "a righteousness that does not inherently belong to him."[122] To "credit," ἐλογίσθη, is a financial metaphor meaning "to reckon to one's account. In the language of an accountant the word means 'to enter in the account book.'"[123] Paul also uses the language of financial transaction (μισθός and λογίζεται, *wages* and *crediting*) to argue that the endowed righteousness is not μισθὸς … κατὰ ὀφείλημα (wages … by debt), which is works, but κατὰ χάριν (by grace) (Rom 4:4-5). Paul interpreted Ps 32:1–2 to mean that David also understood that justification is not by works but by faith. Theodoret of Cyrrhus noted that after Paul had established that Abraham's faith was older than his works, he "quotes a further witness in support of his position, viz., David the prophet and king."[124] Moreover, the Psalm's passage underlines a vital part of Paul's

justification by faith, namely, forgiveness of sin as the basis through which God credited righteousness to the forgiven.[125]

4.3.2.1:2: Abraham was not Justified by Circumcision (4:9–12)

Bray comments that "Paul returns to his theme, that the blessing of faith is given apart from circumcision. The Fathers all echo him in this and merely reinforce what the apostle says about Abraham. Gentiles are invited to receive the blessings of Abraham, the father of all faithful."[126] For example, in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Origen commented that "[i]f Abraham was justified before he was circumcised, then it is possible for anyone who believes in God to be justified by faith, even if uncircumcised."[127] Origen highlighted Paul's conviction about the place of Gentile believers in the commonwealth of Abraham in v. 9. This conviction negated exclusive claims such as in v. 1 that Abraham was the father of the Jews. Rather it expanded the commonwealth of Abraham to also include all who are justified by faith (3:29–30).

The heart of the matter in this section is that Abraham was not justified by circumcision, and Paul had already stated that it was not a condition for justification (3:29–30). This makes sense because God's forgiveness was the condition, and justification was not restricted but open to all whom the Lord had forgiven, both Jews and Gentiles (Ps 32:1–2), Abraham being the prime example in Gen 15:6. Paul further argued in vv. 10–11 that Abraham's circumcision in Gen 17:10ff occurred after he was already credited as being righteous (Gen 15:6).[128] Thus this also showed that Abraham's faith was older than his circumcision. The selection and arrangement, or ordering, of historical events is one of White's significant insights. Paul used the ordering of the events to support his argument, namely, that Abraham believed God before he was circumcised, and so faith in Christ was all that the Gentile people (believers) needed. This sequence of events was instrumental for Paul in achieving some of his goals for retelling these events about Abraham to the Roman believers.

The question now becomes: if Abraham was not justified by circumcision and it was not a condition for justification, then why was circumcision required? Tertullian answered that Abraham "had accepted circumcision as a sign for that time, not as a prerogative title to salvation."[129] Ambrosiaster said circumcision is "a sign of the righteousness of faith … The

children of Abraham received this sign so that it would be known that they were the children of him who had received this sign because he believed in God and so that they would imitate their father's faith …"[130] In this way, Paul argued that whether they be Jews or Gentiles, God would deal with people on the same basis, namely, faith in God alone without works and circumcision (4:3–12).[131] Faith was therefore enough to admit people into the commonwealth of Abraham.[132] Faith in God is not passive but active; hence it must show in one's actions. Paul's aim was not to devalue circumcision,[133] or to devalue the Jewish contingent in that commonwealth, but rather to show that emulating the faith of Abraham was a condition for becoming his true children.[134] Similarly, Philo had already said that a noble Jew was one who emulated the virtuous life of Abraham. This means that Abraham's descendants were those who were living a virtuous life as di Abraham did (*Virt* 187–197).[135]

4.3.2.1:3: Abraham was not Justified by the Mosaic Law (4:13–17)

Paul also argued that Abraham was not justified because he observed the Law – a point that he already made in 3:20. Dunn calls it *coup de grace*, which opposed the proposition that people could be justified by observing the Law.[136] The Law does not only help people know of sin, it also "… encourages people to perform good works, entices them to seek to determine their own destiny and to 'boast' in their accomplishments."[137] The law had built a wall between Jews and non-Jews, but grace destroyed the wall (vv. 13–16). In his *Commentary on Romans*, Pelagius commented: "The Law does not forgive sins but condemns them, and therefore it cannot make all nations children of Abraham … But faith makes all believers children of Abraham, because their sins have been forgiven by grace.[138] Paul supported this argument of a universal Abraham by virtue of Gen 17:5. Elsewhere Paul also used the ordering of biblical events to argue that the Law was introduced 430 years after Abraham was justified by faith, and therefore Abraham could not have been justified by Law (Gal 3:17).

4.3.2.1:4: Abraham was Justified by Faith Alone (4:17–22)

According to Paul, justification was by faith since Abraham believed God's promise that he would have numerous descendants through his son, Isaac (v. 17). There are three significant characteristics of the faith of Abraham. Firstly, it was a faith against all hope; yet Abraham

believed that he would become the ancestors of many nations (v. 18).[139] The faith of Abraham was "characterized by uncertainty and fear of the unknown future, [yet his] faith was a firm confidence in God as the one who determines the future according to what he has promised."[140] Secondly, notwithstanding the staggering odds against his belief in God's promise, his faith did not weaken even when he had become physically weak (v. 19).[141] Pelagius again remarked that: "Faith takes no aspect of nature into account, because it knows that the one who spoke is almighty."[142] Thirdly, the faith of Abraham grew stronger despite the daunting evidence against it (v. 20).[143]

This discussion of Abraham's justification simply returned to the discussion Paul's opening statement that Scripture attested such a position. Paul concluded his interpretation of the selected events about Abraham by portraying him as a model of faith for the Gentiles (Rom 4:23–25). His exegesis of the Abraham narrative taught Gentiles (Christians) about the foundation by which they could attain self-mastery, namely, faith in Christ whom Paul had revealed elsewhere as the seed of Abraham. If Gentiles responded to Christ by faith, God would give them the firstfruit of their salvation: the Holy Spirit.[144]

3.4: Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined Paul's use of his primary source (Gen 12:12–13, 15, 17–18, 22, 24) and the result shows a varying degree of dependence on the source. White's insights also helped to re-present Paul's argument.

Several Jewish sources have portrayed Abraham as the father of the Jews alone.[145] As a model for the proselytes, Paul's Abraham could easily be understood as the model for both the Galatian and Roman Gentile believers. However, he is a model by his faith and not his works. Paul interpreted all the events he selected from Abraham's life to retell in Gal 3–4 and Rom. 4 to argue for the inclusion of Gentile believers as part of Abraham's descendants. Therefore, Paul's reconfiguration of the commonwealth of Abraham was a universal one.

[1] Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination*; *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*; Oegema, *Early Judaism & Modern Culture*, 24–37. See also Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. In Pauline studies, the "intertextual approach" focuses on Paul's reading and misreading or re-reading of Israelite Scripture.

[2] Oegema, "Biblical Interpretation of Paul", 272.

[3] Evans, "'It is not as Though the Word of God had Failed,'" 13; Hays, "*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul:* Abstract," 42–3.

[4] Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*"; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul,* 95, 155-9, 176; Stendahl, *Final Account*, 24–6; Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*.

[5] Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination*, 143.

[6] Ibid: 143–63.

[7] Oegema, *Early Judaism & Modern Culture*, 24, 27.

[8] Ibid., 37.

[9] Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint (Vol. 1: Genesis–IV Kings)*.

[10] I think there is an allusion to Gen 15:6 in Sirach 44:20 and Mishnah Nedarin 3:11.

[11] I consider this as an allusion or an echo of Gen 21:8; 25:5–6 because Paul is pointing to the incapacity of the heir to take control of his rightful estate prior to his guardianship. The above Genesis texts reported that there was a time when the heir, namely, Isaac, was weaned and also when Abraham handed over everything to him.

[12] Oegema, *Early Judaism & Modern Culture*, 37.

[13] Wilson, *Pauline Parallels*, ix.

[14] Ibid., x.

[15] Ibid., 267-8.

[16] Paul was silent as to what caused the "deadness" in Sarah's womb. Other possible causes could be a curse (Gen 20:17–18) or a certain illness (Deut. 7:14–15). Childlessness may also be interpreted as some form of disability. See, Baden, "The Nature of Barrenness in the Hebrew Bible," 13–28.

[17] *Romans 1–8*, 220.

[18] However we do not know how the Galatians responded to Paul's harsh admonition to return to justification by faith in Christ alone.

[19] I think, that for Paul, those events he chose and retold were the heart of the entire data on Abraham at his disposal. This implies that the reasons for the entire events concerning Abraham are revealed in Paul's reasons for retelling those chosen events relating to Abraham.

[20] A παιδαγωγός is a "custodian, male nursemaid. He was a slave employed in … Greek and Roman families to have a general charge of a boy in the years from 6 to 16, watching over his outward behavior and attending [to] him whenever he [the boy] went home, as for example to school" (Rienecker, 510).

[21] Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles*; Segal, *Paul the Convert*.

[22] Stowers argues that there is no agitator in Romans, hence he puts forward an imaginary interlocutor code name "Teacher of Gentiles" whom he refers to elsewhere as "a Jewish teacher," see *Rereading of Romans*, 15, 28–44, 231, 234, 246–9.

[23] Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*, 136-142; Stowers, 227–50; Eisenbaum, "Paul as the New Abraham," 136–8.

[24] Eisenbaum identified the following scholars as some of those in the congruous group: John Gager, Lloyd Gaston, and Mark Nanos; and their opposite includes the following: E.P Sanders, Francis Watson, and Stephen Westerholm; while scholars who occupied a somewhat in-between position include: James Dunn and N.T. Wright ("Paul as the New Abraham," 130–1).

[25] Barcley, "The Land and the Promise," 141.

[26] Ibid. The Qumran fragment, 4QMMT, sheds more light on such a Jewish mindset in Galatians (M. G. Abegg Jr., "4QMMT, Paul, and 'works of the law'," 203–16.

[27] Nanos, "The Inter–and Intra–Jewish Political Context of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," 146.

[28] *Grace in Galatia*, 21–4.

[29] Nanos, "The Inter–and Intra–Jewish Political Context of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," 153.

