Illuminator vs. Redeemer:
Was Ebionite Adam/Christ Prophetology
"Original," Anti-Pauline, or "Gnostic"?

© 2012 by Christopher Buck

(written June 1982)

The rediscovery of Ebionite Christianity is one of the achievements of recent scholarship.[1] Since World War II, specialists in Christian origins have sought to recover what might be thought of as "lost" forms of Christianity. Of all forms of Jewish Christianity, Ebionism is the most distinct and well known. The researches of Bavarian scholar Schoeps drew the notice of fellow scholars to verifiably Ebionite elements preserved in the Pseudo–Clementine *Homilies* ("H") and *Recognitions* ("R"),[2] until then deemed romances devoid of much historical worth. The late Cardinal Danielou treated Jewish Christianity phenomenologically, defining its various forms collectively as a culture ("a culture of apocalypses"). Made possible by the convergence of manuscript discoveries, Danielou succeeded in presenting Jewish Christianity as the predominant though not exclusive influence in the early Church for a full century after Christ.[3] Jewish Christians were primarily living in Palestine, Transjordan, and Syria, but were doubtless in Rome, Asia Minor, and northern Africa as well. Jewish Christianity, like a lost civilization, appears once to have had a formative (though later ostracized) presence in the early Christian world.

The two Jewish revolts reversed the situation, such that the ethno– ("pagan") Christians emerged as the prevailing "orthodoxy." Judged in relation to "triumphant Pauline Christianity," the early major forms of Jewish Christianity were "completely misunderstood by Western heresiologues" which condemned Millenarism, Encratism, and Ebionism as impoverished doctrine.[4] All of this surprising data so revolutionized concepts of Christian origins that Quispel of Utrecht was led to declare that "the Jewish Christians or Ebionites were the legitimate heirs of primitive Christianity, whereas the New Testament to a large extent reflects the views of Gentile Christianity as defended by St. Paul and his fellows. This is the present state of scholarship."[5]

Whether or not such a "present state of scholarship" as Quispel asserted could once have claimed a consensus in 1969 has now yielded to a more general view that there flourished a remarkable diversity in the early Christian world, this being reflected in the New Testament itself, and certainly within "Jewish Christianity." Thus, sub–categories within Jewish Christianity had to be established. However, classifications which had served as descriptive

conveniences for historians, such as "Jewish," "Gnostic," and "Hellenistic," have been called into question. Syncretism was a fact, both culturally and, in particular, religiously, adding great overlap to and blurring distinctions among such divisions. As to Jewish Christianity as a whole, data became so vast that one scholar observed: " 'Judaeo-Christianity' is now an entity which seems to grow while we are not looking; it has become the broomstick of the Sorcerer's Apprentice."[6]

The bewildering diversity of Jewish Christianity does not detract from the fact that Ebionite Christianity still invites study,[7] since it can serve as a telescope to very archaic Christian thought–patterns, and their development and persistence in a Semitic milieu. Following the direction of Robinson and Koester's *Trajectories* (1971), in this paper an effort will be made to plot a "trajectory" for Ebionite Christology, since Christology is central to the beliefs of every Christianity. How did the idea of a Prophet–Messiah develop into the Ebionite doctrine of "the True Prophet," and how did this Adam/Christ prophetology function in relation to other forms of Christianity? Did the archaic traditions which Ebionite Christianity conserved develop adaptatively to new historical situations, such that the same Christology functioned successively differently as time went on?

One major source for knowledge of Ebionite beliefs is the Pseudo–Clementine romance. Within that romance are embedded parts of a lost Ebionite work known as the *Kerygmata Petrou* (KP), which purport to be sermons of Peter. The KP pericopes have been identified methodologically[8] within the Pseudo-Clementines (PsC), with only minor variances among scholars.[9] The Christology of the KP is generally called by historians of religions, the doctrine of "the True Prophet." The role of the true Prophet is that of an Illuminator: "For this is peculiar to the Prophet, to reveal the truth, even as it is peculiar to the sun to bring the new day" (H 2:6). That Prophet "alone is able to enlighten the souls of men, so that with our own eyes we may be able to see the way of eternal salvation" (H 1:19). "For otherwise it is impossible to get knowledge of divine and eternal things" (R 1:16). Elsewhere, the PsC state that "no one can know the mind or work of the invisible and incomprehensible God, unless He Himself send a prophet to declare His purpose" (R 8:58 not KP), evocative of Jewish prophetology as reflected in Amos 3:7.

The true Prophet bestows salvation by showing the way, but the salvation spoken of here is not Redemption or Atonement. "Wherefore the first duty of all is to inquire into the righteousness of God and His kingdom" states the KP Peter in echo of the Sermon on the Mount (R 2:20; Matt 6:33). Christ is called "our King of righteousness" (H 8:21) but "neither is there salvation in believing in teachers and calling them lords" (H 8:5). Rather: "This is religion: to worship Him only and to believe only in the Prophet of Truth" (H 7:8). The Christianity of the KP is more Theocentric than Christocentric, since Christ is described as "the gate" to the city of God (R 2:22), where the presence of God is the soul's destination, Christ being the way.

Upon recognition of the true Prophet, following the Messenger is equivalent to belief in him. Thus Peter of the KP continues to define true religion in the same passage of the KP in details which evoke the so–called Apostolic Decree,[10] ending with the exhortation that true Christians should be "given to good works, refraining from wrongdoing, looking for eternal life from the all–powerful God." However, the eternal life spoken of here is not simply everlasting life, since the immortality of the soul is assumed by the KP "the souls of men, being drops of pure light…not…capable of dying" (H 20:9: cf. H 16:16).

Not only is Jesus the true Prophet, but Moses also; hence "through both" Moses and Jesus "one and the same teaching becomes known" and "God accepts those who believe in one of them" (H 8:6). Words alone are of no worth, but only deeds which are "good works" (H 8:7). After quoting a saying of Jesus which compares to Matt 7:21/Luke 6:46 ("Why sayest thou Lord to me and doest not what I say?"), Peter concludes "but if a man has been considered worthy to know both teachers as heralds of a single doctrine, then that man is counted rich in God" (H 8:7). For the KP, the law saves; for Paul it enslaves. In essence, however, the KP states that "the love of men towards God is sufficient for salvation" (H 3:8), bearing in mind that "he is a worshipper of God, who does the will of God, and observes the precepts of His law" (R 5:34).

All throughout the KP, Moses and Jesus are paralleled. "I am he concerning whom Moses prophesied," proclaims Jesus in the KP, saying, "A Prophet shall the Lord our God raise unto you of your brethren, like unto me: Him hear in all things; and whosoever will not hear that Prophet shall die" (H 3:53). In the same pericope of the KP, Jesus is identified as the Son of God. This is a qualified Sonship in the sense that it is unique, but not exclusive — unique in the sense that Jesus is elevated to the "*beloved* Son of God" (adopted as and called so "in the waters of baptism" [R 1:48]); but not exclusive, since "the Evil One" (H 2:38), the "king of things present" (H 8:21), could, in a sense, be regarded as a primordial "brother" of Christ (H 20:7; this being Micah's reaction to Peter's use of the word "child" of God relative to the evil principle). The idea of Sonship is purely symbolic (H 16:16), where the Son is not of the same substance as the Father. Men can become "sons of adoption" (R 4:9). Nor does "the Evil One" (H 19:2) have anything but a relative and symbolic personification: "Evil, then, does not exist always, yea, it cannot even exist at all substantially" (H 19:20; cf. R 4:23 not KP). Not only is God spirit in the KP, but the Son of God also.

Not only is Jesus "born" as the Son of God in the Jordan river (cf. Ps 2:7 as a testimony–text adduced *in full* by the Codex Bezae (D) and the Old Latin versions of Luke 3:22 as well as fragment 4 of the Gospel of the Ebionites)[11] he is also the Messiah. But this title has for the KP a specific sense apart from Jesus. A distinction obtains here between *Jesus* and *Christ*. Jesus is a man (though not "mere") who became the Christ; the Christ spirit entered into Jesus at Baptism. When patristic sources charge that Ebionites denied the Virgin Birth, possibly what

the Ebionites had denied was that the Christ–Spirit was a man and that Christ's mother was a woman, since she was in reality the Holy Spirit.[12]

How, therefore, does the KP define the Sonship and Messiahship of Christ? The answer is to be found in the idea of a Messianic genius, a theophanology in which the Messiah is thought of as the pre-existent Will of God, which in each age of history "chooses" a special man to translate that Will to mankind:

> But the reason of his being called the Messiah (the Anointed One) is that, being the Son of God, he was a man, and that, because he was the first beginning, his Father in the beginning anointed him with oil which was from the Tree of Life (Syriac R 1:45:4).[13]

The statement, "he was a man," probably refers to the fact that in the beginning Adam was the Son of God and the Christ, for the text which follows states:

> I remember, Peter, that you have told me concerning the Primordial Man that he was a prophet, but that he was anointed you have not told me. If accordingly a man cannot be a prophet without being anointed, how could the Primordial Man then be a prophet when he had not been anointed? (Peter answers:)…If the Primordial Man prophesied, it is clear that he was also the Anointed One (Messiah) (Syriac R 1:47:1–3).[14]

It is therefore clear that Jesus was, in Ebionite Christology, Adam/Prophet/Christ/Son of God. As also "Master" (H 2:51) and "Teacher" (H 11:20), and even "Lord" (H 16:15), it is very certain that Christ is not equal to God: "Our Lord neither asserted that there were gods except the Creator of all, nor did He proclaim Himself to be God…" (H 16:15). The Peter of the KP offers the logic that "it is the peculiarity of the Father not to have been begotten, but of the Son to have been begotten; but what is begotten cannot be compared with that which is unbegotten or self–begotten" (H 16:16).

