

3

Inspiration and Canonicity: Reflections on the Formation of the Biblical Canon

SID Z. LEIMAN

Determination of the inspired status of biblical books

In a previous study,¹ I had occasion to raise the following questions regarding the biblical canon of the rabbis:

Assuming that only inspired books could qualify for inclusion in the biblical canon, on what grounds was it decided that the book of Enoch and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were to be excluded from the biblical canon? To be more precise, how did the talmudic rabbis, or their predecessors, determine the inspired status of any given book?

I did not have the answers to the questions then, nor do I claim to have them now. Nevertheless, I welcome the opportunity afforded by the Symposium on Normative Self-Definition in Judaism from the Maccabees to the Mid-Third Century to explore some answers proffered by ancient and modern scholarship, as well as to offer some suggestions which may stimulate others to productive scholarship as they demolish my argument.

Literary history was not a major concern of the rabbis. One searches in vain through the talmudic and midrashic literatures for a systematic account of the formation and closing of the biblical canon. There are, however, scattered throughout talmudic literature numerous bits of evidence which, when combined and evaluated, may serve the historian in reconstructing the history of the formation and closing of the biblical canon. It is evident from a careful reading of rabbinic texts that it was the perception of the rabbis that only inspired books qualified for inclusion in scripture.² Moreover, not every inspired utterance of the biblical authors was included in scripture. Only

Inspiration and Canonicity: The Formation of the Biblical Canon

those inspired utterances whose message was necessary for all generations were included in the biblical canon.³ Nowhere do the rabbis clearly delineate how they determined whether or not a book was inspired, or how it was determined that a particular book carried an inspired message for all generations. Indeed, one suspects that to all intents and purposes the major decisions had already been made before the tannaitic period. That is, the rabbis inherited a more or less fixed biblical canon from their rabbinic predecessors. They introduced some modifications as late as the third century CE, but such modification amounted to no more than cosmetic surgery.⁴ Since the canonization process occurred in large part prior to the formulation of our earliest rabbinic texts, the speculative nature of our investigation becomes apparent. We are attempting to reconstruct the history of events that took root no later than in the Persian period, and blossomed in the early Hellenistic period, two periods about which we have almost no contemporary Jewish evidence.⁵ Nothing definitive can be said about criteria for the inclusion of books in, or their exclusion from, the biblical canon as it developed in the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods. Nevertheless, speculate we must; for that is the nature of the scholarly enterprise; and often enough, one scholar's speculation leads to another scholar's establishing the facts והיה שכרי.

I shall begin with a representative survey of suggestions proffered by classical and modern scholars. After listing these suggestions, I shall explain why I find them unpersuasive, and shall then proceed to offer other, I hope more palatable suggestions in their stead.

Solutions proffered by classical and modern scholarship

1. The earliest⁶ Jewish justification for the rejection of a specific book from the biblical canon is preserved by Jerome at his commentary to Jer. 29.21–23.⁷ Jerome repeats a Jewish tradition first publicized by Origen in his *Letter to Africanus*.⁸ It identifies the two elders who incriminated Susanna as Ahab and Zedekiah, the two false prophets who were roasted in fire by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon (cf. Jer. 29.21–23).⁹ Jerome's text reads:¹⁰

The Hebrews say that these are the elders who wrought folly in Israel and committed adultery with the wives of their fellow-citizens,