[30] The proselyte evangelists have every reason to evangelize the Galatian congregations, because "having previously been accorded the status of righteous Gentiles by the Synagogue, they have a vested interest in

guarding and facilitating the ritual process that negotiates hierarchical distinctions between righteous Gentiles and proselytes. Ritual circumcision defines their sense of self- and group identity; it governs their social interaction; it defines their social reality and political worldview. They can empathize with the liminal situation of the addressees but not with their outlandish claim to have acquired already the equality of status that accords with proselyte conversion" (Nanos, 157).

[31] de Boer, *Galatians*, 399. The dominant view understands the opponents (and those referred to in 6:13) as Jewish Christians (ibid.; Nanos, 152; Barcley, 140; Martyn, 120–1; Witherington III, 448–9.

[32] Nanos, 157.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., 156.

[35] Ibid. It is not clear whether Paul had told them that they would be accepted into the community of the righteous because of their faith in Christ or whether they (mis)understood Paul to have said so (ibid., 149).

[36] This is the view of Nanos, 152, but for a contrary argument see de Boer, *Galatians*, 50–61; Martyn, *Galatians*, 120–6.

[37] Stendahl. *Paul among the Jews the Gentiles*, 1–6.

[38] Ibid., 7.

[39] Eisenbaum, "Paul as the New Abraham," 130.

[40] Although Paul's Christianity does not generally agree with Judaism, for example, the place of the Law in Paul's new community whose majority were Gentile believers in Christ.

[41] Segal. *Paul the Convert*, 266ff.

[42] Ibid., 187–223.

[43] See especially Isai 6:9. The phrase "this people" has already appeared in 1:3, 2:6, 3:12,15, 5:13,25 and later in 8:6,11. It is used in reference to Israel, except in a negative sense: they will "hear continually, yet gain no insight, and see unceasingly, but do not achieve understanding" (Isai 6:9), see, Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 248.

[44] Isai 49:6 presents two scopes of redemption/salvation, namely, for the tribes of Jacob and the nations. God does not only expect his Servant to be the means that ushers in the reign of God or God's salvation, but also the Servant is himself the salvation that both the tribes of Jacob and the nations of the earth need. Therefore Brevard S. Childs notes that although the Servant is tasked with the responsibility of restoring the tribes of Jacob, this is only the least important part of his mission. The climax of his mission is to be light to the nations (*Isaiah*, 358. Luke reports in Acts 13:47 that Barnabas and Paul quoted from Isai. 49:6 during their missionary activity.

[45] The "nations" and "realms" or Kingdoms refer to both Judah and its surrounding neighbours such as Edom, Philistia, Moab, and Ammon. For further discussion see Allen, *Jeremiah*, 27–8. The reference to the realms or kingdom of the north (1:14) is not to the Northern tribes of Israel because they were already taken into captivity by the Assyrians long before Jeremiah was born.

[46] See especially Acts 22:14. This account changes the Ananias from a devout Jesus disciple in Acts 9 to a devout Jew understandably because Paul was before Palestinian Jewish religious authority and plausibly so that to argue that Paul's call was by divine election. So whatever Paul does, it was divinely sanctioned.

[47] See especially Gal 1:15. The nature of Paul's call by divine election is well stressed here. It is plausible that Luke knew of Paul's Galatian letter and so might have adapted and retold Gal 1:14–15 in Acts 22:14.

[48] Acts 18:5–6 says that the Jews opposed Paul's revelatory message and so he turned his attention fully to the Gentiles. Therefore although his audience was the whole world (see also Acts 22:4–16), it later shrank to focus only on the Gentiles.

[49] It appears here that Paul was sent primarily to the Gentile people, but he states that in response to his commission, he preached first in Damascus, then in Jerusalem, Judea, and to the Gentile people (Acts 26:19–20).

[50] Eisenbaum, "Paul as the New Abraham," 133.

[51] Ibid., 135–6.

[52] Barcley, "The Law and the Promise," 144–5.

[53] Ibid., 146.

[54] "Paul as the New Abraham," 136.

[55] Ibid., 142–3. Philo had already noted that biology, noble birth, and having virtuous ancestors do not guarantee nobility and virtues (*Virt*. 187–197). Although Isaac had a virtuous father, Abraham, he still needed to

live as his father had (*Virt*. 206–210). Lastly, some with inferior ancestry such as Tamar, Bilhah, and Zilpah, ascended the ladder of honour because they learned from the virtuous to live a life of nobility (*Virt*. 220–225).

[56] "Introduction," 88. It is reasonable that this figure should not only apply to the capital city, Rome, but to the entire Roman Empire.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid., 88–9; P. Garnsey & R. Saller, "Patronal Power Relations," 97–8.

[59] Ibid., 96.

[60] Ibid., 99. Thus, the patron could give the clients food or money or even invite him to dinner (ibid).

[61] Garnsey and Saller noted that the emperor sometimes "distributed his benefits individually to those who had access to him and, more broadly, to favored groups, notably the Roman plebs and army" (ibid., 98). The emperor also showed appreciation to aristocrats in Rome in return for their support and loyalty by providing them with resources to help their clients. For example, at Pliny's request, the Emperor Trajan granted offices and citizenship to some of Pliny's clients. Garnsey and Saller also observed that this made Pliny an "effective mediator" between the emperor and those clients (ibid., 98–9). This makes me disagree with Garnsey and Saller that the emperors "did not and could not monopolize patronage. They did not attempt to be universal patrons to all their subject …" (ibid., 98). However, since they offered resources to aristocratic houses in Rome to offer to their clients, I think that this strengthened their hold on the empire. However, unless if the aristocratic houses gave these gifts to their clients without telling them where they came from, which is highly unlikely considering Pliny's role of mediation between the emperors and the people. Therefore, I think that it is plausible to say that it was a way to monopolize the system, except that it went as wide as the emperors' resources could reach and as steady as their generosity continued through their intermediaries.

[62] Ibid., 98.

[63] Ibid., 97.

[64] Horsley, 93; Garnsey & Saller, 100.

[65] J. K. Chow, "Patronage in Roman Corinth," 104–5.

[66] Bowersock, "Foreign Elites at Rome," 54.

[67] For other prominent names see ibid., 57.

[68] Ibid., 55–6.

[69] Ibid., 54–60.

[70] Ibid., 56.

[71] Ibid., 54.

[72] Ibid., 54, 60.

[73] De Boer, *Galatians*, 180 cf. Martyn, *Galatians, 285*; Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia*, 214–5; Barckley, 141.

[74] The goal in question is to be at peace with God or salvation (ibid).

[75] Borgen. *Philo, John, and Paul*, 255–72; Martyn, 476–7; De Boer, 322–3. See also Witherington III discussion on the debate (372–4).

[76] De Boer, 284–5; Martyn, 430–1.

[77] There are scholars who do not see continuity in Paul's argument from Romans 3:21 to 4:25. However there are scholars who argued for continuation. For example, Oda Wischmeyer, "The Letter to the Romans." Dunn would rather treat Romans 3:21 to 5:21 as a unit, while Stowers treated 3:21-26 independent of 3:27–5:11. I am in favour of treating them as a unit because, on the one hand, Paul has argued that God has shown his anger against all ungodliness (Romans 1:18 to 3:20) and, on the other, that God has revealed his righteousness through Christ Jesus without the Mosaic Law (3:21–31). To support his argument, Paul presented the patriarch Abraham as a test case and argued that Abraham was justified neither by practicing circumcision (4:9–12) nor by observing the law (4:13–17) but by believing God (4: 18–23). The implication that Paul drew from 4:1–23 was that, to all those who believe in Christ, God will credit righteousness (4:24–25). Paul has already mentioned that Christ was the ἱλαστήριον whose shed blood brought redemption (3:24–25), plausibly pointing to his sacrifice. Stowers does not see the logic of sacrifice in Romans 3:21-26 (*Rereading Romans*, 206–13). Now Paul stated that the God who Abraham believed also raised Christ from the dead (4:24). Paul concluded with Christ's death and resurrection (4:25).

[78] C. E. Glad, "Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy: Philodemus and Paul."

[79] *Rereading of Romans*, 1.

[80] Ibid., 229.

[81] Ibid., 228–9.

[82] Ibid., 194, 229. Scholars have understood the meaning of the phrase διά πίστεως Ἰησου Χριστου as either subjective genitive to mean "through faith or faithfulness of Jesus Christ" or objective genitive to mean "through faith or faithfulness in Jesus Christ." Most Bible translations and commentators interpreted the phrase as objective genitive but over the last three decades there are commentators who have would rather translate the phrase as subjective genitive (Stowers, *Romans*, 194 n 1). Moo notes that "[t]this alternative is particularly attractive because it removes what otherwise seems to be a needless repetition … This idea is theologically acceptable, and Paul does not use the noun *pistis* to refer to God's faithfulness... In the present context Paul consistently uses *pistis* to denote the response of believers to God (see, e.g., 3:25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31; also throughout ch. 4). Moreover, [since Paul never makes] Jesus the subject of the verb *pisteuo* (believe, entrust); this makes it difficult to think that *Iesou Christou* is a subjective genitive" (*Romans*), 127.

[83] Paul used Abraham (whom the Jews viewed as the archetype of the devout Jew who showed his devotion to God by keeping the covenant and the law and who was reckoned righteous) in his polemic against his opponents who taught works against faith alone (Moo, *Romans*, 256; Dunn, *Romans*, 196–7). Even if Abraham was below the standard of God, the Jews still revered him as did Paul who used him to show to his interlocutor and his readers that Abraham was a model of faith against works. However, it is also true that Abraham was more than just a model of faith for the Gentiles believers; I have already shown in this chapter that he was more than a model of faith for the Gentiles: he was their spiritual ancestor.

[84] S.K. Stowers "Paul and Self-Mastery," 524.

[85] Ibid., 525.

[86] Xenophon commented that Socrates self-mastered (he was ἐγκρατέστατος) "sexual desire and the stomach … and possessed the most endurance of cold and heat and every sort of toil; and regarding needs, he was trained in moderation so that he was content with very little" (*Memorabilia* 1.2.1).

[87] "Minor Socrates," 127–8.

[88] Stowers, "Paul and Self-Mastery," 525, 6-7. Medea confessed to a similar helplessness in the following words: "I realize what I am about to do is evil, but passion is stronger than my reasoned reflection; this is the cause of the worst evils for humans" (Euripedes, 1077–80). Christopher Gill translated the same text as: "I know that what I am about to do is bad, but anger is master of my plans, which is the source of human beings' greatest troubles" (ibid., 525).