Once again, the most important concept to Ebionite Christology, at least during the second and third centuries, was the doctrine of the True Prophet. There is a curious oscillation between the one and the many in this KP belief. On the one hand, the "true Prophet is the Christ" (R 1:44), "the eternal Christ" (R 1:43), "the only true Prophet" (H 3:21), who "alone… from the beginning of the world, changing his forms and names, runs through universal time until, anointed for his toils by the mercy of God,…comes to his own time and rests for ever" (H 3:20). While the true Prophet is single, the manifestations are plural, such that revelations were given to Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses (H 17:4; R 2:47) "who were the seven pillars of the world" (H 18:14 not KP). God's "only Son" (H 8:10) makes the eighth such epiphany, this sequence being attested by the Ebionite scholar Symmachus, who renders the eight "princes" of Micah 5:4 into the eight "Christs" (= "Messiahs").[15]

The one and the many inter–relate so that "the Prophet of truth, being one,…shall in His own times have as His prophets all who are found pure" (H 3:16 prior to KP). This passage cannot refer to ecstatic Christian "prophets" of pneumatic movements (as most interpreters, including Montantists, have treated Matt 23:34) since Peter, who would be the likeliest to be so highly regarded, disavows the distinction ("I who am not a prophet, but a disciple of the true Prophet [H 18:7]). Schoeps states that the KP texts "betray a certain vacillation between manifestation and incarnation in the mode of the presence of the Shekinah in the bearers of the Spirit of revelation, who are, in any event, brought into a unity through this Spirit."[16] In this sense, Jesus would be the incarnation of the Christ–Spirit, but not of God, strictly speaking.

Ebionite Christology is further developed and articulated by related ideas about Christ which constellate around the True Prophet doctrine. As to other titles, the "Gate of Life" (H 16:14), the "Wisdom of God" (R 1:39, 40) are applied to the true Prophet, as do (for the sake of one argument) the terms "god" and "angel" (H 16:14). But the KP defines angels as "they who are the angels of the least of the faithful among us" (H 17:7) in what recalls Jesus' equation of true believers as angels (Luke 20:26).[17] "Christ is God of the princes" (or gods; R 2:42) in a figurative sense only; who calls any other than the one who "alone is both called and is God" will receive "eternal punishment of soul" (H 3:37). The "holy men…are made gods to the wicked" (R 2:42) just as Christ the greatest archangel (also R 2:42). In this respect, Christ is not a man; yet Jesus is the "Son of Man" (R 3:61), but this is not an important title in KP.

Generally speaking, the KP Christology is adoptionist (R 4:9); but a subordinationist Christology can be detected as well (R 6:8), though it is not prominent. For example, a citation of Matt 19:17 occurs just after a KP pericope (H 3:57), but direct evidence is found in a KP text which states that God "is alone good" (H 2:46). Yet even the ascription of good to God alone is insufficient: "but God cannot be good or evil, just or unjust. Nor indeed can He have intelligence, or life, or any of the other attributes which can exist in men, for all these are peculiar to men. And…it is not possible for us to have any thought or make any statement in regard to God; but all we can do is to investigate one point alone, namely, what is His will which He Himself has allowed us to apprehend" (H 19:10). "Be it so," the KP Peter teaches, "you cannot know what God *is*, but you can very easily know what God is *not*," (R 6:6). In the KP, all things, including Christ, are subordinated to God.

It is striking how the KP is always careful to conserve the unity of God, and does so with a refinement remarkable in an ancient world accustomed to all kinds of categorical imperatives asserted of God. The Christology of the KP is correspondingly quite highly developed; but for the KP, the idea that Christ "thought it not robbery to be equal with God" (Phil. 2:6) would be one of the absurdities against God" (R 2:55). This purified idea of God has for the KP a unific function: "… that monarchy, on the one hand, is productive of concord, but polyarchy is effective of wars. For unity does not fight with itself" (H 9:2). This is insightful, since the doctrine of the Trinity provoked controversy and factionalism within the Great Church.

How did this Ebionite Christology evolve? Can stages in its development be tracked? In order to do this it will be useful to periodize Ebionite history into pre-Pauline, Pauline, and post–Pauline stages. In a sense, this will be like drawing a tree, representing first roots, then trunk, and at last branches. Let us recall some relevant, first–century apocalyptic expectations which were the roots of the KP's own prophetology.

Within the religious spectrum of Mosaic sects (such as Pharisees, Sadducees, and "Essenes," who appear to include Qumran "Covenanters," pre-Christian Nazarenes, Rechabites, etc. [cf. R 1:54 and 1:37 on Jewish sects and the "right opinion of a Jewish minority" — Essenes?]), a diversity of eschatological dramas in the form of apocalypses turned hopes into utopias and ancient worthies into future saviors. Warrior–kings, monarchial priests, and patriarchal Prophets were the leaders necessary to bring the golden age back to the chosen people. By the time of the first century, the Qumran Covenanters awaited the advent of "the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (IQS 9:11). This same trio appears again in the Messianic Anthology or Testimonia (4QTestim 5–20) from Cave 4, in appeal to three proof–texts: (1) Deut 18:18–19 (the Prophet); (2) Num 24:15–17 (the King); and *3) Deut 33:8–11 (the Priest).

Corresponding exactly, though ordered differently, to the three figures referred to by the priests and Levites in John 1:19–25, the Prophet is not designated as a Messiah, even though in close association with two Messiahs. The only possible instance in the Dead Sea Scrolls where the word Messiah might have the role of a prophet is found in a fragment dealing with Melchizedek (11QMelch).[18] Two OT texts speak of the anointing of a prophet (Is 61:1 and 1 Kgs 19:16; cf. Ps 105:15). The Melchizedek fragment, dated by Cross in the first half of the first Christian century,[19] offers a *pesher* (a special Essene midrash) on one of those texts, *viz*., Is 61:1–3. What is striking is that line 18 speaks of the *mebasser* ("herald") as the Messiah: "and the herald is that Anointed One about whom Daniel said…"[20] . The usage of the word "Anointed" is seen as "absolute" here, and "so much is certain that this herald of glad tidings is the prophet who announced the radical turn in the world's events brought about by God (through Melchizedek)."[21] Thus, the Qumran community appears to have expected three distinct eschatological figures. The first is a Prophet who could well have been thought of as "anointed," just as the two other figures, who are Messiahs (in a sequence of prophetic, priestly, and royal Messiahs?). Evidence suggests a Prophet–Messiah expectation to have been alive in Samaria as well.

In the Rejection pericope of Luke 4, Jesus adduces the Is 61 verse as a proof–text to show that he himself was the Prophet–Messiah foretold by Isaiah, in a way much like the *pesher* in the Melchizedek fragment. But not only is there a Qumran–NT eschatological commonality, but a Qumran–Samaritan connexion as well, providing stronger context for Ebionite Christology. Returning to the Testimonia, Shekan identified the Qumran *pesher* on Deut 18:18–19 as from Ex 20:21 in the Samaritan recension.[22] If this is so, possibly the prophecy of the

Prophet like Moses, which text occurs in the Samaritan Decalogue, was of importance to Samaritans as well as Covenanters as early as the first century. This would account for the success of the Dositheus' messianic claim, in terms of attracting a following in second–century Samaria.

Eusebius reports that "the Samaritans were persuaded that Dositheus, who arose after the time of the Savior, was the very prophet whom Moses predicted; they were deceived by him, so that they said he was the Christ" (*Theophany* 4:35).[23] If Eusebius' record is accurate, the association of the terms "prophet" and "Christ" would show that a Prophet–Messiah expectation was then quite alive, just as the Melchizedek fragment would also attest. Corroboratively, in a significant historical reminiscence, the KP recalls that Dositheus and the Samaritan expectation which, in a sense, made Dositheus' following possible: "Another schism is that of the Samaritans; for they deny the resurrection of the dead,…. They indeed rightly, from the prediction of Moses, expect the one true Prophet; but by the wickedness of Dositheus, they were hindered from believing that Jesus is He whom they were expecting" (R 1:44).

What model can account for the Qumran eschatological trio, echoed in *John* 1:19–25, and particularly for the role of the Prophet–Messiah within that trio? Overlap is evident in Messianic traditions. Prophet, priest and king *par excellence* figured into eschatological expectations in an almost formulaic way: supreme leaders in each of these primary offices would cure Israel's ills. Such prophecies could function somewhat like a job description; if someone wished to assume leadership, appeal to prophecy was necessary for legitimation. The PsC state: "for what in the present age is more glorious than a prophet, more illustrious than a priest, more exalted than a king?" (R 1:46). What could serve as a better model for a Prophet–Messiah than the greatest Prophet the Jews had ever known, Moses (Deut 34:10)?

It is interesting that the Prophet–like–Moses claim made on behalf of Jesus, especially by Peter in Acts (3:19–22), is later placed by the KP on Jesus' own lips as a self–reference. This transference occurs in the PsC in a section which might best be described as an epitome of Christ's teachings through loosely–strung *logia*, Jesus cites Deut 18:15–16, 19 in H 3:53 (cf. R 1:36) in a way which Kline thinks follows an OT text very similar to Acts, but not from Acts itself; rather, a "testimony book" could have served as the source.[24] In a culture which continued to view Moses as the supreme religious figure in history, the identification of Jesus as a Mosaic eschatological prophet was predictable, even though the ideal of a King who could topple Caesars was more popular.

But what might have provided the most general provenance for Prophet–Messiah Christology in the PsC was more than a simple appeal to a single proof–text, or to even a compilation (and often conflation) of proof–texts circulating as a "testimony book." A full–blown Moses/Jesus association would have been more possible on the basis of what has been termed as "Moses aretalogy."[25] That is to say, there had been in circulation prior to Jesus a

"Prophet like Moses" pattern, in a fully–extended metaphor. Jesus, in a sense, becomes like Moses, for Moses was a messianic prototype, serving as both a predecessor and model–liberator. The idea of the "true Prophet" is really the "Prophet like Moses" theme — one which was current among the Samaritans also in the first century A.D., if not earlier.[26] Yet the eschatological association would continue to develop into a mystical union of identities: Moses and Christ will merge into a single messianic persona.