Jewish and Christian Self-Definition

and to one of whom Daniel said: 'O you who are grown old in evil days' (Susanna 52) and to the other of whom he said: 'You seed of Canaan and not of Judah, beauty has deceived you and lust has perverted your heart! Thus you did with the daughters of Israel and they, in fear, spoke with you; but a daughter of Judah did not abide your iniquity' (Susanna 56-57). And that which the prophet now says, 'And they have spoken a word in my name falsely which I did not command them' (Jer. 29.23) they (the Jews) think that this is indicated by the fact that they (Ahab and Zedekiah) thus deceived wretched little women who are carried about by every wind of doctrine by saying to them, because they were of the tribe of Judah, that the Messiah must be born from their seed, who, having been enticed by desire, furnished their bodies, as if they were future mothers of the Messiah. But that which is said at present 'whom the king of Babylon roasted in fire' (Jer. 29.22), seems to contradict the history of Daniel (i.e., Susanna); for he asserts that they were stoned by the people according to the opinion of Daniel (Susanna 61-62). This indeed has been written (Jer. 29.22) that the king of Babylon roasted them in the fire. Whence this fable (i.e., the book of Susanna) itself, as it were, is not accepted by very many, including almost all the Hebrews, nor is it read in their synagogues. 'For,' they say, 'how could it be that the captives had the power of stoning their leaders and prophets?' And more than this, they affirm to be true that which Jeremiah writes, that the elders indeed were refuted by Daniel, but that sentence was brought against them by the king of Babylon who had power against the captives as victor and lord.

According to Jerome, the Jews rejected the book of Susanna because of two fatal objections: (1) A captive nation was in no position to administer capital punishment, and (2) Jeremiah's account contradicts the account set forth in the book of Susanna with regard to who administered the capital punishment (as well as with regard to the mode of punishment - S.Z.L.). In the light of these objections, the historicity of the Susanna account is impugned and, together with it, its canonicity.

2. Zvi Hirsch Chajes (d. 1855) suggested that various books of the Apocrypha were rejected by the rabbis because of halakic discrepancies between the accounts in the Apocrypha and normative Judaism.¹¹ Regarding the book of Susanna, for example, he noted that according to talmudic teaching capital punishment was administered in the Diaspora only when the Sanhedrin was in session at the temple in Jerusalem.¹² Since the Sanhedrin was not in session during the captivity, capital punishment could not have been administered by Daniel. Moreover, according to talmudic teaching, conflict of testimony between witnesses suf-

Inspiration and Canonicity: The Formation of the Biblical Canon

fices only to invalidate their testimony; it is hardly a capital offence.¹³ For these reasons, the rabbis denied the book of Susanna a place in the biblical canon.

3. Solomon Zeitlin postulated that the third and final section of the biblical canon (with the exception of Ecclesiastes and Esther) was canonized in 65 CE.¹⁴ Well aware that at that late date virtually all of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books were in circulation, Zeitlin felt constrained to explain away the deliberate rejection of those books by the rabbis. He adopted Chajes' approach and applied it to a wide variety of non-canonical books. Thus, e.g., according to Tobit 7.14, Raguel gave his daughter away in marriage by means of a legal document which he wrote. But according to normative Jewish practice, the groom writes the legal document and hands it over to the bride. Zeitlin concluded that the rabbis 'would never canonize a book which was in direct contradiction with their Halakah'.¹⁵

4. Alluding to the rabbinic rejection of some of the pseudepigrapha, Rudolf Meyer wrote:¹⁶

There was also differentiation against the pre-Mosaic period. Since the Torah was the source of all knowledge, there could be no work of greater antiquity if the system was to stand. This implied the rejection of any religious claim which the literature of the patriarchal period might have.

Thus, according to Meyer, such pseudepigraphical works as the Life of Adam and Eve, the books of Enoch, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were rejected by the rabbis simply because the Torah faithful would not tolerate a work claiming greater antiquity than the Torah itself.