[89] Ibid., 530. There is a similar concept of hierarchy in Philo's *de Abrahamo*, in which Abraham is portrayed as someone of higher mind who lived by the natural law in contrast to Lot and Hagar.

[90] Ibid.

[91] Ibid. Stowers also observed that Augustus used the same method to send messages to other nations not yet under Roman imperialism to submit to their self-mastered superior (ibid., 531).

[92] Moreover the "ethic of self-mastery" in the context of intimidation, subordination, and control shows that "'natural use of the female' means that a male penetrates a female in an act that signified the subordination of the woman and control by the man over her" (Stowers, *Romans*, 94–5).

[93] *Rereading Romans*, 35.

[94] Ibid., 36.

[95] Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 65. The Jewish school for self-mastery is superior to other schools of self-mastery, for example, the Stoics'.

There seems to be at least a similarity between the Jewish school for self-mastery and that of the Greco-Roman discussed above. For example, the fact that the Gentiles' people must observe the "ideal constitution", Jewish law, to become moral and religious before the Jewish community suggests a system of hierarchy/class and intimidation. The buying and selling in the Gentile's court of the temple suggests a class system in Judaism of this period (Matthew 21:12–17; Mark 11:15–19; Luke 19:45–48; John 2:13–22).

[96] 4 Macc. 5:23 see also vv. 22–24; *Ag. Ap.* 1.8; *Ant*. 3.13, 65; 4.42; 4.329–31; 6.346; 7.390–1. In the Medieval period, R. Judah Ha-Levi maintained the superiority of Judaism over other religions and that only adherents of Judaism could observe the demands of the Mosaic Law, which is the only means that a person can receive favour from God (*The Kurzan*).

[97] Borgen, "Josephus and his Works," 225.

[98] To Philo, Abraham was "the standard of nobility for all proselytes, who, abandoning the ignobility of strange laws and monstrous customs which assigned divine honours to stocks and stones and soulless things in general, have come to settle in a better land, in a commonwealth full of true life and vitality, with truth as its director and president" (*Virt.* 219). So through Abraham Gentiles could join the Jewish school for self-mastery.

[99] For example, the officiating priest must not "drink wine or any intoxicant" because of its consequences, which include "slackness" and "foolish behaviour" (*Spec.* 98). This demand must be observed because it is severer to offend God than man (*Spec.* 100). The high priest must marry a virgin from a highly distinguished family, for reasons including holy seed and the character development of his virgin wife (*Spec.* 105).

[100] Stowers discussed the concept of self-mastery in Galatian, see *Rereading*, 71–4. Stowers "Paul and Self-Mastery", 534.

[101] In Rom 8:18, $\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ is translated as "suffering" in order to compare the present situation with the future. $\Pi\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ may also be rendered as "emotions, affections" to give the meaning of "passion." By implication, the comparison may mean that the present sacrifice to attain self-mastery through the Spirit does not compare with the glory to be revealed to those who went through the process.

[102] Stowers, *Rereading*, 66–74, 143–53; Gager, *Reinventing Paul,* 101–26.

[103] Ibid., 144–7. Therefore for the Greek moralists and philosophers, "[t]he true philosopher brings honor upon his profession by being a living example of what he teaches" (ibid., 147).

[104] Ibid., 147–8.

[105] Ibid., 145, 149–50.

[106] Ibid: 66. For Stowers's analysis of the dialogue between Paul and his invented interlocutor in Romans 2:17–3:8 see *Rereading Romans*, 159–75.

[107] Jeremiah 31:33 seems not to change my view that the fount of virtue for Judaism is external because, although one interpretation of the text is that God would plant his Law within the people "so that obedience becomes natural," another interpretation is that of "a renewal of worship in the temple" (Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, 198–9. Holladay implied that the second view was necessary because of the phrasal ambiguity between "within them" and "on their heart" (ibid). Moreover the Jeremiah passage is the *haftarah* that accompanied Ex. 34:27.

[108] *Reading Romans*, 83–125.

[109] Moo, *Romans*, 105–8.

[110] *Rereading Romans*, 94.

[111] Moo commented that the use of aorist tense in Rom 1:19b–28 included people in both the past generation and in Paul's present (*Romans*, 123).

[112] Romans 1:32 says "although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them."

[113] Sarna, *Genesis*, 33. The Greek version rendered תִּמְשָׁל-בּוֹ as σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτοῦ.

[114] The meaning of "God delivered them up" (Rom 1:24, 26, 28) is that "God deliberately allowed them to go their own way in order that they might learn to hate the futility of a life turn away from the truth of God. It was an act of God's judgement and mercy, who smites in order to heal (Isa 19:22); and throughout the time of their God-forsakenness, God is still concerned with them and dealing with them" (Cranfield, *Romans*), 34.

[115] Moo. *Romans*, 128. The same is true for the entire Rom 2:1–16.

[116] Stowers. *Rereading Romans*. 138–42. Stott commented that "Jews and Gentiles appears to differ fundamentally from one another, in that the Jews *hear the law* (13), possessing it and listening to it being read in the synagogue every Sabbath day, whereas the Gentiles *do not have the law* (14). It was neither revealed to them nor given them. Nevertheless, Paul insists, this difference can be exaggerated. For there is no fundamental distinction between them in the moral knowledge they have … or in the sin they have committed …, or in the guilt they have incurred, or in the judgment they will receive" (*Romans*, 85).

[117] Moo, *Romans*, 146–7.

[118] Ibid., 155.

[119] See Stowers, *Reading Romans*, 141.

[120] *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Romans*, 109.

[121] Gen 26:5; *Jub* 16.28; 24.11; *2 Bar.* 57.1–2; *m. Qidd*. 4.14; CD 3.2.

[122] Moo. *Romans*, 262.

[123] Rienecke, *Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament*, 357.

[124] *Romans*, 113.

[125] Moo, 266; Dunn, 206–7.

[126] *Romans*, 114.

[127] Ibid., 115.

[128] E.P. Sanders commented that "[i]t is completely wrong, however, when it [circumcision] is made an essential requirement for membership [in the commonwealth of Abraham]" (*Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983), 20; Fee, "Who are Abraham's True Children? The Role of Abraham in Pauline Argumentation," 133ff.

[129] Bray, 115.

[130] Ibid., 115–6.

[131] Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 34.

[132] Moo, 267.

[133] Stowers, 244.

[134] Dunn, *Romans*, 210–1.

[135] Fee also shared the same conviction in his understanding of Gal 3:23–29 (Fee, "Who are Abraham's True Children? The Role of Abraham in Pauline Argumentation" in *Perspective*), 130–1.

[136] *Romans*, 158.

[137] Moo, 210.

[138] Bray, 120.

[139] Ibid., 122.

[140] Dunn, 219.

[141] Moo: 283. How should we understand his lie about his relationship with Sarah when they were in Egypt? See Moo, *Romans*, 200, 283.

[142] Bray, 123.

[143] "Faith is strong precisely because it looks solely to God and does not depend on human possibilities … It is not that faith ignores or denies the historical realities … By implication faith is weak when it allows itself to be determined by or depend upon what lies within human power" (Dunn, *Romans*, 220).

[144] Acts 1:8; 2:1–3; Rom 5:5; 8; 2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13–14; 4:30.

[145] The rabbis understood Abraham's faith/believe in Gen 15:6 as faithfulness to mean Abraham obeyed "… the whole Law before it was given" (*Mishnah Qiddusin* 4.14). Genesis 26:4–5 ("… because Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws") might have been utilized to support such a claim (Dunn, 200). There are other sources for such claim, for example, CD 3.2; *Jub* 16.28; 24.11.

Chapter 5:

Juxtaposition of Philo's and Paul's Retelling of the Abraham Narrative

This chapter will juxtapose and analyse Philo's and Paul's retelling of the Abraham narrative, beginning with Philo's and Paul's use of their primary sources. To expand on my earlier analyses of Philo and Paul, this comparison will focus on the following key aspects: I will compare some of Philo's and Paul's interpretations of the Abraham narrative; I will compare White's theory on the production of history as described earlier, to Philo's and Paul's retelling of the narrative; and I will compare what we learned from their goals for retelling the Abraham narrative and what we learned about their audiences.

5.1: Philo's and Paul's Use of their Primary Sources in Retelling Some Events in the Abraham Narrative

For his primary sources, Philo drew mostly on Genesis 11–25 s well as Jewish traditions[1] while Paul relied almost entirely on Genesis. I provide below a table for Philo's and Paul's use of their primary source.

Primary Source (Genesis 11:26–25:11)	Philo (*De Abrahamo*)	Galatians (Chaps 3–4)	Romans (Chap 4)
Born: 11:26			
Married Sarai: 11:29	93		
Migration: 11:31	60–88		
Call and blessing: 12:1–5; 18:18–19; 22:18	60–77	3:8	
Promise to the seed: 12:7; 13:15; 15:5; 24:7		3:16	4:18
Went to Egypt: 12:10–20	89–98		
Separated from Lot: 13:7–11	208–216		
Rescued Lot: 14:13–16	225–235		
Abram believed God: 15:6, 22	262	3:6	4:3
God's covenant with Abram: 15:18			

Hagar, an Egyptian slave: 16:1[2]	251	4:22–25	
Abraham and Hagar: 16:1–4	247–254[3]		
Ishmael was born to Abram: 16:15–16[4]	254	4:22–25	
Abram to be father of many nations: 17:5			4:17
Covenant of circumcision: 17:10–11, 24			4:11
Sarah's barrenness: 17:17; 18:11	247–250		4:19
Abram entertained angels: 18:1–21	107–118, 142–246		
(Sin of) Sod. and Gom.: 18:20–21; 19:1–11	133–141		
Abram interceded for Sodom: 18:22–33			
Kinship marriage revealed: 20:12[5]			
Isaac, the heir, is born: 21:1; 25:5–6	132, 167–168	4:23	
Isaac was weaned: 21:8; 25:5–6		4:1–2	
Hagar and Sarah (conflict): 21:9		4:22	
Banishment of Hagar and Ishmael: 21:9–21		4:30	
Abraham to sacrifice Isaac: 22:1–14[6]	170–199		
Sarah's death and burial: 23	255–261		
Abraham married Keturah: 25:1–6			
Death of Abraham: 25:7–10			

Philo portrayed Hagar as "outwardly a slave, inwardly of free and noble race … an Egyptian by birth, but a Hebrew by her rule of life" (*Abr*. 251),[7] which is notable because Philo disliked the Egyptians. Paul, by contrast, had Hagar and Ishmael symbolize the covenant made at Mount Sinai, a covenant that leads to bondage, whereas Sarah and Isaac symbolized the covenant of the heavenly Jerusalem, a covenant that leads to freedom. Moreover, although Philo praised Hagar, he neither mentioned her son Ishmael by name, nor did Philo consider Ishmael as worthy of Abraham (254). Paul also portrayed Hagar and Ishmael as inferior in the sense that they symbolized the Sinai covenant of which the Gentile believers in Galatia were not a part (Gal 4:28). The fact that both Philo and Paul knew of the relationship between Abraham,

Hagar, and Ishmael, yet dismissed it, suggests that they saw the maternal line, in this case, as the basis for identifying the "true" children of Abraham.[8] According to Philo, Abraham's children were those who imitated his virtuous life, while for Paul, Abraham's children were those who had faith in the seed of Abraham, namely, Christ. Paul expected his Galatian audience to identify with Sarah, not Hagar, whereas Philo did not even mention Hagar by name.