But the presentation of Jesus in the PsC goes beyond a formal similarity between Jesus and Moses; for Jesus actually becomes the new Moses.[27] By developing a parallelism between the two soteriological figures, the Ebionites developed as well a doctrine of parallel Covenants. This federal theology (where just as Moses is the teacher of the Jews, Christ is for the Gentiles [R 1:42]) led to significant conclusions with respect to religious toleration in post–classical times.[28] Peter in the KP declares: "For since through both, one and the same teaching becomes known, God accepts those who believe in one of them…. In all circumstances good works are needed; but if a man has been considered worthy to know both as heralds of a single doctrine, that man is counted rich in God" (H 8:6, 7).

One PsC passage argues that Christ is superior to Moses (R 1:59), but the KP for the most part is interested in establishing the equality between the two. The KP itself suggests a Moses aretalogy: "Therefore He chose us twelve, whom He named apostles; and afterwards the other seventy–two most approved disciples, that, at least in this way recognizing the pattern of Moses, the multitude might believe that this is He of whom Moses foretold, the Prophet that was to come" (R 1:50). But beyond the pattern or model of Moses, the idea of a "Moses *redivivus*" may be at work here (this figuring in both Qumran and Samaritan eschatologies) as a bridge to the Adam/Christ concept. An eschatological equation has been forming before our historical eyes: Adam = Christ = Moses Redivivus.

Later development of Ebionite Christology led to the view that not only was Christ the new Moses, but that Moses was the old Christ. The eschatological equation starts to be reversible. This was achieved through the idea that the Christ is an otherworldly messianic genius conferred upon certain chosen individuals throughout the course of history. The Christ was the source of enlightenment for every Prophet of the past, including Adam. In this respect, Adam was the first Christ.

The Ebionite Adam appears to be an extension of the Moses/Christ parallel: the KP asserts of Adam that it was "certain that he was a prophet" (R 1:47). No need had Adam to partake of the fruit of the Tree (H 3:212), nor was he a transgressor (H 2:52), for Adam was first "anointed with oil which was taken from the wood of the Tree of Life; from that anointing therefore he is called Christ" (R 1:45). As stated earlier, relative to Ebionite exegesis of *Micah* 5:4, all those to whom revelations were given included Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses (H 17:4; R 2:47). The PsC name these patriarchs "the seven pillars of the

world" (H 18:14 not KP). This idea exists in later Jewish sources, as does the idea that Adam was a prophet.[29] On this point various Church Fathers agree, but nowhere do we find Adam as being, in essence, the first Christ, except as an antitype. Is this, in turn, antitypal to Ebionite Christology, where the positive association of Adam and Christ is unique?

Most of the older Jewish sources which glorify Adam still come short of the idea of Adam as a prototype for the Messiah(s). In I Enoch 85–90 (Charles thought the PsC partly dependent on Enoch)[30] the white bull represents first Adam and then the Messiah. In a *targum* which may be dated second if not third century after Christ, there is a clue to why Adam is promoted, as it were, to Christhood: the motive is anti-Pauline. Throughout the Targum to Ezekiel, Adam rides the chariot–throne, and is central to the *targum*'s Merkabah vision. As such, Adam is non-messianic; nevertheless, Levey finds in the document two indirect attacks on Pauline doctrine. [31] These polemical thrusts against Paul's pejorative picture of Adam, who is both the antitype of Christ and the patron non-saint of Paul's emphasis on sin, suggest a parallel motive and thus an insight as to why the Ebionites came to regard Adam as a prototype of Christ.

Whereas in the first century A.D. Jewish Christians generally held to a Prophet–Messiah idea of Christ consistent with their Semitic eschatological milieu, later, in the second and third centuries, a Prophet–Messiah Christology was forced to interact with a predominantly Gentile Christian milieu, as well as within a Gnostic–Christian milieu. Prophet–Messiah Christology was becoming more and more controversial in a generally polemical milieu within Christendom. The Ebionite Christians, thus, were developing their own Christological counter–ontology, and counter–authority.

Reminiscent of Acts 15:7 ("God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear…the Gospel"), there is a KP passage where Peter declares: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the true Prophet,…sent us the ignorant Gentiles to baptize them for the remission of sins, and commanded us to teach them first" (H 17:6, 7). This is formulated in apparent opposition to Paul's authority arrogated in Gal 2:7: "But contrariwise,…the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter." That the figure of Simon in the Pseudo-Clementines is a thin literary disguise for Paul represents a scholarly consensus,[32] as should be obvious from the following KP pericope, in which Peter fulminates against Simon/Paul in what is probably the most famous passage of the PsC:

To the pious in their earthly lives, truth comes not in dreams or visions, but in the full consciousness of the waking mind. It was in this way that the Son was revealed to me by the Father. Hence I know from my own experience the meaning of revelation. As soon as the Lord asked who men considered Him to be, I said at once, "You are the Son of the living God" (Matt 16:16). And He who pronounced me blessed on this account, told me first that it was the Father

who had revealed this truth to me. Since then, I have known what revelation is; namely, the discovery of truth without instruction, vision or dream.

If Jesus has become known to you through visions, then it is only in such wise as in His anger He grants visions to His enemy. How then can any one be instructed through a vision so as to be capable of teaching? And if you object that it is possible, how is it then that the Master spent a whole year with us teaching us with our minds fully awake? How are we to believe that He in fact appeared to you at all? How can He have appeared to you when you believe the exact opposite of His doctrine? If, however, you have become an apostle as a result of an appearance which lasted but one hour, then you should proclaim and expound His teachings, you should love His apostles, and not quarrel with me, who was with Him on earth. You have opposed me, who am an unshakeable rock, the chief pillar of His church. Were you not my adversary, you would not calumniate me, and despise my preaching, with the result that I do not find the response of faith to teaching which I have heard directly from the mouth of the Lord, as though I stood condemned, and you were highly praised. When you call me "condemned" you are arraigning God, who revealed the Christ to me; you are impugning the Lord who because of this Revelation to me pronounced me blessed. If you really wish to work for the truth, then first of all learn something from us, learn what Jesus taught us, and as a disciple of truth, become our fellow worker (H 17:17, 18, 19).[33]

Elsewhere in the PsC, the authority and kerygma of Paul are contested. Over against Paul, the PsC describe Peter as "the true apostle of the true Prophet that was sent by God for the salvation of the world" (H 20:19 not KP). Bound up with the idea of a "true apostle" is the contrast to a "false apostle" (R 4:34 not KP). The two rival apostles would, as one would expect, proclaim two rival gospels. It is noteworthy that the only epistles of Paul the KP appears to be familiar with are *Galatians* and *1 Corinthians*.[34] It is precisely at the outset of *Galatians* (1:6) that Paul is "astonished" that there are those who are "deserting" him, turning instead to "a different gospel." What is this other gospel? Betz states that Paul himself refers to it as the "gospel of circumcision."[35] One recalls "another Jesus" and "another gospel" which Paul must fight (2 Cor 11:4). The verse right after (11:5) suggests once more the other gospel to be of Peter, who must be the one alluded to as "the very chiefest of apostles." That the Church had very early split into factions is clear from 1 Cor 1:12. Paul is quite open about having "withstood him to the face" (Gal 2:11), for Peter was to be "condemned." The episode at Antioch was what the KP had in mind. At the root of the conflict, doctrinally, was the eschatological Christ of Paul vs. the "historical," that is, Ebionite Jesus of Peter. This appears to be the purport of the KP diatribe against Paul, who is probably more the personification of Gentile or Roman Christianity than an individual which the KP Peter, who speaks for the Ebionites, polemicizes against.

The KP Peter urges Simon/Paul to "proclaim and expound" the "teachings" of Jesus. Clearly there is here an old form of the so–called "Jesus–Paul debate."[36] Any "quest for the

historical Jesus" of course involves the question of the extent to which the kerygma of Paul is modeled on earlier tradition, the extent to which that tradition itself echoes Jesus, as well as the extent to which tradition is further developed and possibly interpolated by Paul. Obviously, Paul never knew the earthly Jesus. (The KP Peter emphasizes this.) At a very early stage, however, Paul must have known *of* the earthly Jesus, in order to have actively persecuted "pre-Pauline" Christians. If the Acts account is true, then Paul had witnessed the martyrdom of Stephen, and the testimony of Stephen (or of James, Schoeps believes)[37] must have left an impression on Paul. Later, Paul experiences a call/commissioning Christophany, of which event there are three accounts in Acts,[38] and thereafter received, apparently, "revelations" from Christ.

Why does the KP Peter challenge the historical integrity of Paul's kerygma? Paul himself testifies that he had spent a fortnight with Peter (Gal 1:18), and in that verse the Greek verb *historeo*, from which word derives the English "history," suggests that the nature of Paul's visit was to "learn from" or "get information from" Peter.[39] It is thus quite possible that Peter served as a major source of knowledge for Paul on the "historical" Jesus. If this was so, it adds irony to the fact that Paul crossed doctrinal swords with Peter, especially at Antioch (Gal 2:11), the "Rome of the East."

There appears to be an allusion to this event in a "letter" prefixed to the KP, the "Epistle of Peter to James" (*Epistula Petri*), where it is written: "For some from among the Gentiles have rejected my lawful preaching and have preferred a lawless and absurd doctrine *of the man who is my enemy*. And indeed some have attempted, whilst I am still alive, to distort my words by interpretations of various sorts, as if I taught the dissolution of the Law and, although I was of this opinion, did not express it openly" (Ep Pet 2:3–4). One may even point to another pseudo–Petrine letter, to find an ancient reminiscence of a breach between Peter and Paul, that of 2 Pet 3:16.[40] As to the KP itself, James refers to "some one of our enemies" (R 1:70), "Simon who is also Saul," according to a marginal note in one of the mss. of R.[41] The KP passage quoted in length above obviously presupposes and alludes to the conflict at Antioch.

Logia of Jesus rarely appear in the Pauline corpus. Never does one find Paul quoting Jesus from any of the four evangels, at least not directly. This fact gives pause for thought, even granting the gospels to be later than Paul in final form. Moreover, very few events in the life of Jesus animate Paul's discourses.[42] Before the splendor of the exalted Christ, the earthly Jesus pales into near invisibility in the vision of Paul. The KP Peter objects to this disregard for the "historical" Jesus.