Critique of the solutions proffered

Solutions 1-3 are of a kind. In common they postulate that discrepancies between candidates for scripture and rabbinic teaching sufficed to bring about the exclusion of the various apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works from the biblical canon. When, however, one allows for the range of discrepancy tolerated by the received scriptures, as well as the range of discrepancy tolerated in mishnaic and talmudic teaching, the specious character of solutions 1-3 becomes evident. Thus, for example, Gen. 26.34 and 36.2 (similarly Gen. 28.9 and 36.3), passages generally ascribed by source analysis to the same do-

cument (P), are contradictory. Nevertheless, the editors of P – if one accepts the documentary hypothesis – as well as the redactor(s) of the Torah saw no problem in incorporating and canonizing a contradiction for all generations. Nor can it be argued that such picayune discrepancies are hardly analogous to the more substantive discrepancies raised by Jerome's Jewish informants, by Chajes, and by Zeitlin. More fundamental discrepancies, whether apparent or real, were incorporated into scripture. Two different versions of the Ten Commandments, each claiming to be the *ipsissima verba* of the Lord, are embedded in scripture. Deut. 24.16 proscribes vicarious punishment; Ex. 34.7 presupposes it.¹⁷ Num. 18.18 flatly contradicts Deut. 15.20. Deut. 17.15 either requires or tolerates the appointment of an Israelite monarch; the clear implication of I Sam. 8.5 ff. is that no such verse was known in Samuel's day. The list could go on and on, but enough samples have been adduced to prove the point. Whether we assume that all of scripture was canonized simultaneously, or that it was canonized in stages, the authorities responsible for its canonization were not troubled by apparent or real inconsistencies – at least with regard to according books biblical status.¹⁸ Inconsistency was not equated with heresy. (A modern Yiddish proverb sums it up well: פון א קשיא שטארבט מען נישט – one doesn't die from a question.) It would appear that the authorities were more concerned with 'Who said it?' than with what was said. And as will be suggested below, they were more concerned with identifying the circles from which a particular book emanated than with the details of its message.¹⁹

In the light of the discoveries at Qumran, solution 4 is no longer tenable. The central significance of the Torah was no less the case at Qumran than it was at Jerusalem or Jamnia. Nevertheless, Jubilees, Enoch, the Testaments of Levi and Naphtali, and the Torah co-existed at Qumran. Moreover, not a few rabbis (see bBB 15b; pSot 20d; and GenR. 57.4, pp. 614–15) assigned Job and his book to the patriarchal period; obviously they did not feel that the authority of the Torah was jeopardized by the existence of books of greater antiquity. That the book of Job – and not only Job himself – was assigned by some rabbis to the patriarchal period is implied by the talmudic text at bBB 15a. It is perhaps not superfluous to add that in 1980 hundreds of pious and learned Jews include in their library of 'sacred texts'²⁰ a mystical treatise entitled The Book of the Angel Raziel, which

Inspiration and Canonicity: The Formation of the Biblical Canon

they are persuaded was authored by the angel Raziel, who then presented it to Adam (for so it is stated on the title page). Its alleged antiquity and authority have never been viewed as a threat to the Torah.

Some suggestions

In the light of an examination of the evidence bearing on the formation and closing of the biblical canon of the rabbis,²¹ the following suggestions may provide a more adequate response to the questions raised at the start of this essay.

1. Books believed to have been authored after the cessation of prophecy did not qualify for inclusion in the biblical canon of the rabbis. Since the cessation of prophecy was thought to have occurred in the late Persian period or in the early Hellenistic period (but certainly before the Maccabean revolt), much of the extant apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, and Qumran literature probably was never considered for inclusion in the biblical canon. This for one of two reasons:

(a) If the books were known to have been authored in the third century BCE or later, they could not qualify for inclusion in the biblical canon because they were not inspired.

(b) The effective date for the closing of the biblical canon was not 65 CE, as suggested by Zeitlin, but somewhere in the early Maccabean period, perhaps circa 150 BCE. Nowhere in rabbinic literature (or, for that matter, in the books of the Apocrypha or in Josephus) is it suggested that a book was *added* to the biblical canon that obtained in the second century BCE. Some rabbis attempted to constrict the corpus of canonical books by removing Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, or Esther from the biblical canon.²² They did not suggest *new* candidates for inclusion in the biblical canon. Thus, books published for the first time in the first centuries BCE and CE, even if ascribed to the biblical period, were not candidates for biblical canonicity because their candidacy was declared after the fact, i.e. after the biblical canon of the rabbis, or their immediate predecessors, was closed.