Philo's and Paul's use of their primary source had this in common: they did not intend to write a history of the patriarch, but rather to retell selected events from the Abraham narrative in a way that fitted their goals. That said, their selection and use of their source differed sharply. Firstly, Gen 15:6 was very important for Paul's thesis in both Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4; hence he quoted it at the beginning of both arguments (Gal 3:6; Rom 4:3). Philo, however, only mentioned Gen 15:6 as listing one of Abraham's virtues and did so at the closing of his exegetical narrative (*Abr*. 262).[9] Secondly, Philo used the main source more than Paul did; Philo had thirteen quotations, five paraphrases, and four direct allusions compared to Paul's four quotations and three allusions in Galatians 3–4, and three quotation and two allusions in Romans 4. Thirdly, Philo edited out some significant events, such as the close-kin marriage between Abraham and Sarah and the banishment of Hagar and Ishmael, in order to portray Abraham in a positive light. Paul also did some editing in that his selection and arrangement, especially in Roman 4, was intended from the onset strongly to support justification by faith against justification by the Law. Lastly, Gen 18 and 22 seem quite central for Philo because he quoted, paraphrased, or alluded to each of these chapters three times. He referred to Gen 12 and 23 twice each, and used Gen 11, 13, 15, 19, 24, and 25 once each. In the case of Paul in Gal 3–4 and Rom 4, he referred to Gen 21 four times, Gen 15 three times, and Gen 12, 17, and 18 twice each. However, Paul sourced his key argument from Gen 15, 17, and 18.

5.2: Philo's and Paul's Interpretations of Some Events in the Abraham Narrative

In this section I will juxtapose some key interpretations of both Philo and Paul in their retelling of events in the Abraham narrative. In the examples I will discuss below, as expected, they disagreed in much more often than they agreed.

5.2.1: How did Abraham Live a Virtuous Life Prior to the Mosaic Law?

Philo uses ἀρετή at least thirty times in *De Abrahamo* to show how people lived virtuously before the Mosaic Law. He began with the first group of three (Enosh, Enoch, and Noah) and proceeded to the second group of three (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob). Both groups lived according to the Law of nature and were virtuous given that Moses wrote about them in the book of the Law (4–7). Philo was very clear that Abraham's virtuous life was perfect compared to the first group of three (14, 36, 48–67) and so, for Philo, Abraham's virtuous life made him become "a law and an unwritten statute" in the Mosaic Law (275–276).

Paul confronted a similar question in Rom 1:18–32 when he explained that the Gentiles were guilty before God and were without excuse (vv. 18–21, 32). Moreover he introduced a contrast to argue that there were Gentiles who, although without the Mosaic Law, kept it even so. Paul wrote that they:

> do by nature [φύση] things required by the law, they are a law for themselves, even though they do not have the law. They show that the requirements of the law are written on their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts sometimes accusing them and at other times even defending them (Rom 2:14-15).

In Philo's terms, Abraham as a Gentile lived a life of excellence even before the Mosaic Law was given (Rom 4:13; Gal 3:15–18).

Therefore, Philo and Paul differed somewhat in their understanding of the impact of natural law on Abraham. Philo, on the one hand, argued that it led Abraham to live a life of excellence and allowed him to become a part of the Mosaic Law. Paul, on the other hand, argued by implication that natural law guided Abraham, though his major emphasis concerning Abraham was his faith in God's promises. Therefore, Philo emphasized works while Paul, faith.

5.2.2: Can Non-Jews Become Members of the Commonwealth of Abraham, and if Yes, How Can They?

Both Philo and Paul argued that non-Jews could be a part of the commonwealth of Abraham. In *De Abrahamo*, Hagar could have been part of that commonwealth if only she had continued in her training.[10] Philo in *Virt*. 187–198 mentioned that Tamar, Bilhah, and Zilpah were examples

of Gentiles who joined that commonwealth. Paul's main message to Gentile believers was that they were justified by faith through Christ. Philo and Paul therefore disagreed on how non-Jews were admitted into that commonwealth. In *De Abrahamo*, it was by emulating the virtuous life of Abraham, who also had a spiritual experience (57–58). Philo mentioned elsewhere that a biological relationship to Abraham was not enough for membership. Paul similarly believed that possessing the Law (as descendants of Abraham) and boasting of one's relationship with God without obedience to the Law did not make one a part of God's family (Rom 2:17–29). In Gal 3–4 and Rom 4, Paul only required that Gentiles put their faith in God, as Abraham did, and in the seed of Abraham, namely, Christ (Gal 3:1–5, 15–6, 23–9; 4:28–30; Rom 4:22–5). I will return to the theme of requirements for membership below.

5.2.3: Who is the Seed of Abraham?

In *QG* 3.54, Philo edited out the singular form τέκνον as found in Gen 17:16 and rendered it in the plural form τέκνα. He commented that "it is not in place to inquire why He (God) used the plural 'children' in speaking of their [Abraham's and Sarah's] only beloved son" (*QG* 3.54).[11] The literal meaning, according to Philo, is the descendants of Abraham, from whom there would come peoples and kings. Philo also quoted from the same Gen 17:16 text in *Mut.* 130-153 in which he rendered τέκνον in the singular form in reference to an heir (Isaac) for Abraham. Gordon J. Wenham correctly sees a relationship between τέκνον in Gen 17:16 and σπέρμα in Gen 12:7.[12] Therefore although Philo rendered τέκνον in Gen 17:16 in the plural form to refer to peoples and kings, both τέκνον (Gen 17:16) and σπέρμα (Gen 12:7; 13:15) point to Isaac in the context of Genesis 12 and 17.

Paul neither saw the need to edit out the singular form for the plural form as did Philo nor did he see "peoples and kings" as did Philo. In Gal 3:16, Paul maintained its singular form σπέρμα, but for him that σπέρμα was Christ. However, Paul agreed with Philo whose exegesis on Gen 17:16 in *QG* 3.54 indicated that Abraham was the ancestor of many peoples and kings. According to Paul, his readers in both Galatia and Rome were also children of Abraham by faith (Gal 3:29; 4:28; Rom 4:16-18). Therefore Christ was the seed of Abraham, and both the Galatian

and Roman congregations should put their trust in that seed of Abraham and so join the commonwealth of Abraham.

5.3: What have we Gained from White in Respect to Philo's and Paul's Retelling of the Abraham Narrative?

With a view to juxtapose Philo's and Paul's retelling of some events in the Abraham narrative, I will briefly show below how we may understand Philo's and Paul's Abraham through White's insights on history. White will also help us to see Philo's and Paul's areas of agreement and disagreement. The table below will use White's theory as already described, to compare Philo's and Paul's retelling of the Abraham narrative.

	Philo (*De Abrahamo*)	Paul (Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4)
Mode of Emplotment	Romantic	Romantic/Tragic/Satirical
Mode of Argument	Organicist/Contextualist	Organicist/Contextualist
Ideological Implication	Liberal	Radical
Figurative Language	Metaphor	Metaphor

In regards to the mode of emplotment, the Romantic mode best describes Philo's and Paul's styles of emplotment. They both presented two heroes; according to Philo these were Abraham and Sarah, but according to Paul these were Abraham and the Galatian Christians. Philo and Paul both agreed that the evil condition that required defeating was the childlessness of Sarah and Abraham. To the evil condition Philo added two evil systems, astrology and polytheism, and these systems Abraham also defeated. Paul might have agreed with Philo if Paul had been interested in Abraham's life prior to his call. One difference between Philo and Paul was that some of Paul's heroes later chose to become villains, while Philo's heroes

continued being heroes to the end. The fact that some of Paul's audience in Galatia was transformed from heroes to villains because they were trying to earn God's grace by practicing the Law. This transformation introduces yet another mode, that of Satire, since even heroes were still captive to the evil they were fighting. However, they still had the chance to become heroes again if they chose to return to Paul's message of justification by faith. Failure to do that would make this a Tragedy. Thus they were heroes in the past (Romance), villains in the past (Satire), and either heroes or villains in the future (Romance or Tragedy).

In regards to the mode of Argument, Philo and Paul both applied the Organicist and the Contextualist modes. The Organicist mode focuses on separate and individual events through classifying, categorizing, and labeling with the sole aim of aggregating these scattered and separated individual units into larger whole. The historian makes the selection on the basis of the ideas and themes that are central to his or her goals for retelling the historical events. Both Philo and Paul were reductive, integrative, and goal-oriented because they only retold some of the events in the Abraham narrative. For example, in both Gal 3–4 and Rom 4, Paul only quoted, paraphrased, and alluded to events in Gen 12 (and possibly 13; 18; 22; 24) and in Gen 15, 17–18, 21 (and possibly 25).[13] Philo only quoted, paraphrased, and alluded to events in Gen 11–13, 15, 18–19, 22–24, and 26. One of Paul's goals in retelling the Abraham story in the Organicist mode was to rebuke those Galatian believers who had yielded to a different teaching. In the Roman church, Paul used that mode to argue that, since Abraham was not justified by observing the law but by faith, the Gentiles also required only faith for their justification. As well, Philo in *De Abrahamo* did not mention that Abraham was circumcised and observed the Mosaic Law. Rather, the Mosaic Law had, according to Philo, a source in the excellent lives of those who lived by the natural law. Therefore Abraham observed the Law as one whose life fashioned the written law. Philo retold those events in order to introduce his audience to the excellent life of Abraham and to invite them to emulate it (*Abr*. 4).