Paul is a pneumatic, a kind of proto-Montanus; there is no historical way to verify that Jesus ever spoke what Paul asserts Christ taught. In fact, there is worse the problem of a rival gospel which KP Peter calls the "opposite" doctrine which Paul proclaims. Whose gospel is to be believed, and on whose authority? In Gal 1:11–12, Paul claims that by revelation from Christ

was the gospel communicated to him. On this basis, Paul makes some rather grandiose arrogations to apostolic pre-eminence elsewhere (1 Cor 9; 2 Cor 11; Gal 1–2). The two kerygmas are radically different; so also the authorities and communities behind them.

The KP appeals to an eye–witness apostolate, whereas for Paul the idea of authority by charisma is important. In this respect, the KP Peter's criterion of apostleship is consistent with the Peter of Acts (1:21f.). Chadwick, in his 1959 Inaugural Lecture at the University of Oxford, geometrically depicts the two rival concepts of authority as a circle and an ellipse: "Primitive Christianity is a circle with Jerusalem as its centre…. The apostle Paul is the creator of the idea of a quasi–independent Gentile Christendom…. The circle is already on the way to becoming an ellipse."[43] The KP uses also an image of a circle; in this case, the zodiac, a heavenly circle:

…false prophets, false apostles, and false teachers…speak indeed in the name of Christ, but…accomplish the will of the demon. Wherefore observe the greatest caution…. But let neither prophet or apostle be looked for by you at this time, besides us. For there is one true Prophet, whose words we apostles preach; for He is the accepted year of God, having us apostles as His twelve months. (R 4:34, 35)

The Ebionites obviously made a claim to primacy in terms of having most faithfully preserved the message of Jesus. But that message is further elaborated by the Ebionites, such that Jesus is, in a sense, indistinguishable from the polemic. That for Paul, Adam is the *antitype* of Jesus while, for KP Peter, Adam is the perfect *prophetic prototype* of Christ, is no doctrinal accident. With the Ebionite emphasis on the "historical" Jesus who taught on earth, how could the Ebionites have derived from the teachings of Jesus the idea that Adam was a Prophet and that Adam therefore was a spiritual as well as physical forefather of Jesus?

Whereas the KP Peter always proclaims Christ as "the true Prophet," Paul never does so. For both, the title of "the Son of Man" is not important, unless, for the KP, the Adam/Christ parallel derives from the idea that the title "Son of Man" is really "the Son of Adam." In an article which almost always is overlooked in the journal literature ("The Son of Man or The Son of Adam," *Biblica* 49 [1968]),[44] the idea that the Son of Man is a commonplace circumlocution for a man or for "I" is rejected as inadequate to explain the significance the title bore for Jesus.

Since the Greek epithet always occurs with two definite articles, *the* son of *the* man, this "barbarism" of Greek must mean more than it at first appears to. From the standpoint of classical Greek, the construction is glaringly awkward, a "literary monstrosity" as Dupont put it, and is consistent enough as to be deliberate, and must, therefore, bear some special added significance. The two parts of the title can imply "the Son *par excellence* of the Man *par excellence*," that is, a very particular, unique Son of a very particular, unique Man. Equivalently, the Son of Man can signify "the Son of Adam."[45] If the Ebionites applied the idea of Christ as

"the Son of Adam" to Prophet–Messiah Christology, the Adam/Christ parallel can be seen as a more natural development. The Adam/Christ prophetology appears, moreover, to have been the product of intentional, that is of *contentional* development.

Why did the KP Ebionites represent the "true Prophet" Adam as the first Christ? If Christ truly was "the Son of Adam" — as the NT title "the Son of (the) Man" might imply — this Adam/Christ parallel, in a sense, reverses the "Fall." This question is all the more interesting since no other single myth of antiquity has so profoundly influenced Western thought. The Fall was obviously crucial to the sequence of "logic" in Paul's explication of salvation–history. For Paul, "death reigned" as a consequence of "Adam's transgression," notwithstanding the fact that Adam was "the figure of him that was to come" (Rom 5:14). Christ is acclaimed as "the last Adam" (1 Cor 15;45), but as an ideal of "spiritual" Adam in antithesis to the "natural" or "earthly" Adam (vv. 46–47). Murmelstein has shown how widespread the ideas of such Adam–Messiah typological relations were.[46] But the Ebionites appear to have consciously reversed this pejorative picture of Adam in order to reverse in turn the kerygma of Paul.

"Neither was Adam a transgressor," declares the KP (H 2:52). Rather, Adam, "himself being the only true Prophet," was given revelations from God as to the nature of creation, such that he had no "need to partake of a tree, that he might know what is good and what is evil" (H 3:21). "Our father was ignorant of nothing," the KP explains, and then cites Deut 32:7 as a proof–text for this view: "Ask your father, and he will tell you." This exegesis is not too strained, for this verse which is part of "the Song of Moses" is followed by an explicit mention of "the sons of Adam" (v. 8). It is therefore understandable how the KP can see Moses eulogizing Adam when the audience is transported to "the days of old" (v. 7), in a kind of wistful reminiscence triggered by the exhortation to "remember." In fact, one who maintains that Adam did sin "insults the image…belonging to the eternal King," and will find it difficult to gain pardon for such an insult, "though he be misled by spurious scripture to think dreadful things against the Father of all" (H 3:17).

In the KP, Peter's statement that Adam "was a prophet" and likewise "anointed" (R 1:47) contrasts loudly to the progenitor of sin which Paul arraigns, so much so that Schoeps believes the Ebionites "wished to attack Paul, by glorifying the first Adam whom Paul had discredited."[47] But beyond this motive, the Adam/Christ parallel was drawn, the present writer believes, in order to counter the importance that the Fall held for Gnostics, and to intensify a doctrine of prophetic revelation over against the Gnostic rejection in favor of self–knowledge. In a sense, what Paul had begun to do was to argue that the risen Christ could continue to impart revelations to "chosen" individuals. This kind of elitism had an appeal in antiquity, and the idea that Jesus could impart secret teachings to an initiated few is borne out by the various Nag Hammadi documents which purport to be "revelations." Naturally, the Gnostic "revelations" were not tolerated in silence by the Ebionites, to whom these claims must have sounded like the claims of Paul.

Syria was fertile soil for Gnostic ferment, and often the Ebionites are historically lumped together with Gnostics in scholarly literature. This kind of hasty association on the basis of apparent similarities (such as syzygy dualism, extreme criticism of the OT, antinomianisms, etc.) creates fusion out of confusion, and is insensitive to the historical dialectic between Ebionite and Gnostic ideas, between which there was great interplay and even reciprocal though usually unconscious influence. For example, Oscar Cullman wrote an entire monograph on the rapport between Gnosticism and the Jewish Christianity of the Pseudo-Clementines (1930). In 1968, Cullman continued to maintain this view.[48] His predecessors were such pillars of scholarship as Baur (opposed by Neander), Ritschl, Harnack, and Bousset as well as Bultmann and Jonas.[49] Using Mandaean, Zoroastrian, and extra–biblical Jewish sources to illustrate Gnostic notions found in the PsC, Cullman's thesis was further reinforced by discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in which dualism was also prominent. His important article of 1957 was followed by his appeal in 1968 to the Coptic Gnostic Codices from Nag Hammadi, which discovery oddly enough occurred in the very same year as the Dead Sea Scrolls (1945).[50] The dualism of the Chenoboskion papyri (Nag Hammadi texts) has yet to be further articulated; but as far as Qumran dualism is concerned, Fitzmyer has to take issue with Cullman.[51]

All dualism is not, after all, Gnostic. Perhaps the KP system of syzygies is precisely a counter–dualism in answer to Gnostic dualism. And in this counter–dualism, the true Prophet is an active moral force. Both Gnostic and Ebionite dualism begin, archetypally, with a Primal Man. Discussions of an ancient Adamic figure are far from historical investigations; rather, speculation over an Adam in the remote past is really a device for supporting a view of the immediate present. The Prophethood of Adam emphasizes the enlightening of mankind over against the darkening of man by the Demiurge. Can an Ebionite dialectic with Syrian Gnosticism (in the historical area of the KP) be demonstrated? If so, this will serve as our method for making a determination essential to our understanding of Ebionite Christianity. Generally speaking, Gnosticism exalts Paul and looks down upon Judaism, although, ironically, Jewish mystical elements may be at work in Gnostic thought. Not only does a Gnostic "know" unrevealed truths, but may contest the traditionally revealed truths, such as in the OT (one can recall *The Epistle to Flora* or Marcion's rejection of the OT).

Syrian Gnosis begins with Simon Magus, traditionally. Following Menander (a pupil of Simon), Gnosticism in Syria is advanced by the second–century Saturninus. Just as Ignatius of Antioch had to fight first–century Simonianism, Irenaeus sought to neutralize the poison of Saturninus, reputedly a disciple of Menander. Contemporary with Saturninus was his coreligionist Cerdo (c. 140), who exercised such strong influence over his student Marcion (c. 90–165). A direct historical connection exists between Marcion and Simon Magus through Cerdo, according to patristic sources.[52] One cannot help but be impressed by the rapid succession of Gnostic teachers whose influence was so pervasively felt in Syria: Simon Magus,

Menander, Saturninus, Cerdo, and Marcion. Even Gnostics were at odds with one another in Syria, with Bardesanes (154–22), an erstwhile follower of the Gnostic Valentinus, opposing the successors to Marcion. In this environment is placed the Ebionites of the KP.