2. Books composed in Greek were automatically disqualified from inclusion in the biblical canon.²³ Only Hebrew was viewed as an appropriate vehicle for recording inspired literature. Thus, on linguistic grounds alone books such as the Wisdom of Solomon and II Maccabees were automatically disqualified from attaining biblical status.

3. Books written in Hebrew and ascribed to the biblical period which challenged *central* halakic teachings of the rabbis were *ipso facto* excluded from the biblical canon. Thus, the book of Jubilees, which is predicated upon a calendar at variance with the rabbinic calendar, could not be considered a serious candidate for inclusion in the biblical canon. A call to celebrate all the festivals on the 'wrong' days of the year (with the consequence that all the festal offerings were invalid; the High Priest's entry into the Holy of Holies was on the 'wrong' day – a capital offence; etc.) could only be viewed as rank heresy. I stress 'books which challenged central halakic teachings of the rabbis', for books which challenged central theological teachings of the rabbis, while problematic, were not necessarily excluded from the biblical canon. Ecclesiastes is a case in point. Its seemingly antinomian, pessimistic, and often contradictory sentiments left the rabbis nonplussed. Despite the theological problems it created for the rabbis, Ecclesiastes retained its position in the biblical canon precisely because it did not challenge central halakic practices in any substantive way. Halakic Judaism has managed to survive for over 2000 years despite its retention of Ecclesiastes in the biblical canon. Indeed, in the medieval period halakic Judaism instituted the public reading of Ecclesiastes in the synagogue service.

4. Books whose biblical status was uncertain, such as the book of Ben Sira,²⁴ were sometimes excluded from the biblical canon precisely because they were venerated as biblical by sectarian groups. In Judaeo-Christian circles, the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature formed an inspired literary continuum between the Old and New Testaments. Rabbinic Judaism, however, recognized that prophecy had ceased prior to the Maccabean period. The rabbis could not accept the apocryphal books as inspired literature, nor did they have any ulterior motive for doing so. The book of Ben Sira was in all likelihood excluded from the biblical canon as part of a general rabbinic polemic against literature with biblical pretensions. Its content, *per se*, presented no problem to the rabbis. Indeed, in a later period when the biblical canon was irrevocably fixed and when Jewish sectarian canons no longer posed a threat to rabbinic Judaism, the book of Ben Sira was read and expounded in rabbinic circles much like any other biblical book. It was considered an uninspired canonical book. It was thought to be uninspired because it was authored in the post-prophetic

Inspiration and Canonicity: The Formation of the Biblical Canon

period; nevertheless, it was canonical for the rabbis in that they accepted it as an authoritative guide for religious doctrine and practice.²⁵

It is noteworthy that for the rabbis the notions of inspiration and canonicity were separate and distinct. An inspired book was a book believed to have been composed under divine inspiration. A canonical book was a book considered authoritative for religious doctrine and practice. The biblical canon of the rabbis consisted of those books they considered at once inspired and canonical. Other books, such as Ben Sira, retained their canonical status while being excluded from the biblical canon.

The biblical canon and normative self-definition

The biblical canon was shaped by a community; it would then contribute to the shaping of that community.²⁶ What scripture did for the Jews was more than what the Jews did for scripture. If Jews have survived to this very day as Jews, it is precisely because scripture provided a framework for Jewish survival. Throughout Jewish history, normative self-definition was very much bound up with scripture and how it was perceived. It is not simply the phenomenon of being a people of the book, however, that is distinctive. Jewish sectarians, and the various Christian and Islamic religious communities through the ages, would make the same claim. Ultimately, the critical differences go back to a more fundamental question: sources of authority. Who determines whether or not prophecy has ceased? Who determines whether or not a prophet or a messiah will be viewed as true or false? Who decides whether or not a book will be accorded biblical status? Who decides whether or not a given biblical verse is to be taken literally or figuratively? What criteria will be used in making these determinations? The most potent factor in normative self-definition rests in the answers to these questions.