The Contextualist mode interprets history by establishing connections between a present or a desired-present condition and a past condition. This mode traces a state, whether already actualized or desired in the present, to its origin. In this case, Philo's intended outcome was that

his audience should seek after a life of excellence through the life of Abraham (*Abr.* 4). This excellent life consisted of Abraham's obedience to God and his kindness to people. Therefore, by implication, it was related to his good works. If they responded to Philo's teaching and invitation positively, then such a response would connect their virtuous living in the present with its origin, Abraham's excellent virtues.[14] Paul also connected his readers' justification by faith with Abraham's life of faith. He was angry that some of them had later abandoned such teaching in favour of one that required them to earn justification by good works; this teaching was similar to what Philo taught. The implication of abandoning Paul's teaching was exclusion from the commonwealth of Abraham since they had severed the link they had with their spiritual ancestor Abraham, namely, faith.

In regards to the Ideological implication, Philo's was Liberal while Paul's, Radical. The Liberal ideology seeks/desires to change an undesirable condition, but believes that that change is in the future rather than imminent because desirable change only happens through gradual means. We see this ideology in Philo's *Abr.* when he portrayed Abraham as needing to convert from astrology and polytheism to monotheism and Creator worship. However, Philo's retelling of the events suggested that the required change occurred after a major event, namely, his emigration from Chaldea to Haran and then to Canaan. Abraham's other deeds, such as his hospitality (*Abr.* 89–106), his sacrifice of Isaac (*Abr.* 167–207), his kindness (*Abr.* 208–224), and his bravery (*Abr.* 225–244) functioned to perfect his character. Moreover, since Abraham attained his excellent and virtuous life by living according to the law of nature, it is only reasonable that, in living by such standards, everything he achieved was a gradual process. In Galatian 3–4 and Romans 4, Paul was Radical in his ideology. He agreed with Philo that there was a need for a change, namely, a transition from the old life to the new one. He differed from Philo in that he portrayed this change as imminent, not in the future. This imminent change required a revolution: replacing the present unwanted condition with the desired one. On the one hand, this revolution was not done by human effort but by God's grace through Jesus Christ; on the other hand, people needed to accept this grace for the transition to occur.

In regards to figurative language, both Philo and Paul used Metaphor. As for Philo, he was an allegorist of the Jewish religious texts; for example, in *De Abrahamo*, Abraham's emigration from Ur signified emigration of the soul. We have seen that allegory is functionally a metaphor because it redescribes reality by giving it multiple interpretations. This process involves characterizing, comparing, contrasting, and transferring of qualities through simile or analogy. For example, Philo transferred the qualities of "male to virtue" (102), "wife to virtue" (*Abr*. 101), and "invisibility to the king" (74). By implication, Philo used metaphor in *Abr*. 262–269 to show that Abraham did not live for high office, fame, wealth, or strength as Lot did, but by "faith in God." However, Philo's "faith in God" may be understood as pressing "onward to God along the doctrines of virtue" (*Abr*. 269). Moreover, Abraham's faith in God is better understood in terms of action than words (262). This action is living by the natural law, namely, living in piety and obedience to God, and showing kindness to people. In the Loeb edition, the word translated "doctrine" is θεωρήμα (269). It has various meanings such as "sight, speculation, vision;" but Philo used it theologically to mean a doctrine especially "of higher mysteries of the faith, which belong[s] to [the] sphere of σοφίας."[15] I understand this doctrine as equivalent to the law of nature. Therefore, Philo's use of "trust in God" (262) and/or "faith in God" (268) is not the same as Paul's use. Paul built his teaching on the excellence of life in Christ and the working of God's Spirit in Christ's believers. Paul interpreted σπέρμα metaphorically as Christ (Gal 3:16). Paul also allegorized the relationship between the Galatian believers and Sarah and Isaac, but saw no relationship between the Galatian believers and Hagar and Ishmael.

In this way, both Philo and Paul believed that "faith in God" surpassed trust in other things such as wealth, strength, nobility, and family. Yet Paul said that people were justified by faith in Christ without works, and in this way he significantly differed from Philo who understood faith in God within the purview of the natural law. Also, while Philo saw the desired change as gradual, not imminent, and thus futuristic, Paul saw it as already present because of Jesus' sacrifice. They also both showed that they were merely agents of this desired change, which was conditional upon their readers' responses to their message. Philo and Paul both saw a problem but had different ways to solve it.

5.4: What is the Relationship between Philo's and Paul's Purposes for Retelling the Abraham Narrative?

I will juxtapose five major themes in Philo's and Paul's goals for retelling the Abraham narrative and demonstrate that Philo and Paul had much in common. For example, allegory was one of their points of contact.

5.4.1: Abraham as a Model of Excellence:

Both Philo and Paul used events in the Abraham narrative to inform their readers that Abraham, though he lived before the Mosaic Law was given, had lived a life that both Jews and non-Jews should emulate. This implies as well that Philo and Paul believed Abraham was a standard by which their audiences should judge their lives.

Philo and Paul, however, disagreed on what made Abraham an excellent model for their respective readers. Philo believed that Abraham's life of excellence was caused by his living according to natural law, which means living for God and showing kindness to people whether known or unknown and whether Jews or non-Jews. According to Paul, Abraham lived by faith and was justified by faith; this made Abraham a model of faith for Paul's readers.

5.4.2: The Respective Readers of Philo and Paul:

We might conclude from Acts 13:43, 48 and 14:1 that Paul's audiences in the churches of Galatia consisted of both Jews and Gentiles. Witherington III argues that Paul's intent in Galatians would have been off target if the recipients of the letter were predominantly of Gentile origin and only a minority were Jewish.[16] Martyn, however, disagrees with this view and instead argues that there was no Jew in the Galatian churches because Paul wrote to the churches in the north (Ankyra and Pessinus)[17] where there was no Jewish community in the middle of the first century AD. The few inscriptions that suggest a Jewish presence in the northern region were dated to the second and third century AD.[18] The identity of the audience of Paul's Galatian letter depends on whether the north or the south hypothesis is accepted. We simply do not have enough information either in Acts or Galatians to conclude with certainty who Paul's audience was.

Certainly there was a huge Gentile Christian presence and some God-fearers. I am arguing that the Galatian churches must have been familiar with the Abraham narrative because Paul only retold a few events about Abraham in the Galatian epistle. This is reasonable because the Galatian churches would have had enough information on the Abraham narrative to be able to fill in the blanks that Paul left in his letter. If so, then, the God-fearers who were somewhat familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures and Judaism would have fit nicely into such a group.[19] The events in Acts 13:43, 48 and 14:1 suggest the presence of God-fearers.

The church in Rome was predominantly Christians of Jewish origin, with a few Christians of Gentile origin, before the expulsion of the Jews under Claudius. Consequently the Roman church was predominantly Gentile Christians even after the order for the expulsion of the Jews was lifted.[20]

Concerning the above discussion, the readers of Galatians and Romans are not as difficult to identify as those of Philo's *De Abrahamo* because Philo did not give us the geographical location and the setting of his audience. Maren Niehoff and Andrew Harker have argued that Philo was in Rome for about three years from late *c*. AD 38 to AD 41 as the head of the Jewish embassy to the Emperor Gaius. Harker commented that Philo might have even stayed beyond Claudius's coronation.[21] During his time in Rome, Philo most probably engaged in intellectual activity, part of which involved sharing his *Exposition* or at least a part of it. Philo's audience also included non-Jews who were unfamiliar with the Hebrew Scriptures and Judaism. In his audience as well were probably some Jews who were also ignorant of their traditions. Therefore we can postulate that Philo's readers were non-Jews and may have also included Jews who needed more information on Jewish Scripture. They also would have had varied levels of familiarity with philosophy.[22]

If this is correct, then both the audiences of Philo and Paul were comprised mainly of non-Jews and a very few Jews. Philo mostly targeted non-Jews in *De Abrahamo* and Paul mostly targeted Gentile Christians in both Galatians and Romans. We can postulate that Philo used more materials on Abraham because his audience was unfamiliar with the Abraham narrative in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and Paul used fewer materials because his audiences were

not unfamiliar with the Abraham narrative in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. What they might have found strange, was Paul's interpretations of the story of their spiritual ancestor.

5.4.3: The Correction of Wrong Perceptions:

Scholars such as Niehoff, Gregory Sterling, Martin Goodman, and Michael Cover situate Philo's *Exposition* within the context of the atmosphere after the Alexandria pogrom, which provided its context. According to Harker, the Greek pogrom against the Jews in Alexandria occurred in AD 38. It centered on the erection of the statue of Gaius in the Synagogues (*Flaccum* 40–52).[23] The reaction of the Jews to the pogrom also added to the wrong perceptions non-Jews had of Jews.[24] Therefore, Philo had to prove his intellectual competence to correct the wrong perceptions. In *De Abrahamo*, Philo portrayed Abraham as peace-loving and kind. He only went to war when Lot and his family were taken captive and was victorious even though he had fewer people with little or no military training. This implied that, as peaceful as the Jews were, they could go to war if necessary and that God would be on their side. Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac became for Philo the standard for sacrifice, and Abraham's relationship with God became the standard for divine-human relationships.

Also, Paul's intent was to correct, Gentile Christians belief that they must complement their faith in Jesus Christ with circumcision, good works, and the Mosaic Law. He refuted any such additions and urged his readers to return to justification by faith alone. He argued that, if Abraham did not need those additions to be justified by faith, Paul's Gentile Christians readers in both Galatia and Rome also had no need for additional requirements in order to gain peace with God.

Therefore, while Philo was interested in correcting the non-Jews' wrong perceptions about Jews, for example, in regards to the pogrom, Paul was interested in correcting additions to justification by faith. Both Philo and Paul introduced Abraham as a solution to the problems before them.