The KP is most convincingly traced to Coele–Syria ("Hollow Syria") as the area of origin. Koester acknowledges this as the most widely accepted determination.[53] Coele–Syria is usually distinguished from northern or Upper Syria (Antioch region), as well as from the Osrhoene (capital: Edessa) or East (or, better still, Northeast) Syria. Thus West Syria most closely defines Coele–Syria, the Lebanese Beqa' (Valley of Lebanon), situated between the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon Mountains.[54] A curious pattern of apostolic tradition obtains here: a Peter tradition dominates Coele–Syria; a Judas Thomas tradition occupies Osrhoene; and a Paul exaltation is evident in Asia Minor, northeast of Upper Syria, with Antioch claiming both Peter and Paul.[55]

Tradition establishes Pella as the first Ebionite settlement. If so, how do KP Ebionites end up in Syria? A single travel route connected Antioch with Pella, via Damascus. "The King's Highway" ran the length of the Transjordanian highlands and extended to Damascus. Along the northern section, "the Way of Bashan" (enroute to Damascus), Ebionite settlements evidently formed (e.g., in Astaroth and Karnaim). However, if Pella in fact was an Ebionite centre, any migration to Coele–Syria would likely have followed a different route, probably along one of the eastern branches of "the Way of the Sea" (*Via Maris*) traversing the Rift Valley north to Coele–Syria. The "Way of the Plain" would have connected travelers from Pella to the northerly eastern branch of the "Way of the Sea."[56] Do the Ebionites, for whom Pella appears to have been a centre,[57] later migrate to Coele–Syria from Pella?

Lüdemann regards the traditional flight of Jerusalem Christians during the Zealot revolt as historically improbable,[58] while Schoeps sees a reminiscence of that exodus alluded to in the rich symbolism of the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse.[59] Will a solution to this question be unearthed in the current Sydney/Wooster excavations at Pella?[60] In any event, that the Palestine–Syrian coast was evidently the route of Peter's known missionary journey to Antioch is indicated by the PsC, which maps out such cities as Caesarea, Tyre, Sidon, Tripolis (*via* Berytus, Dora), Orthasia, Antaradus, *en route* to Antioch (*via* Balaneae, Paltus, and Gabala). The extent of Marcionite influence in roughly the same region not long after is archaeologically evidenced by the fact that the earliest dated Christian inscription found in the Province of Arabia (at Dair 'Ali, southeast of Damascus) belonged to a Marcionite church, in the year 318/19 A.D.[61] Allowing a few years for the Marcionite wave to sweep from West to East Syria — a land already rife with Gnostics — we can see how extensive the influence was. Gunther concludes that "there appears to be historical continuity from Simon and Cleobius (or Simon to Cleobius) to Menander to Saturninus to Cerdo to Marcion."[62] This very succession forms a compressed trajectory for Gnosticism in Syria. This trajectory is roughly coincident with but not identical to that of the Ebionites, in terms of historical geography.

A trajectory for Jewish Christianity in Syria is not so linear nor definitive nor genetic, but evidently the Ebionite beliefs articulated in the KP evolved alongside Gnosticism. Which Christianity came first? Strecker states that the idea of this Jewish Christianity as "sectarian" in nature is outdated.

Rather, it was independent of mainstream Christianity, with no indication of an active confrontation: "It is much more probable that in the world from which the *Kerygmata* derives, Jewish Christianity was the sole representative of Christianity."[63] Whichever Christianity was first, other forms soon followed. The spiritual conquest of Syria for Christ actually involved a veritable contest of Christianities.

Other parts of Syria served as the original homeland for other forms of Christianity. "Orthodoxy" entered Syria and gained a strong foothold in Antioch, as the letters of Ignatius (c. 100) attest (although one study in 1980 has challenged the authenticity of the Ignatian corpus, dating the forgeries c. 160).[64] At any rate, the data at hand gives us a picture of Christian pluralism in Syria during the first three centuries, with both Jewish Christianity and Gnosticism as movements prior to or more established than the incipient "catholic" communities there. Initially, therefore, the Ebionite Christianity of the KP would have had more occasion to carry on a dialectic with Syrian Gnosticism, which was ultra–Pauline, than with the "great Church." If this were the case, KP Christology, with its anti-Pauline elements inherited from Jerusalem, would predictably have reacted to radical Paulinism inherent in Syrian Gnosticism, which culminates in Marcionitism.

From Simon Magus onward, earlier Syrian Gnosticsms provide the antecedents for Marcionitism in the "genealogy of heresies." In general, Gnosticism is anti-establishmentarian. It is highly individualistic, being elitist. This disenchantment with the present system of belief articulates itself as an attack on Yahwistic monotheism. This revolt against Yahweh arises from a profound sense of the failure of Jewish history. The promises of Yahweh appeared to end in desolation. Convinced of the bankruptcy of traditional verities, Gnostics were, for the most part, intellectuals, forming religious protest movements in late antiquity.

A dominant attitude among Gnostic groups was a feeling of alienation from Judaism. Oriental syncretism, despite the enormous Jewish influence in Gnostic texts, became a key ingredient in Gnostic cosmogony. This admixture of myths served to bring to life a worldview which saw creation as darkness generated by a hostile power, the creator–god of the OT. Principles of dualism, polydynamism, and docetism animate doctrines which stress the arcane secrets of the cosmos as crucial to know if one is ever to find one's way back to the realms of light.

When practiced, Gnosticism functioned as a discipline of transcendence. This is usually exercised in the form of asceticism. Asceticism could also be the *praxis* of an orthodox monk or

of an Edessan Jewish Christian encratite. Gnosticism and Jewish Christianity are not necessarily without overlap. Schoeps refers to Elkesaitism as "Gnostic Ebionitism".[65] However, the religion of Elkesai is quite distinct from that of the KP, despite points of contact. Quispel asserts: "The Pseudo–Clementine writings may be somewhat fantastic, but certainly are not Gnostic."[66] Can this be demonstrated?

The Pseudo–Clementine romance is a literary masterpiece, authored by an Ebionite scholar, Schoeps states. The Ebionite author personifies Gnosticism in Simon Magus. The figure of Simon in the *Kerygmata Petrou* doubles as a literary disguise for both Paul and Marcion, as well as Simon for himself. The identity of Magus as Paul has been discussed above. But how are we enabled to unmask Simon, on a deeper level, as the alias of Marcion? When one recalls that for Marcion, Paul was the exponent of true Christianity, the continuity is obvious. Just as Simon the magician can metamorphose himself into different forms, yet is always a deceiver, Syrian Gnosticism has undergone its own metamorphoses, in the course of time, resulting in the Marcionite threat. A threat indeed, for Marcion repudiated Peter and James as corrupters of Christianity — a position which constitutes a direct if not implicit attack on the appealed–to apostolic authority for the Ebionite kerygma.

Marcion's doctrinal differences with Ebionite beliefs were so fundamental that the very nature of God was called into question. For Marcion, Jesus came to reveal the Supreme God of Love. The Creator God of the OT was another god (Demiurge) who was wholly a God of Law, evil as well as judicial: "When the lord of the world saw the deity of Jesus, he knew that there was another god besides himself," proclaimed Marcion (according to Eznik, the 5th–c Armenian Bp.).[67] Marcion labored to contrast the OT and the Gospel. "There will be salvation only for souls who have learned this doctrine; the body, doubtless because it was taken from the earth, cannot participate in salvation," declared Marcion (Iren *Adv Haer* 1:27:3). Marriage and procreation came from Satan. Jesus descended from heaven in the fifteenth year of Tiberius as an angel; Christ's body was phantasmal. Jesus "destroyed the Law and the Prophets" according to Irenaeus' account of Marcion (*Adv Haer* 1:27:2). Christ came to overthrow the tyrannical rule of the OT Creator.[68]

This composite picture of Marcion, drawn from various sources, agrees in essentials supplied by the PsC. Simon/Marcion asserts an unrevealed God, "another God, incomprehensible and unknown to all" (R 2:47). The "Power of which Marcion speaks is superior to the Creator" (R 2:51). This Power is one "of immense and ineffable light" (R 2:49). The "good" God created the souls of men, but permitted them "to be brought down as captives into this world" through the agency of the Creator God (R 2:57). The PsC Simon/Marcion teaches: "But the good God bestows salvation if he is only acknowledged; but the creator of the world demands also that the law be fulfilled.… It is truly very difficult for men to know him, as long as he is in the flesh; for blacker than all darkness, and heavier than all clay, is this body with which the soul is surrounded" (R 2:48). The realm of the good God is

beyond earth and heaven; one of "bodiless and infinite light" to which "the sun would…be darkness…in comparison" (R 2:61). The Creator God is fraught with defects; Simon proves from the OT that "whom you call God…is not the supreme and omnipotent Being, inasmuch as he is without foreknowledge, imperfect, needy" and subject to "grievous passions" (H 3:37).

It is interesting that the KP Peter cannot refute Simon's proof–texts adduced from scripture, and must therefore answer with the assertion that false passages have been interpolated into scripture (H 3:42–50). Space does not permit us to relate the other refutations of Simon by Peter in the KP, except to say that the idea that Christ first appeared in Adam militates directly against the docetic Christology of Marcion, for which Christ descended suddenly without precedent. A strict theme of revelation, recalling the kind of stance in Amos 3:7, was advanced by the Ebionites of Coele–Syria to counter the anti-Judaic (and this anti-Jewish–Christian) influence of Gnostics in that region.

This study suggests that KP Adam/Christ prophetology extends and develops a primitive pre-Pauline Christology along anti-Pauline lines and, later still, along anti-Gnostic lines. The pre-Pauline Christology was that of Jesus as Prophet–Messiah (possibly with mystical evocations of an enthroned Adam/King through the Son of Man title if it had Merkabah associations). In this sense, the root–form of KP Christology can be viewed as one "original" form of Christology. During the ministry of Paul, and later into the post–Pauline period, KP Christology in its formulation took on anti-Pauline overtones. One of the doctrines active in the Ebionite counter–position was the conscious exaltation of Adam even to the station of Christhood. This had the effect of reversing the Fall of Adam so crucial to Pauline logic in its explication of salvation–history. This Adam/Christ parallel was intensified and systematized during the second and third centuries in order to answer the ultra–Pauline Gnostics who discredited "the Law and the Prophets." These developments took place principally in West Syria. The inter–relationships of Jewish, Catholic and Gnostic Christianities in Coele–Syria there are illuminating, if one could imagine that region as roughly a microcosm of Oriental Christianities.