Notes to pages 52–57

48. J. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina*, 1902, esp. pp. 34–37.

49. Kurfess, *NTApoc II*, p. 708.

50. J. G. Gager, 'Some Attempts to Label the *Oracula Sibyllina*, Book 7', *HTR* 65, 1972, pp. 91–7.

51. Collins in the Doubleday edition of the *Pseudepigrapha*.

52. S. Pines demonstrates that in a tenth-century treatise of 'Abd al-Jabbār, which contains interpolations from Jewish Christian traditions, there is abundant evidence of major rifts within Christianity. Reminiscent of some passages in Ascens. Isa. is the claim by Jewish Christians that 'the Christians' have abandoned 'the religion of Christ'. Pines astutely observes that Jewish Christians may have found 'coexistence with Jews' easier than with 'Christians' (p. 44). Pines is arguing for the possibility that Jewish Christians 'may have intermingled with and exercised a certain influence on Jewish sects' (p. 44). We have seen evidence of a reverse influence, and that could increase the possibilities Pines has perceived. See Pines, *The Jewish Christians of the Early Centuries of Christianity According to a New Source*, 1966. Also see R. A. Kraft's judicious review of this booklet in *JBL* 86, 1967, pp. 329f., and R. McL. Wilson's cautions about the importance of the document in 'The New Passion of Jesus in the Light of the New Testament and Apocrypha', *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (ed. Ellis and Wilcox), 1969, pp. 264–71. Research on Jewish Christianity is greatly facilitated by A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reinink's *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*, 1973.

53. At the same time, the 'Jewish community, overwhelmingly, continued to recognize the basically legal character of Judaism, as is evident from the creation of the Talmud, both the Palestinian and Babylonian versions': H. M. Orlinsky, *The Bible as Law: God and Israel under Contract*, 1978, p. 19.

54. Morton Smith, 'Early Christianity and Judaism', *Great Confrontations in Jewish History* (ed. Wagner and Breck), 1977, p. 41, demonstrates how 'the emergence of Christianity and rabbinic Judaism as distinct entities' was 'a gradual process of distinction and definition'. With Smith we have seen that Christianity evolved during the first two centuries in and through 'conflicts with other Jewish groups'. After this period, as Smith states, 'two practically independent religions' 'live side by side' evolving 'principally by the needs of their own internal developments, not by their relation to each other' (p. 61).

3 *Inspiration and Canonicity: Reflections on the Formation of the Biblical Canon*

1. S. Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture*, pp. 9f.

2. See bMeg 7a and the discussion in Leiman, *Canonization*, pp. 102–20.

3. See bMeg 14a: 'Many prophets arose in Israel, even double the

Notes to pages 57–58

number of Israelites who came out of Egypt. But only prophecies required for all generations were written down.'

It may be that by 'written down' the rabbis intended 'included in the biblical canon'. Cf. the usage of *ktb* at bYom 29a. Thus, the rabbis may have recognized that much of what the biblical authors had to say was reduced to writing without being accorded biblical status – precisely because it was not required for all generations. See especially tYad 2.14.

4. Leiman, *Canonization*, pp. 132–5 and notes.

5. Cf. M. Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*, 1971, pp. 148–50.

6. For purposes of this presentation, I have excluded the talmudic justifications for the ban against reading Ben Sira. These talmudic justifications are probably later than Jerome; they are ambiguous; and in the case of the Babylonian Talmud, the justification relates to a late, faulty, and otherwise unknown version of Ben Sira. See Leiman, *Canonization*, pp. 86–102 and notes.