5.4.4: The Portrait of Abraham:

From our discussion above, we may conclude that Philo portrayed a national Abraham with universal possibilities while Paul portrayed a universal Abraham. We also saw earlier that both Philo and Paul were not innovators in their differing portrayals of Abraham. I must now ask: what are the universal possibilities that Philo found in his portrait of Abraham? Were all non-Jews welcomed into Abraham's commonwealth? If yes, what were the requirements for acceptance into that commonwealth?

Philo's universal possibilities meant a potential inclusion of all people whether Jews or non-Jews into the subgroup of either "Israel" or "Jews." Philo understood "Israel" as someone who saw God (as the Father and Maker) (*Abr*. 57–58) while a "Jew" as the one that worshipped God (as the Father and Maker) and lived the Jewish way of life (*Virt*. 108; *Leg*. 194). According to Birnbaum the "Israel" subgroup

> is not a clearly identifiable social group but instead may be similar to what we speak of today as an "intellectual elite." In contrast, the Jews are a precisely defined group whose members–by birth or choice–are easily identified. Although "Israel" and the Jews may overlap or may indeed be the same, Philo discusses them as two distinct entities.[25]

On the requirements for joining either the "Israel" or the "Jewish" subgroup, Birnbaum notes rightly that we can at best only speculate because Philo did not actually address the requirement for joining either of the above subgroups.[26] However, we can infer from his *Exposition*, for example, *De Abrahamo* that belief in God, monotheism, and a new way of life were required for membership. The "conscious choice and commitment to the Jewish way of life," according to Birnbaum, allowed proselytes to join the subgroup of the "Jews."[27] In *Abr*. 57–58, Philo explained the "Israel" subgroup as those who saw "God as an intellectual or spiritual activity."[28] Those who fitted the standards of this subgroup may have been from the following categories: "all respected philosophers, or philosophically-minded people, whether they are Jews or not; a subset of the Jews who are philosophically-minded; all Jews; or all Jews, whether philosophers or not, and all respected non-Jewish philosophers."[29] Birnbaum believes that the first group attained the requirement for becoming a member of "Israel."[30] Having a

respected philosophical mind is thus the prerequisite for both Jews and non-Jews who desire to become members of the "Israel" subgroup.

This uncertainty in membership requirements, leaves us with a question: did Philo consider non-Jewish philosophers to be on the same level as Jews in the "Israel" subgroup? This is hard to answer with certainty, because Philo seemed to have said two things. First, he stated that "… what the disciples of the most excellent philosophy gain from its teaching, the Jews gain from their customs and laws …" (*Virt*. 65). This means that he rated both groups (non-Jewish philosophers and the Jews) on par in terms of their learning capacity. Second, Philo also holds that "… reason [alone] cannot make such advances as to attain to a thorough comprehension of God" (*Leg*. 1.6).[31] This underlines the insufficiency of reason alone to see the Father and Maker and, by implication, to join "Israel" subgroup. This is not inconsistent, since elsewhere he said that "the sovereign part of the soul, which is called the mind … has the dignity and capacity to be close (to God), [and to become] … worthy of travelling with Him [God] (*QG*. 4.26). But Philo expected the mind, as God's travelling companion, to always offer God "… great praise for His benevolence and kindness and love of man" (*QG*. 4.26). Philo also expected the mind to entreat God on behalf of others just as Abraham did for Lot and the Sodomites (*QG*. 4.25, 27). Thus seeing God required being more than philosophically-minded, it required loving God as Abraham did. Similarly, by implication, *De Abrahamo* tells that reason alone could mislead astrology and creation-worship. Hence reason that does not lead to the worship of the Creator is insufficient.

Birnbaum believes that Philo's differing estimation of non-Jewish philosophers and Jews can be explained by the contexts in which Philo situated them. In *Virt*. 65, for example, Philo portrayed Jewish social and religious culture in an impressive and positive light, and in *Leg*. 6, for example, he defended it against tyranny.[32] I believe, as does Birnbaum, that context is very important for meaning, which is why I think, from my discussion on the Abraham narrative that *QG*. 4.25–27 also fits such a context because it was based on Gen 18:22–32. Philo's interpretation of the text was that Abraham was the reason or mind that was worthy to travel with God even though Abraham had always to love God and be kind to people. An example of

this kindness was Abraham's intercession for those who may be worthy of salvation,[33] namely, Lot, his family, and the Sodomites. Philo's exposition of the Genesis events in both *QG* and *De Abrahamo* introduced a potential role for himself as a chief mediator between his audience and God, just as Abraham had been. We already saw Paul's mediatory role in the context of the patronage system in chapter four.

The role of Philo as a mediator was to introduce his audience to Abraham's excellent life in order to see if they were worthy of salvation.[34] This is also similar to Paul, who, as a mediator in the context of patronage, called the Galatian believers who now desired to earn their salvation back to grace. In this way both Philo and Paul used the Abraham narrative to reach their audiences, but the outcome of their mediation depended on their audiences' response. Philo's mediation differed from that of Paul on this basis. Philo depended on Abraham's good works for his mediation; Paul depended on Abraham's faith for his.

Therefore Philo's universal scheme for welcoming non-Jews into the commonwealth of Abraham was only activated when the people positively responded to the invitation to emulate Abraham's life of excellence and to show it by their works. However, Paul's universal scheme for welcoming all into the commonwealth of Abraham did not rely on people. It is already activated and ready for people to respond by emulating Abraham's faith without need of addition such as circumcision, works, or Mosaic Law.

Moreover, there was a class system in Philo's universal scheme because, as Birnbaum observed, people either join "Israel" or the "Jews." This the scheme did not receive all people as they were, and there were also different requirements for becoming a part of "Israel" and becoming a "Jew." However, Paul had only one requirement, namely, justification by faith. Therefore Philo's universal scheme is a possibility because to see God requires an individual to attain a certain level of philosophical understanding: something Paul would have argued that his readers were not able to do even if they so wanted. In contrast, Paul's universal scheme was open to all who wished to receive God's grace without earning it.

5.5: General Conclusion

I have considered some varying portraits of Abraham by both Jewish and non-Jewish authors in different times and settings. I have considered Philo's and Paul's retelling of some of the events of the Abraham narrative. It is my contention that we can better understand Philo's and Paul's retelling of these events concerning Abraham from White's insights into the production of history. This study has argued that Philo and Paul differ in their portrayal of Abraham even though they relied on the same source material. There are at least three significant factors that led to this. Firstly, they retold only parts of the Abraham narrative as evidenced in their text selection. Secondly, they arranged those events in a way that satisfied their reasons for retelling them. Thirdly, they had different goals for retelling these selections. One of Philo's goals for retelling the events was to portray a national Abraham with universal possibilities, while one of Paul's goals for retelling the events was to portray a universal Abraham. The Abraham that they portrayed regulated who could be admitted into his commonwealth and what requirements their readers had to meet before they were admitted.

In the process of achieving the above, this thesis has contributed in shedding light in the following areas.

1. The placement of Philo's Abraham in a Roman context: I have shown in chapter 3 that it is reasonable to situate Philo's Abraham in a Roman context and the post-pogrom setting/era of Alexandria.

2. Philo's disagreement with Hellenistic ideals in *De Abrahamo*: I have shown that although Philo was quite influenced by Hellenistic philosophy and ideals, he never abandoned the Jewish Scriptures and their religious traditions. Hence we can say that the Jewish Scriptures and traditions were the tenor while Hellenistic philosophy and ideals the vehicle. At crucial points, he sided with his Scriptures and traditions rather than with Hellenistic thought and culture. For example, the Stoics taught that the universe is god and it operates as both a material and a reasoning substance (Logos). Philo was certainly aware of such teaching, yet, in *De Abrahamo*,

he stated that there exists the Father and Maker of creation. Thus, he was neither a radical Hellenist after all nor a slave to the vehicle or means of his interpretation of Israel's Scriptures.

3. The placement of Paul's Abraham in a patronage system: my interpretative framework placed Abraham within the context of the patronage system, and this enriches our understanding of the tripartite relationship the Galatians had with God, Abraham, and Paul.

4. The placement of Paul's Abraham in a self-mastery system: I corroborate Stowers' rereading of Romans to show how Paul's Abraham also fit the context of self-mastery. However, I went farther than Stowers in showing the origin of self-mastery according to the Judeo-Christian Scripture and how Gentiles (believers) could attain self-mastery through Christ and the work of God's Spirit in the believers. This relationship between the believer and the Spirit was, according to Paul, what strengthened the believer to pursue mastery over impure admixture through the Spirit of God.

Although this study improves our understanding of the differing portraits of Abraham and the reasons that both Philo and Paul portrayed Abraham the way they did, we must also consider areas for further research, which include the following:

1. Paul's fictitious interlocutor in Romans 3–4: Could he be Philo, since he was in Rome at least a decade before Paul's letter arrived? We have already seen some thematic resemblance to Philo in Paul's letter to the Romans. Moreover, did his *De Abrahamo* play any role at all in popularizing such a one-sided portrait of Abraham in that city and subsequently among the house fellowships throughout the city (Rom 16)? This will interest researchers in Philonic-Pauline studies.

2. Philo's Abraham in a Roman context: Philonic studies will greatly benefit from research into this context. At the moment, I am aware that both Sterling and Covers have recently interpreted Philo's *Hypothetica* in a Roman context.[35] Niehoff most recently argued that Philo's *Exposition* was best understood in a Roman context. She also interpreted Philo's *Life of Moses* and *The Life of Joseph* in that context.[36] I do not know if the long-awaited commentary on the *De Abrahamo* by John Dillon will cover this.

3. Were God-fearers part of the mixed church in Acts 13:43, 48 and 14:1? If so, then what role did the God-fearers play in the crisis of faith of the Galatian congregations? Were they part of those who gave in to the proselyte evangelists or part of those who refused? Did the presence of God-fearers in the non-Jewish congregations explain how such Christians could have been able to understand Paul's use of the Abraham narrative?

4. We saw that both Philo and Paul left out other events in the Genesis account. How might the excluded events on Abraham affect Philo's Roman audience? What image of Abraham would they have had if those events were included? Some excluded events are, the kinship marriage of Abraham and Sarah (Gen 20:12), the banishment of Hagar and Ishmael (Gen 21:9–21), and the Abraham's marriage to Keturah and their sons (Gen 25:1–6). It may rather be interesting to ask if there are early interpreters who included these parts of the Abraham story, and how might their interpretations differ from Philo's and Paul's.