Did Prophet–Christology die out along with the Ebionites? When did this form of Oriental Christianity become extinct? What kind of perpetuating influence did Ebionite ideas leave on subsequent history? These questions are important in addressing the significance of those Christians whose thought–world is only partly recovered from fragments of the lost document known as the *Kerygmata Petrou*. To better establish the Ebionites' place in history, we must assess the Ebionites' relationship to future as well as past history. This enriches our sense of continuity. Ebionite Christology, it appears, preserves for us an "original" picture of Jesus preserved by some of the earliest followers.

By its own standards, it was not a "low" Christology. It was a thoroughly Semitic Christology, consonant with a Semitic prophetology.

It is one of the tragic ironies of Christian history that the so–called Golden Rule was so little practiced on an interfaith scale. Thus, the Ebionites, whose Christology cherished Jesus and Moses as brothers, nearly twins, were able to look favorably upon their Jewish brethren as also "saved." But Ebionism ended up condemned by "orthodox" Judaism and Christianity alike. The Ebionites died out largely due to this kind of ostracization. The *Kerygmata Petrou* is more than a lost document. It is a treasure map for not only the recovery of archaic Christological tradition, but for the historical paradigm it provides for interfaith toleration achieved doctrinally through a federal theology of "parallel covenants." But historical advocacy is out of place here. Put simply, where does our trajectory of Prophet–Christology take us beyond Ebionite Christianity itself?

The first patristic reference to Ebionites by name occurs in c. 175 A.D. in Irenaeus (*Adv Haer* 1:26:2). But our first geographical evidence is found in Eusebius. Together with Epiphanius, we may be able to draw a very sketchy picture of the distribution of Ebionite communities. This is significant in terms of charting a trajectory (or trajectories) for the Ebionite Christians themselves as well as indicating a direction of the possible continued influence of Ebionite Christology after the extinction of the Ebionites as a distinctive communion. The following chart is based on patristic data. Taken as a whole, the data must be at least partly reliable, albeit muddled (especially in Epiphanius' accounts):

Distribution of Ebionite Communities Outside of Western Palestine and Galilee

I.	Cyprus	[Epiphanius]
II.	Syria	
	A. North Syria	
	1. Baroea (?) (Aleppo)	[Epiphanius/Jerome on Nazoraeans]
	2. Antioch (?)	[St. Jn. Chrysostom/Pseudo-Clementines]
	3. Laodicea (Lataqia)	[Origen (Phil. 23)/Pseudo-Clementines]
	B. West Syria (Coele–Syria)	[Epiphanius on Nazoraeans/Didascalia]
	1. Paneas (Baniyas/Caes. Ph.)	[Epiphanius; boundary w/N. Transj. unclear]
	C. East Syria	
	1. Kochaba (Choba/w. of Dam)	[Eusebius/Jerome]
III.	Transjordan	
	A Northern: Bashan (Baanaea)	[Epiphanius]
	1. Kochaba (near Karnaim)	[Epiphanius]
	B. Central: Perea (Gilead)	[Epiphanius/Eusebius]
	1. Pella	[Epiphanius/Eusebius/Apocalypse 12 (?)/Aristo of Pella]
	C. Southern: Moab	[Epiphanius/cf. Eusebius on Ps 590:10]
IV.	Arabian Nabataea	[Epiphanius]

Pella is traditionally the place of origin for the Ebionites, after their exodus from Jerusalem. As stated above, Lüdemann challenged the veracity of this tradition, but entertains

the possibility (in a footnote) that places not far away from Pella enumerated by Epiphanius (Moab, Kochaba, Bashan) may have been Ebionite locales. Lüdemann then raises the question, "Or are they [Ebionites] even the 'inventors' of the Pella–tradition?" The question we can raise here is this: why would Ebionites in the vicinity of Pella seek to establish Pella as an Ebionite center in favor of actual nearby locales? Second in importance as a location for the Ebionites is Kochaba. Confusion reigns in patristic sources as to the precise site, for there are three possibilities of places which all bear the same name: one in Galilee, another near Damascus, and one more in Transjordan or "Arabia."[69]

Interestingly enough, around Damascus there are villages with the name of "*Menim*", which manifest the presence of communities of *minim*, a Jewish stigma meaning "heretics" by which term Ebionites were branded.[70] Also near Damascus is the modern–day Dayr–Khabiyah, this place–name evidently deriving from two roots: *dyr* ("religious community") and *hwb* ("poor").[71] Could this represent an Arabic equivalent of "Community of the Ebionites"? — Koch asks.[72] Harnack suggests all three Kochaba's as Jewish Christian residences which, if true, in the words of Lüdemann, "would be a rather strange coincidence!"[73] Epiphanius locates the Kochaba near Karnaim and Astaroth in Bashan, but elsewhere refers to Kochaba as being "in Arabia" (*Panarion* 40:1:5). Epiphanius further states: "But I am now told from other sources, also, of his [Ebion's] connection with the locality of Kochaba and Arabia far and wide" (*Pan* 30:2:9/tr. Finegan).

Epiphanius uses the term "Arabia" quite loosely, but the association is inviting, in trying to determine a trajectory for Ebionite Christology after the extinction of the Ebionites themselves. The relationship to Arabia is tantalizing for the very reason that several scholars have recently speculated that Jewish Christian communities (including Ebionite ones) remained alive in Arabia down to the time of Muhammad, and thereby formed part of the milieu into which Islam was born.[74] Otherwise, we must concede the Ebionites to have vanished, disappearing from the historical horizon altogether. Our latest patristic reports indicate that around 375 A.D. Ebionites were on the island of Cyprus (according to Epiphanius, who lived on Cyprus), while Theodoret of Cyprus (east of Antioch) states that Ebionites had virtually died as of his time (c. 450).[75]

But what about Arabia? A negative conclusion is the outcome of J. S. Trimingham's recent monograph, *Christianity Among the Arabs in Pre-Islamic Times* (1979). Syriac Christianity is the dominant Christian influence in Arabia prior to Muhammad, according to Trimingham, through Nestorian and Monophysite radiations. Since Syriac Christians were of pagan origin, and were opposed to all that was Jewish, the idea that Christianity in Arabia was at all affected by any "influence of early Judaistic messianic Christians" upon Aramaean (Syriac) Christianity, which in fact *failed* to deeply penetrate Arabic nomad culture, falls to the ground.[76] Against the hypothesis of Ebionite influence upon the *Qur'an* is Giulio Basette–Sani, whose interpretative book, *The Koran in the Light of Christ*, appeared in English in 1977:

The question of the sources of the Koran, as it has been treated for more than a hundred years, was resolved by presenting Muhammad as a very clever "alchemist," a man who was able to select part of an idea from Judaism, another from Christianity, still another from Gnosticism, etc. — as much as was needed to mix with Arabism and thus present Islam to us. What a genius of an alchemist must this Arab of the desert have been to concoct all these ingredients! …

According to Tor Andrae,…"Mohammed's conception of revelation thus betrays a relationship to the Ebionite–Manichaen doctrine which cannot be accidental." …Since this thesis of Gnostic, Manichean, or Ebionite influences is more and more accepted as scientific fact, I feel it necessary to demonstrate that such a theory is absolutely unfounded….

Ebionism…was extremely repugnant to Paul. But there is no anti-Paulinism in the Koran…. Let us take a close look at the relationship between the pseudo–Clementine [sic] and the Koran…. The "true prophet" of the pseudo–Clementine, besides being all–knowing, is sinless…. Now if the Koran, in true Semitic style, presents the elements of creation in pairs,… this pairing is due to parallelism and Semitic logic, whereas in the pseudo–Clementine it is a metaphysico–moral dualism. We meet this dualism again in the clarification of the prophets (the first of whom is Adam)…: Abel, Deucalion, Moses, Jesus, and St. Peter. How can anyone see in this classification the origin of the Koranic list of prophets, as Tor Andrae does? In the Koran, we find no special role assigned to…Peter.[77]

Such reasoning is curious at best, but indicates the vitality of the discussion. The present author sees weaknesses in both Trimingham's and Basetti–Sani's arguments. The latter denies any formal relationship of substance between the Pseudo-Clementines and the Qur'an. Although it is true that Peter is not directly named in the Qur'an, centuries of Muslim *tafsir* or commentary on the tale of the city in the surah of *Ya Sin* (termed by Muhammad "the heart of the Qur'an"), identify the city as Antioch. The third apostle sent to Antioch is Peter, in exegesis of the story.[78] As to any dualism in Quranic prophetology, there appears to be one evocative of KP syzygy: "Thus have we given an enemy to every prophet — Satans among men" (S 6:112). The KP states: "…the true Prophet has told us, a false prophet must come first" (H 2:17). Respecting the singleness of the "one true Prophet" who reappears in cyclical succession throughout history, a striking parallel is likewise found in the Qur'an: "He who warneth you is one of the warners of old" (S 53:57). Furthermore: "We make no distinction between any of His Apostles" (S 2:285). An Adam/Christ parallel is even made: "Verily, Jesus is as Adam in the sight of God" (S 3:52).

The Quranic sequence of prophets is often similar to the KP: "Abraham…was a man of truth, a Prophet" (S 19:42); "Isaac and Jacob…each of them We made a Prophet,…and gave them the lofty tongue of truth" (S 19:50, 51); "Moses…was…a Prophet" (S 19:52); "Ishmael… was true…and was…a Prophet" (S 19:55); "Enoch…was a man of truth, a Prophet" (S 19:57);

"(Jesus said): 'verily, I am the servant of God,…and He hath made me a Prophet' " (S 19:31); "These are they among the Prophets of the posterity of Adam" (S 19:59).[79] It is odd that Schoeps has, in arguing for Ebionite influence on the Qur'an, completely overlooked the striking association of Prophet and of truth which occurs throughout the sequence of Prophets in the nineteenth surah, evoking the KP expression, "the true Prophet," and also "the Prophet of truth": "…the Prophet of truth, being one,…shall in His own times have as His prophets all those who are found pure" (H 3:16).[80] Also in the same surah, Moses is called "a man of purity" (S 19:52). The Quranic Prophets are of the "progeny of Adam" (S 19:59), which might suggest the prophetic lineage which starts with Adam as the first Prophet, who, the Qur'an informs us, received revelation from God (S 2:28–29, 35).