7. Jerome, *Comm. in Hier.* V.67 (CCSL 74, pp. 284f.).

8. Origen, *Ep. ad Africanum* 8 (PG 11, cols. 64f.).

9. For related Jewish traditions see L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* VI, 1928, p. 426 n. 106. Add R. Kasher, 'Ha-Toseftot ha-Targumiyot le-Haftarat Shabbat Hanukkah', *Tarbiz* 45, 1975–6, pp. 41–2, and correct J. Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, 1978, p. 129 n. 16, accordingly.

10. For the translation, see J. Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary*, p. 128. The original Latin (see above, n. 7) reads as follows: 'Aiunt Hebraei hos esse presbyteros, qui fecerint stultitiam in Israhel et moechati sunt uxores ciuium suorum, quorum uni loquitur Danihel: inueterate dierum malorum et alteri: semen Chanaam et non Iuda, species decipit te et concupiscentia peruertit cor tuum! Sic faciebatis filiabus Israhel et illae metuentes loquebantur uobiscum; sed non filia Iudae sustinuit iniquitatem uestram. Quodque propheta nunc loquitur: et locuti sunt uerbum in nomine meo mendaciter, quod non mandauit eis, illud significari putant, quod miseras mulierculas, quae circumferuntur omnium doctrinae, sic deceperint, quo dicerent eis, quia de tribu erant Iuda, Christum de suo semine esse generandum; quae inlectae cupidine praebebant corpora sua quasi matres futurae Christi. Sed illud, quod in praesentiarum dicitur: quos frigit rex Babylonis in igne, uidetur Danihelis historiae contraire. Ille enim asserit eos ad sententiam Danihelis a populo esse lapidatos; hic uero scriptum est, quod frixerit eos rex Babylonis in igne. Unde et a plerisque ac paene omnibus Hebraeis ipsa quasi fabula non recipitur nec legitur in synagogis eorum. "Qui enim", inquit, "fieri poterat, ut captiui lapidandi principes et prophetas suos haberent potestatem?" Magisque hoc esse uerum affirmant, quod scribit Hieremias, conuictos quidem esse presbyteros a Danihele, sed latam in eos sententiam a rege Babylonis, qui in captiuos ut uictor et dominus habebat imperium.'

11. Z. H. Chajes, *Kol Sifre MaHaRaTS Hayot* I, 1958, pp. 94–5.

Notes to pages 58–62

12. See bSanh 52b and Rashi's comments ad loc.
13. See mSanh 5.2; cf. mMakk 1.4.
14. S. Zeitlin, 'An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures', *PAAJR* 3, 1930–31, pp. 121–58. Cf. his 'Jewish Apocryphal Literature', *JQR* 40, 1949–50, pp. 223–50.
15. Zeitlin, 'An Historical Study', p. 149. Cf. Zeitlin's views on Susanna, *ibid.*, pp. 149–51, which echo those of Chajes. Zeitlin's disciple, S. B. Hoenig, repeats his mentor's views in the entry 'Susanna', *IDB* IV, pp. 467f. See also H. M. Orlinsky, 'The Canonization of the Bible and the Exclusion of the Apocrypha', in his *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation*, 1974, especially pp. 277–86; and his 'The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators', *HUCA* 46, 1975, p. 100 n. 14. Cf. C. A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions*, 1977, pp. 80f.
16. Rudolf Meyer, *TDNT* III, p. 982.
17. For an early rabbinic adumbration of modern scholarly discussion of the problem, see D. Hoffmann (ed.), *Midrasch Tanna'im* II, Berlin 1909, p. 159, bottom. For the definitive modern treatment, see M. Greenberg, 'Some Postulates of Biblical Criminal Law', in *The Jewish Expression* (ed. Goldin), 1976, pp. 18–37.
18. Especially instructive is the fact that Jerome's informant was unaware of the discrepancy between the book of Susanna and talmudic teaching regarding conflict of testimony. Apparently, what was obvious and decisive for Chajes and Zeitlin was of no consequence for Jerome's informant.
19. A similar phenomenon occurred in the medieval period when the Zohar assumed canonical status among the Kabbalists. The fact that its teaching conflicted at times with talmudic teaching and with the received halakah was noticed, but did not prevent it from assuming canonical status even among such ranking talmudists as Joseph Karo and Elijah Gaon of Vilna.
20. By 'sacred texts', religious (*sifre qodesh*) rather than secular (*sifre hol*) or profane writings are intended. Such religious writings are studied (by some) and venerated (by all) but are not accorded biblical status.
21. Leiman, *Canonization*, pp. 16–204.
22. It was precisely the inspired status of these biblical books that was at stake in the rabbinic discussions. As to why their inspired status was suspect, see Leiman, *Canonization*, p. 132.
23. So already Zeitlin, 'Jewish Apocryphal Literature', p. 233.
24. For possible evidence that some rabbinic authorities accorded Ben Sira biblical status, see Leiman, *Canonization*, p. 81 and notes 343 and 345; p. 99 and notes 470 and 471. If indeed some rabbinic authorities accorded Ben Sira biblical status, it is likely that those authorities dated Ben Sira to Simon I, who in rabbinic sources was viewed as a contemporary of the last of the prophets and of Alexander the Great. For the rabbinic sources on Simon I, see J. M. Grintz, *מבואי מקרא*, Tel Aviv 1972, pp. 36–7. For an early dating of Ben Sira, see R. H. Charles