5. We also saw that Philo, especially, added some events that were not found in his primary source in his retelling of the Abraham narrative. How did those events help him achieve his goals? For example, the Hebrew life of Hagar (*Abr*. 251), Sarah's virtuous life (245–246), and some of Abraham's virtues (262–276).

---

[1] I think that Jewish traditions of Abraham play a significant role in *De Abrahamo*. For example, the claim that Abraham abandoned Chaldean astrology to become a monotheist appears in Jewish sources such as *Jub.* IV, VIII, XII. The *Sybilline Oracle* 3.20–24 states that Jews do not practice astrology. The Nephilims were accused of astrology and also teaching it to people (*I Enoch* VIII–IX). There were also Jews in antiquity who portrayed Abraham as a Chaldean astrologist to improve the image of the Jews (Reed, "Abraham as Chaldean Scientist and Father of the Jews", (*JSJ*), 119–58. This contradicts the aforementioned Jewish sources while the *Wisdom of Solomon* 13 avoided extremism by saying that astrology was more tolerable than polytheism. It is difficult to ascertain the origin of the view that Abraham rejected astrology. Reed suggests Gen 12 because it "describes Abraham as inferring the one-ness of God from the irregularity of the stars, thereby implying his rejection of 'the Chaldean science' for Jewish monotheism" (ibid., 119). However, I think that caution must be applied to such inference because we may infer that those four kings and their armies could not have been defeated by 319 men.

This tradition might have developed from Gen 15:5 (where God told Abraham to "look up at the sky and count the stars …") and Gen 22:17 ("I will surely bless you and make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky …"). But it is very unlikely because there is no connection between Abraham and astrology in the Genesis narrative. I doubt that the tradition was built around Gen 15:5 and 22:17 before it was edited out by later scribes. I also do not think such tradition influenced the later addition of Gen 15:5 and 22:17. It is reasonable to me that to the historian of Genesis, any information that did not serve his goals for retelling the events, perhaps, he found insignificant. It could also be that that tradition emerged from the same primary source used by the Genesis historian.

[2] The Genesis material only mentions Hagar's state in the household of Abraham and Sarah, and her place of origin. However, Philo either used a tradition or applied *creative exegesis* to embellish her way of life of Hebrew while Paul also used allegory in Galatians to compare her to the obsolete covenant that was replaced with another covenant.

[3] According to Philo, Abraham did not experience any pleasure when he mated with Hagar because he had one thing in mind, namely, concerning a child and not pleasure.

[4] It is interesting that both Philo and Paul recognized that a son was born to Abraham but they did not say his name.

[5] Sarna stated that the narrator knowingly withheld Sarai's family background information until chapter 20 for suspense and so as "to extricate himself from an embarrassing predicament [when he] reveals that Sarai is his half-sister" (*Genesis*, 87). He also commented that the statement "she is truly my sister" (Gen 20:12) "… must be factual as well as a tradition of great antiquity" (ibid., 143).

[6] Philo used this significant event of the advantage of his goals while Paul edits out the event plausibly because of Christ's sacrifice, which makes justification by faith possible. Hence to retell the event on the sacrifice of Isaac and to also mention the importance of the sacrifice of Christ could have potentially confused Paul's audiences in Galatia and Rome.

[7] Philo elsewhere stated that Hagar did not learn enough to break free from her inferior parentage and background as Tamar, Bilhah, and Zilpah did. Hence Ishmael continued in that inferior worldview. For further discussion, see my chapter 3 above.

[8] During the post-exilic period, the Judahites took desperate measures to protect their genealogy (Ezra 10) and their language (Nehemiah 13) for the sake of raising a generation of godly offspring for the worship of YHWH (Malachi). To achieve this immense goal, all Judahide men married to non-Judahite women had to send them and their children away from the Judahite post-exilic community and banned intermarriage (Ezra 10; Neh. 13). For an extensive discussion on this matter, see Shekari, "An Exegesis of First Corinthians 7:10–16 and Matthew 18:15–20 in Light of Remarriage in the Contemporary Christian Community of Faith," 21–68.

[9] This is further discussed below under Philo's and Paul's goals of retelling some events in the Abraham narrative.

[10] Philo commented that Hagar fled the household of Abraham and Sarah because she was of a "lower or secular" education and she could not endure "the stern and gloomy life of the virtue-seekers" (*Cher*. 4–9; *Fug*. 205–207). He also described her as a "sojourner" and a "servant" who was "waiting on a more perfect nature" that he referred to "as virtue" (*QG*. 3.19).

[11] Wevers does not mention such an alternative reading. Hence Philo could have used an Old Greek manuscript that did not survive; see Genesis, 180 n 16. As I mentioned in chapter 3, this could also be Philo's editing of the text to satisfy his goal.

[12] *Genesis 1–15* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 279. Both τέκνον and σπέρμα appear in the singular form in both the Septuagint and the Hebrew of Gen. 17:16 and 12:7 respectively.

[13] In Gal 3–4 Paul quoted, paraphrased, and alluded to events in Gen 12 (13, 18, 22, 24) and in Gen 15, 21 (25) while in Rom 4 he preferred the events in Gen 15, 17 and 18. The chapters in brackets following immediately after Gen 12 and 21 are additional chapters that Paul may have also used.

[14] Likewise, Abraham's virtues also had its origin in those of the first group of three, namely, Enosh, Enoch, and Noah.

[15] *The Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. "θεώρημα."

[16] *Romans*, 7–8.

[17] *Romans*, 15–7; de Boer, *Galatians*, 3–5.

[18] Ibid., 16 n. 11.

[19] Witherington III, *Romans*, 7–8.

[20] Moo, *Romans*, 9–13; Dunn, *Romans*, xlv.

[21] Harker, *Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt*, 14, 18–9. See also Philo's embassy (*Leg.* 206).

[22] Birnbaum, "The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought," 58–9.

[23] Other reasons that caused the pogrom include the following. Flaccum denied Alexandrian Jews their citizenship by describing them as foreigners and aliens (53–54); he allowed some mobs to evict the Jews from their

houses and businesses, which the mobs plundered (54-72); he cruelly treated Jewish leaders (72–73); and he accused the Jews of planning a war (86–96).

[24] The Jews were thought to be a troublesome people. Moreover the non-Jews also appeared to have questioned the contributions of the Jews to humanity.

[25] "The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought", 56. She further supports her point with the following argument: Philo discusses "Israel" and "Jews" in his separate works such as his *Allegory*, *Exposition*, and *Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus* (*QGE*). This may be due to Philo's intention to reach different audiences. Philo also uses different words to show "Israel" and "Jews" as distinct collectives to define how each subgroup relates to God differently, and lists the requirements of becoming a member of each of the subgroups (ibid., 56–66).

[26] Ibid., 63.

[27] Ibid., 63-7.

[28] Ibid., 63.

[29] Ibid., 65–6.

[30] Ibid., 66.

[31] Philo continued that "who can neither be touched nor handled; but it withdraws from and falls short of such a height, being unable to employ appropriate language as a step towards the manifestation (I will not say of the living God, for even if the whole heaven were to become endowed with articulate voice, it would not be furnished with felicitous and appropriate expressions to do justice to such a subject) …" (*Leg.* 1.6, Yonge's translation).

[32] "The Place of Philo's Judaism in Philo's Thought," 67.

[33] This is a translation of ἄξιος τῆς σωτηρίας.

[34] *QG*. 4.26.

[35] Sterling, "Philo and the Logic of Apologetic," 412–30; Covers, "Colonial Narratives and Philo's Roman Accuser in the Hypothetica," 183–207.

[36] Niehoff, "Philo's Exposition in a Roman Context."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abegg Jr., M. G "4QMMT, Paul, and 'works of the law.'" In *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, edited by Peter W. Flint and T'ae-hun Kim. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.

Albright, William F. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*: *Monotheism and the Historical Process*, second edition. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957.

_____. *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra: An Historical Survey*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1963.

Allen, Leslie C. *Jeremiah*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

Alt, Albrecht. *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Translated by R. A. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

Baden, Joel S. "The Nature of Barrenness in the Hebrew Bible." In *Disability Studies and Biblical Literature*, edited by Candida R. Moss and Jeremy Schipper, 13–28. New York: Palmgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Barcley, William B. "The Land and the Promise." In *Perspectives on our Father Abraham: Essays in Honour of Marvin R. Wilson*, edited by Steven A. Hunt. Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2010.

Bloch, René. "Alexandria in Pharaonic Egypt: Projections in *De Vita Mosis*." *Studia Philonica Annual* 24 (2012): 69–84.

Bird, Michael F. *Crossing Over the Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*. Peabody. MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

Birnbaum, Ellen "The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes." *Society for Biblical Literature* (1993).

Borgen, Peder. "Proselytes, Conquest, and Mission." In *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict: Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, & the Greco-Roman World*, edited by P. Borgen, V. K. Robbins and D. B. Gowler. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1998.

_____. *Philo, John, and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987.

_____. "Josephus and his Works." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha*, *Pseudepigrapha*, *Qumran Sectarian Writings*, *Philo*, *Josephus*, edited by M. E. Stone, 233-81. Assen, Netherland: van Gorcum, 1984.

Bowersock, Glen W. "Foreign Elites." In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, edited by J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, 53–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bowley, James E. "Compositions of Abraham." In *Tracing the Threads: Study in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. C. Reeves. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994.

_____. *Traditions of Abraham in Greek Historical Writings: Jewish and Pagan Authors through Josephus.* Ph.D. diss., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH, 1992.

Bray, Gerald, ed. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Romans*. Downers Grove, ILL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.

Caizzi, Fernanda D. "Minor Socrates." In *Blackwell Companions to Philosophy: A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, edited by M. L. Gill & P. Pellegrin, 119–35. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006.

Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Chow, John K. "Patronage in Roman Corinth." In *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, ed. R. A. Horsley Harrisburg, 104–205. PA: Trinity Press International, 1997,

Collins, John J. "The 'Historical Character' of the Old Testament in Biblical Theology." In *Israel's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*, edited by V. Philips Long, 150–59. Source for Biblical and Theological Studies 7. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

Covers, Michael. "Colonial Narratives and Philo's Roman Accuser in the Hypothetica." *Studia Philonica Annual* 22 (2010): 183–207.