As for anti-Paulinism, the Qur'an decries any Christ–cult: "It beseemeth not a man, that God should give him the Scriptures and the Wisdom, and the gift of prophecy, and that he should say to his followers, 'Be ye worshippers of me, as well as of God'…God doth not command you to take…the prophets as lords" (S 3:73, 74). This recalls the KP: "Neither is there salvation in believing in teachers and calling them lords" (H 8:5). The substantial Sonship of Jesus is likewise condemned: "They say: 'The God of Mercy hath gotten offspring.' Now have ye done a monstrous thing. Almost might the very Heavens be rent thereat, and the Earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall down in fragments, that they ascribe a son to the God of Mercy" (S 19:91–93).

Quranic and Ebionite Prophetologies are too familiar not to be in some way related. But what links can be forged, historically? An answer might be found in Ethiopian Jewish Christianity, which has just been rediscovered, primarily through the researches of Ephraim Isaac of Princeton.[81] Many cultural affinities between Arabia and Ethiopia were observed by ancient travelers.[82] This is natural, for Ethiopia and Arabia form the two shores of the Arabian Gulf. The dates of 335–370 and 525–575 A.D. can be firmly established as periods of Ethiopian cultural superiority in South Arabia.[83] Since the year 330 A.D., the official religion of Ethiopia was Christianity, so far as we know.[84] During the fourth to the sixth centuries, many Christians flocked into Ethiopia; that many of those were from Syria is "beyond question."[85] The first Ethiopian monarch to embrace Christianity was Esana (c. 320–350), it is generally agreed. Inscriptions and coins from that reign are surprisingly free from the orthodox trinitarian formula with "the Lord of the Heavens" invoked instead.[86]

In fact, an anti-trinitarian stance in pre-Islamic Ethiopia was adopted by such leaders as Za–Michael and Asqa (5th–6th centuries), who professed the unity of God. Another Jewish Christian, Frē Maḥbar, taught a metaphorical reformulation: "The Father is the Sun, the Son is the Light, and the Holy Spirit is the Warmth of it."[87] This Ethiopian Jewish Christianity Isaac calls "Za–Michaelianism." It was soon suppressed by the succession of Monophysitism.[88] Ethiopian Jewish Christians held that "the Son is (only) the thought and wisdom of the Father"

and that "the humanity of Jesus is inferior to His (God's) divinity," the Son being the "reflection, the Power, the light, the right hand, and the arm of the Father."[89]

It is interesting that, according to Muslim historiography, the ruler (Najashi–Negus) of Ethiopia found favor with the "Christianity of the Qur'an" when in the year 615 A.D., the first Muslim emigrants from Mecca sought asylum from religious persecution. During the first audience with the king, the whole or part of the nineteenth surah of the Qur'an was recited in the royal court. The king was deeply moved.[90]

Also significant is the place in Ethiopian scripture which pseudo–Clementine literature was to occupy. Qalementos—the Ethiopian form of Clement—was in legend the intermediary through whom the apostles passed their teaching. Eight such books ascribed to Qalementos became known as the *Octateuch of Clement*, which secured a place in the Ethiopian NT canon. The Syrian Octateuch of Clement formed part of the West Syrian canon, the most famous manuscript of which is the "Buchanan Bible." Other pseudo–Clementine works circulate in Ethiopic translation.[91] Clementine works survive in Arabic as well. The Arabic spelling of Clement is *Iklamus*.[92] The subtle web of connections among Syrian, Ethiopian, and Arabian traditions is remarkable. But does the lost KP survive among the unsearched Clementine sources? On 4/30/82, Professor Isaac wrote to the present author:

> Concerning your question about the possibility of *Kerygmata Petrou* being found in Ethiopic sources, this is indeed a very important question; and about five years ago I started examining some of the Ethiopic Pseudo–Clementine sources precisely with a view to it. Alas, due to other scholarly and personal distractions, I had to put it aside and I have not been able to return to it…. In the meantime, let me suggest that perhaps you can take up this matter as your own project for study.

Prophet–Christology evidently persisted in a Semitic milieu for several centuries to come. Wherever echoes of Prophet–Christology are heard in post–Quranic writings, a corresponding anti-Paulinism is often associated. Among Jewish authors, Saadia (d. 942) states that a sect of Christians then living accorded to Jesus "the position of prophet only."[93] Wolfson, in commenting on Saadia, says that "the Koran, while rejecting the orthodox Christian type of Christology, upholds the Ebionite type of Christology.[94] Another Jewish writer, the Qaraite Qirqisani, relates in *Book of Lights* (937 A.D.) that "Jesus was a righteous man" but that "it was Paul who invested Jesus with divinity."[95] An Arabic Jewish treatise of tenth–century authorship declares that Jesus "wanted that all should know…that he did not claim to be divine…(or) that he and his father are one god or that, unlike the other prophets, he worked miracles without imploring God."[96] The document excerpted by Ibn 'Awn goes on to cite Peter's testimony based on the proof–text of Deut 18:18f.; the treatise urges all Christians to hearken to Peter's words, and then asserts: "Moses spoke true, if Jesus is (meant) by these words. You are accordingly obliged to admit that he (Jesus) is a prophet like (Moses)…

subordinate to God. Thus there is an end to the contention that he is Lord and Creator."[97] Paul is then criticized.[98]

A further witness to the persistence of Prophet–Christology in a Semitic culture is the 'Abd al–Jabbar text in which Shlomo Pines of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem detected a new Jewish Christian source.[99] The text explains that the lost original "true Gospel" had "no mention of the cross or the crucifixion." The text also states: "A group of Christians left Jerusalem and came to Antioch and other towns of Syria." Pines source seems to imply that Jesus' rank was that of a Prophet, and Paul is taken to task for "Romanizing" Christianity.[100] Source–analysis of Muslim polemical texts is a young field, and such "source mining" may yield more data on currents of Jewish Christianity in Arabia.

Beyond the Jewish–Christian sources which may have influenced the arguments of medieval Jewish and Muslim writers, purely Muslim anti-Christian polemics resort as well to anti-Pauline Prophet–Christology. This is a well–known fact, and one quotation should suffice to illustrate this phenomenon. The Muslim forgery, the *Gospel of Barnabas*, says in its preface:

> Dearly beloved, the great and wonderful God hath during these past days visited us by his prophet Jesus Christ in great mercy of teaching and miracles whereof many, being deceived of Satan, are preaching most impious doctrine, calling Jesus Son of God,… among whom also Paul was deceived, whereof I speak not without grief.[100]

The late Henri Corbin undertook the introduction to the recent French translation of this pseudo–gospel, and throughout his prefatory remarks on the text many Ebionite elements in *Barnabas* were detected.[102] Alfaric noted that a possible forerunner of *Barnabas* he encountered in a manuscript ascribed to *Iklamis*, the Arabic Clement. Such connexions with Clement cannot be accidental.[103]

Now that Jewish and Muslim writings have been surveyed, did any heterodox *Christians* recast Ebionite–like arguments? Further evidence of anti-Pauline Prophet–Christology as active in a Semitic thought–world comes from the account of the Nestorians in the *Toledoth Jeshu* — a Jewish counter–gospel and caricature of Christianity circulating in Arabic. The *Toledoth* treats of Nestorius in an unusual way: Nestorius, who lived in the Persian Empire, enjoined Christians, in opposition to Paul, to observe those Mosaic laws which Jesus kept; Nestorius also taught that Jesus was not God but rather a mortal, inspired by the Holy Spirit as were the prophets of old. This odd section of the *Toledoth*, Pines holds, augments the hypothesis that within the Nestorian fold were (crypto–) Jewish Christians. Moreover, we know from the inscription of Kartir, the persecutor of Mani, that there were both Christians and *Nazarenes* in the Sassanid empire.[104] Thus, there appear to have once existed Jewish Christians in Persia.

If this were true, Persia would form part of the arc of the Ebionite Christological trajectory which this study has tried to describe. Persia is the centre of a centrifugal Manichaean prophetology which in form echoes Ebionite ideas of the cyclical successions of revelators throughout the course of history. In fact, the newly–discovered Cologne Mani Codex states explicitly that some of the Elkasaites among whom Mani was raised came to believe in Mani as "the True Prophet."[105]

Later still, Persia would give birth to 19th–century Bahá'u'lláh, whose doctrine of "progressive revelation" has recently been described as Ebionite Prophetology revoiced on a higher octave. One prominent Bahá'í author, Dr. Udo Schaefer of Germany, wrote: "This was the 'Fall' of Christianity: that Paul with his 'Gospel,' which became the core of Christian dogma formation, conquered the world, while the historic basis of Christianity was declared a heresy, the preservers of the original branded as 'Ebionites'…. It is worthy of note that there were striking similarities between this Christianity and Islam…. Measured by the standard of Bahá'u'lláh's revelation, the Pauline doctrine of Justification, the doctrine of Original Sin, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the sacramentalisation of the Christian religion, the whole Church plan of salvation — …these are a deformation of Jesus' teaching."[106] This full–scale criticism of Pauline doctrine as "un–Christian" is not so full–blown in Bahá'í scriptures, which honor Paul and exalt Jesus, yet question Pauline doctrine.[107]

This is as far as the Prophet–Christology trajectory can take us; we have tracked it to the present. Does, then, Ebionite Christianity have a relevance to our own religiously–pluralistic world? Does the trajectory yet continue? The answer, perhaps, is to be found in interfaith ecumenism. The discussion of Ebionite Christianity has broadened to ecumenical circles. It has also become a reference in Muslim–Christian and Jewish–Christian–Muslim interfaith dialogues.[108] Curiously enough, a short–lived organization, which in 1890 sprang from the Ahmadiya movement in India, was a modern revival — though unsuccessful — of Ebionite Christianity. The founder of "The Nazarene New Church" — E. J. S. White of Kurnool — sought to unite Muslims with Christians in this communion, established with the rationale that "Islam has always been…the mere perversion of the Nazarene or Ebionite sect" which "maintained the pure doctrine" derived from Jesus, "having nothing to do with…Paul."[109]

The Jesus–Paul debate among scholars, however, usually ignores the phenomenon of Ebionite Christianity.[110] An ongoing five–year Jewish Christianity Seminar is, at any rate, being sponsored by the Society of Biblical Literature.[111] That continued research into the Ebionite dimension of Christian origins is still important should be self–evident.