Notes to pages 62–67

(ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament I*, pp. 293–4, and cf. E. Rivkin, 'Ben Sira and the Nonexistence of the Synagogue', in *In the Time of Harvest*, 1963, pp. 348–50 (Appendix A).

25. Leiman, *Canonization*, pp. 92–102.

26. For the historian, these two enterprises (the history of the formation of the biblical canon *vis-à-vis* the role played by the biblical canon in history) must not be confused. Such confusion appears to be the trademark of many who engage in so-called canon criticism, about which I shall have more to say elsewhere. Suffice to say here that while both enterprises merit the careful attention of modern scholarship, they are hardly interchangeable parts.

4 Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism

1. J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, 1836–43; ²1877–78.

2. See Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Hellenism', *EJ* VIII, 1972, col. 291, and *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*, Middletown, Connecticut 1977, pp. 307–12.

3. Walter Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ⁵1958, col. 499; ET, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, ²1979, pp. 251f.; G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1961–68, p. 451b; cf. H. Windisch, 'Hellēn', *TDNT* II, pp. 507–16.

4. II Macc. 2.21.

5. II Macc. 4.13; much later, Tacitus (*Hist.* V.8.2) recorded the false tradition that Antiochus IV had tried to impose Greek ways upon the Jews; see Jonathan A. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 1976, pp. 131–59, 250f.

6. M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, ET, 2 vols., 1974.

7. *Ibid.* I, p. 252.

8. See, e.g., Hecataeus of Abdera apud Josephus, *Ap.* I.190–93. On the authenticity of the passage, see below, n. 62.

9. See Werner Jaeger, *Paideia*, ET, 3 vols., 1939–45.

10. II Macc. 12.19, 24.

11. II Macc. 7; the author finds it necessary to mention the fact that on occasion the martyrs speak, not Greek, but 'the ancestral language' (vv. 8, 21, 27).

12. The greater part of the protest literature of the conquered peoples was indeed directed against the Greek-speaking rulers. See the perceptive remarks of Samuel K. Eddy, *The King Is Dead*, 1961, pp. 333f.

13. See David Lelyveld, *Aligarh's First Generation*, 1978.

14. Greeks resented the fact that *Hellenized* Jews would not worship Greek gods; see, e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* XII.125.

15. See below, pp. 73–84.

16. See Martin P. Nilsson, *Die hellenistische Schule*, 1955; Henri I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, ET 1964, pp. 147–86 (to be corrected by Nilsson, pp. 34–42), 256–60; Jean Delorme, *Gymnasion*, 1960.