Cranfield, Charles E. B. *Romans: A Shorter Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1985

Cross, Frank M. "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs." *HTR* 55 (1962): 232–59.

Davies, Philip R. "Ancient Israel' and History: A Response to Norman Whybray." In *Israel's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*, edited by V. Philips Long, 188–91. Source for Biblical and Theological Studies 7. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

De Boer, Martinus C. *Galatians: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.

Dunn, James D.G. *Romans 1–8*. Dallas, TX: Word Books Publishers, 1988.

Eisenbaum, Pamela. "Paul as the New Abraham." In *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation*, edited by R. A. Horsley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.

_____. "'It is not as though the Word of God had Failed': An Introduction to Paul and the Scriptures of Israel." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, edited by C. A. Evans & J. A. Sanders, 13–7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Fee, Gordon D. "Who are Abraham's True Children? The Role of Abraham in Pauline Argumentation." In *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham Essays in Honour of Marvin R. Wilson*, edited by S. A. Hunt. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Feldman, Louis H. "Hellenizations in Josephus' Jewish Antiquities: The Portrait of Abraham." In *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gōhei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.

Frei, Hans W. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in 18th & 19th Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven, CT / London: Yale University Press, 1974.

Gager, John G. *Reinventing Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Garnsey, Peter & Richard Saller. "Patronal Power Relations." In *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, edited by R. A. Horsley, 96–103. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997.

Glad, Clarence E. "Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy: Philodemus and Paul." Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1992.

Goldingay, John. "The Patriarchs in Scripture and History." In *Israel's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*, edited by V. Philips Long, 485–91. Source for Biblical and Theological Studies 7. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1940.

_____. "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His *De Vita Mosis*." *Harvard Theological Review* 26 (1933): 109–125.

_____. *The Politics of Philo Judaeus, Practice and Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1938.

Goody, Jack. *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Hamerton-Kelly, Richard. "Sources and Traditions in Philo Judaeus: Prolegomena to an Analysis of his Writings." *Studia Philonica Annual* 1 (1972): 15–29.

Harker, Andrew. *Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt: The Case of the Acta Alexandrinorum*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Hata, Gōhei. "The Story of Moses Interpreted within the Context of Anti-Semitism." In *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, edited by Louis H, Feldman and Gōhei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.

Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

_____. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, vol.1. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974, 104.

Herschberger, Ruth. "The Structure of Metaphor." *Kenyon Review* 5:3 (1943): 433–443.

Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26–52*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989.

Honigman, Silvie. *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: Study in the Narrative of the "Letter of Aristeas."* London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Kamudzandu, Israel. *Abraham as a Spiritual Ancestor: A Postcolonial Zimbabwean Reading Romans 4*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Klingbeil, G. A. "Historical Criticism." In *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, edited by T. D. Alexander & D. W. Baker, 404. Downers Grove, ILL/ Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

Lampe, G. W. H., editor of *The Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Long, V. Phillips. "What is History?" In *Israel's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*, edited by V. Philips Long, 232–54. SBTS 7. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

Machiela, Daniel A. *The Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20): A Reevaluation of its Text, Interpretive Character, and Relationship to the Book of Jubilees*. Ph.D. diss., Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame, 2007.

Martens, John W. *One God, One Law*: *Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003.

Martyn, J. Louise. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Maurice, Frederick D. *The Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament: A Series of Sermons Preached in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn*. 3rd edition. London: Macmillan and Co., 1867.

McFague T, Sallie. *Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

McKnight, Scott. *A Light among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activities in the Second Temple Period*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991.

Meek, Theophile J. *Hebrew Origins*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.

Millard, Alan R. "Abraham, Akhenaten, Moses and Monotheism." In *He Swore an Oath: Biblical Themes from Genesis 12–50*, edited by R. S. Hess, G. J. Wenham & P. E. Satterthwaite. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994.

_____. "Methods of Studying the Patriarchal Narratives as Ancient Text." In *Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives*, edited by A. R. Millard and D. J. Wiseman, 35–52. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2008.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, UK. 1996.

Munz, Peter. "History and Myth." *Philosophical Quarterly* 6, no. 22 (1956): 1–16.

Nanos, Mark D. "The Inter–and Intra–Jewish Political Context of Paul's Letter to the Galatians." In *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation*, ed. Richard A Horsley, 146-59. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Niehoff, Maren R. "Philo's Exposition in a Roman Context." *Studia Philonica Annual* 23 (2011): 1–21.

Oegema, Gerbern S. "Biblical Interpretation in the Letters of Paul." In *Traduire la Bible Hébraïque: de la Septante à la Nouvelle Bible Segond = Translating the Hebrew Bible: from the Septuagint to the Nouvelle Bible Segond*, R. David, and M. Jinbachian eds., 255–72. Montréal, QC: Médiaspaul, 2005.

_____. *Early Judaism and Modern Culture: Early Jewish Literature and Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010

Otwin, Marenin. "Implementing Deployment Policies in the National Youth Service Corps of Nigeria." *Comparative Political Studies* 22, no. 4 (01/1990): 397–436.

Parker, Simon B. Review of M. S. Smith. "The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts and The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel." *Hebrew Studies* 33 (1992): 158–62 and *Review of Biblical Literature* 2 (2004).

Paul, Hermann. *Hayden White: The Historical Imagination*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2011.

Peters, Francis E. and John L. Esposito. *The Children of Abraham: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Reed, Annette Yahiko. "Abraham as Chaldean Scientist and Father of the Jews: Josephus, *Ant*. 1.154-168, and the Greco-Roman Discourse about Astronomy/Astrology." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35 (2004).

Richards, Ivor Armstrong. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Ricoeur, Paul. *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*. Edited by Lewis Edwin Hahn. LLP 22. Chicago, ILL: Open Court, 1995.

Rienecker, Frank. *Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament*. Edited by C. Rogers. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1976.

Ringgren, Helmer. *Israelite Religion*. Translated by D. E. Green. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.

Rogers, Trent A. "Philo's Universalization of the Sinai in *De Decalogo* 32–49." *Studia Philonica Annual* 24 (2012): 85–105.

Royse, James R. "The Text of Philo's *De Abrahamo*." *Studia Philonica Annual* 20 (2008): 151–165.

_____. "The Works of Philo." In *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, edited by A. Kamesar, 32-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Runia, David T. "The Place of *De Abrahamo* in Philo's *œuvre*." *Studia Philonica Annual* 20 (2008) 133–50

Sterling, Gregory E. "Philo and the Logic of Apologetic: An Analysis of the *Hypothetica.*" *SBL Seminar Paper* 29 (1990): 412–30.

Sandelin, Karl-Gustav. "Philo as a Jew." In *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria*, edited by Torrey Seland, 19-46. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983.

_____. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Sandmel, Samuel. *Philo of Alexandria*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

_____. *Philo's place in Judaism: a Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*. New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1972.

Sarna, Nahum M. *Genesis: the Traditional Hebrew Text with new Jerusalem Publication Society Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

Schofield, Malcolm. "Cardinal Virtues: A Contested Socratic Inheritance." In *Plato and Stoics*, edited by A. G. Long. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Shaw, B. D. and Richard P. Saller. "Close-Kin Marriage in Roman Society?" in *Man*, New Series 19, no 3 (1984): 432–44.

Shekari, Elkanah K-B. "An Exegesis of First Corinthians 7:10–16 and Matthew 18:15–20 in Light of Remarriage in the Contemporary Christian Community of Faith." M.A. thesis, Acadia University, 2013.

Shield, Mary T. *Circumscribing the Prostitute: The Rhetoric of Intertextuality, Metaphor and Gender in Jeremiah 3: 1-4: 4*. New York: T & T Clark International, 2004.

Siker, Jeffrey S. *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in early Christian controversy*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

Smith, Mark S. *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Stendahl, Krister. *Final Account: Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996.

_____. *Paul among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress, Press, 1976.

Stowers, Stanley K. "Paul and Self-Mastery." In *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003.

_____. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, & Gentiles*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1994.

Strong, A. K. "Incest Law and Absent Taboos in Roman Egypt." In *Ancient History Bulletin* 19, no 1-2 (2005): 31–41.

Swete, H.B. *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint (Vol. 1: Genesis–IV Kings).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992.

Thompson, Thomas L. *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: the Quest for the Historical Abraham*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1974.

_____. Biblical *Narrative and Palestine's History: Changing Perspectives 2*. Sheffield: Equinox, 2013.

_____. "Historical and Christian Faith." In *Israel's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*, edited by V. Philips Long, 480-84. SBTS 7. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

_____. *The Bible in History: How Writers Create a Past*. London: Pimlico, 1999.

Tobin, Thomas H. *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 14. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.

Van Seters, John. Thompson, Thomas L. *Abraham in History and Tradition*. New Haven, CT/London: Yale, 1975.

_____. *Changing Perspectives 1: Studies in the History, Literature and Religion of Biblical Israel*. London/Oakville, CT: Equinox, 2011.

_____. *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Watson, Francis. *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1–15*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987

_____. "The Religion of the Patriarchs." In *Essay on the Patriarchal Narratives*, edited by A. R. Millard and D. J. Wiseman, 161-96. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2008.

Wevers, John W., ed. *Genesis. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.

White, Hayden V. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in the Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore, MD/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

_____. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." In *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*, 81–100. Baltimore, MD/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

_____. "The Structure of Historical Narrative." In *The Fiction of Narrative: Essays on History, Literature, and Theory 1957–2007*, 112–25. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.

Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*. Translated by T. H. Trapp. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991.

Williamson, Paul R. "Abraham." In *DOT: Pentateuch*, edited by T. D. Alexander & D. W. Baker, 12-13. Downer Grove, Ill/Leicester: IVP, 2003.

Wilson, Walter T. *Pauline Parallels: A Comprehensive Guide*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

Winston, David. "Philo Judaeus." In *The Encyclopaedia of Religion*, edited by Lindsay Jones. 2nd edition. 4 vols. Michigan: Thomas Gale, 2005.

Wise, M. O., M. G. Abegg, and D. Cook, edited and translated *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.

Witherington III, Ben. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Zucker, D. J. and R. G. Brinton, "'The Other Woman': A Collaborative Jewish-Christian Study of Hagar." In *Perspectives on our Father Abraham: essays in honor of Marvin R. Wilson*, edited by Steven A. Hunt, 339-83. Grand Rapids, MI & Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2010.