What, then, can be said about "the present state of scholarship" which Quispel asserted favoring the primacy of the Ebionites as preservers of the "original" traditions? We can safely say that there was more to Christianity than met the orthodox or heterodox eye. Post–World War II research has, indeed, revolutionized our views of Christian origins. Several important

forms of Christianity took root and effloresced in a variety of cultural soils. That history favored one form over the other is not a proof of primacy. Perhaps we can think of a plurality of "apostolic successions" rather than in terms of one only. The fullest picture of early Christianity is perhaps the most impressive: a mosaic, not a monochrome. Historical enquiry can remove the whitewash of orthodoxy, such that orthodoxy itself becomes more human, more alive as the drama with all its actors is replayed before our historical eyes. Perhaps the appreciation and not the suppression of diversity within Christianity will evoke the richest sense of heritage, the broadest sense of commonality, and the greatest impulse against judgmentalism — the fomenter of religious prejudice. The recovery of Ebionite Christianity is part of a long and painstaking process: the total restoration of our Christian past — a process which might be thought of as the "salvation" of Salvation–history.

Christopher Buck

June, 1982

NOTES

1. "The rediscovery of this Jewish Christianity is one of the achievements of recent scholarship" (Cardinal Jean Danielou, "Christianity as a Jewish Sect," *The Crucible of Christianity*, ed. Arnold Toynbee (N.Y.: World, 1969) 275; "Since the Second World War, Jewish Christianity has been rediscovered by specialists in Christian origins," (Gilles Quispel, "Qumran, John and Jewish Christianity," *John and Qumran*, ed. J. Charlesworth (London: Chapman, 1972) 137; A. F. J. Klijn, "The Study of Jewish Christianity," NTS 20 (1974) 419–31; Quispel, "The Discussion of Judaic Christianity," VC 22 (1968) 81–93; Danielou, "A New Vision of Christian Origins: Judaeo-Christianity," *Cross Currents* 18 (Spring, 1968) 163–73; Frederic Manns, *Bibliographie du Judéo-Christianisme* (Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1979).

2. Two epitomes of the researches of Schoeps are available in English: (1) For the non-specialist: Hans–Joachim Schoeps: *Jewish Christianity: Factional Disputes in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969). Of this work, George Wesley Buchanan ended his review by saying: "*Jewish Christianity* should be welcomed by Americans as a text for a basic introduction into the nature of the non-Pauline sects of early Christianity," (CBQ 32 (1970) 144–45). (2) Also Schoeps, "Ebionite Christianity," JTS 4 (1953) 219–24. On the significance of Schoeps' pioneering studies, Hans Dieter Betz wrote: "The discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices has made it clear that the works of Hans Joachim Schoeps

have not yet been given adequate consideration," (*Galatians* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979] 6). Schoeps' *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), "may very well be the most important book on Paul in this century," (Betz, op. cit., xiii). Against such acclaim, Helmut Koester states: "The presentation of Hans–Joachim Schoeps is, in all its erudition, too programmatic to be of much help," ("GNOMAI DIAPHOROI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," HTR 58 [1965] 290 n. 21). Too emotional is Markus Barth's attack: "Schoeps'…aggressive tone, his well–footnoted though rather sentimental love for the obscure pseudo–Clementine literature…his clever operations with hard–to–date Mishnaic and Talmudic traditions,…completely uncritical… outmoded…and finally his personal, almost messianic claims of possessing the final judgment…" (*Judaism* 12 [1963] 373). The impact of Schoeps' researches on Jewish Christian dialogue is discussed by Walter Jacob, "Dialogue in Europe Today," *Christianity Through Jewish Eyes: The Quest for Common Ground* (Cincinnati, 1974) 187ff.; reprinted, *Schoeps Festschrift*, ed. Topner *et al*., ZRGG 31:1 (1979) 48–60; Robert R. Hann, "The Undivided Way: The Early Jewish Christians as a Model for Ecumenical Encounter?" JES 14 (1977) 233–48.

3. Danielou: *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, 1964). The Ebionites are treated in Chapter Two (pp. 55–64).

4. Danielou: "A New Vision of Christian Origins: Judaeo-Christianity," p. 169.

5. Quispel, "Gnosis and the New Sayings of Jesus," *Sinn und Wanlungen des Menschenbildes, Eranos Jahrbuch* 38 (1969) 266.

6. Robert Murray, "Recent Studies in Early Symbolic Theology," *HeyJ* 6 (1965) 417.

7. Klijn, "The Study of Jewish Christianity," p. 431, states that "the study of Jewish Christianity is still worthwhile," although "it is impossible to compile 'a' or 'the' theology of Jewish Christianity." For problems of definition, see in addition: Robert A. Kraft, "In Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and its 'Theology': Problems of Definition and Methodology," RSR (*Danielou Festschrift*) 60:1 (1972) 81–92; Robert Murray, "Defining Judaeo-Christianity," *HeyJ* 15 (1974) 303–10; Stanley K. Riegel, "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology," NTS 24 (1978) 410–15; Glenn Alan Koch, "Defining 'Jewish Christianity'," *A Critical Investigation of Epiphanius' Knowledge of the Ebionites: A Translation and Critical Discussion of Panarion 30* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1976) 65–84. Koch adds to the complexity of the problem by raising more questions as to identification of the Ebionites alone: "…but the pseudo–Clementines show no evidence of being self–consciously Ebionite, and there is a mélange of material in the extant pseudo–Clementines which comes from a variety of sources and backgrounds…. Is a single, continuously developing community or self–conscious movement reflected in all the materials attributed to 'the Ebionites'? Until some satisfactory solution to this problem is formulated, it would be best to speak of 'the "Ebionites of Irenaeus,…of Epiphanius, etc." or 'the "Ebionites" of the Pseudo-

Clementines' " (pp. 372–73). "Thus some limitations must be set," writes Georg Strecker, who continues: "We shall deal with the legalistic Jewish Christianity situated in Greek–speaking Syria, and will examine…the Jewish Christian *Kerygmata Petrou* ("Proclamations" or "Sermons of Peter"; abbreviated "KP") source of the pseudo–Clementines," ("On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," in Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* [ed. R. Kraft and G. Krodel; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971] 244). Our study will follow Strecker's delimitations, such that we will be investigating the "Ebionites of the KP." No discussion of the Ebionites will represent Jewish Christianity as a totality, but on the other hand, no discussion of Jewish Christianity beyond the first century is worthwhile unless it includes the Ebionites. See, for example, J. M. Velasco and Leopold Sabourin, "Jewish Christianity of the First Centuries," BTB 6 (Fall 1976) 5–26; J. Jocz, "God's 'Poor' People," *Judaica* 28 (1972) 7–29; J. M. Magnin, "Notes sur l'Ebionisme," *Proche–Orient Chretien* 23 (1973) 233–50; 24 (1974) 225–50; 25 (1975) 245–73; 26 (1976) 293–318; 27 (1977) 250–76. For the best select survey of studies on Jewish Christianity to be found in a journal in addition to F. Mann's book, *Bibliographie du Judéo-Christianisme* (1979), see Bruce J. Malina, "Jewish Christianity: A Select Bibliography," *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 1:6 (1973) 60–65. On problems of category: R. M. Wilson, "Jewish Christianity and Gnosticism," RSR 60 (1972) 261–72; I. H. Marshall, "Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments," NTS 19 (1972–73) 271–87; R. M. Grant, "Jewish Christianity at Antioch in the Second Century," RSR 60 (1972) 93–108; James M. Robinson, "The Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship," *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 1–19; Hilaire Belloc, "Gibbon and the Ebionites," *Dublin Review* 169 (Oct., 1921) 265–87.

8. The method Schoeps pursued for isolating KP fragments he describes as follows: "I now regard a simplified procedure as admissible and more promising, viz., that of considering separately those parts of the (Pseudo–Clementine) novel in both recensions which clearly were heterodox Jewish Christian in character — the heterodox catalogue in Recognitions 3:75 is of service, although it is secondary — to the extent that they are attested to as such by other sources (the rabbinic writings, Symmachus, and the Church Fathers, especially Epiphanius)," (Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity*, 16. In his monumental *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenschristentums* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1949) 52–3, Schoeps quarries fossils of the lost *Kerygmata Petrou* from the following pericopes of the Pseudo-Clementines:

Homilies	Recognitions
Hom 1:18–20	Rec 1:15–17
Hom 2:16–18; 33; 38–52	22, 24
Hom 3:2–10; 17–28; 33–5	27–71
Hom 8:4–23	74
Hom 9:1–23	Rec 2:20–48
Hom 11:16; 19–33; 35	66–70
Hom 15:5–11	Rec 3:2–10
Hom 16:5–16; 21	12–30
Hom 17:3–19	33–58
Hom 18:6–10; 19–20	52–61
Hom 19:1–23	Rec 4:1–21
Hom 20:1–10	26–36
	Rec 5:34–35
	Rec 6:4–14

Joseph Fitzmyer ("The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites and their Literature," TS 16 [1955] 350) gives the KP passages identified by Waitz, as modified by Bousset and Cullmann. For the latest critical survey of research of the Pseudo-Clementines, see Lüdemann's articles in the forthcoming issue of *The Second Century: A Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2:1 (Spring, 1982).

9. Schoeps' list expands as well as incorporates the earlier efforts of Waitz, Bousset and Cullman. Strecker (*New Testament Apocrypha* [ed. E. Hennecke, W. Schneelmelcher, R. McL. Wilson; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963] II:106) subtracts R 1:33–44.2 and 53.4b–71 from Schoeps' list, since these tests go back to another source, the *Anabathmoi Jakobou* ("The Ascent of James") II (AJ II), parallel to Epiphanius' source (AJ I). For the most recent analysis of this section of the PsC, see Gerd Lüdemann, "Jewish Christian Sources in the *Pseudo-Clementines: Recognitions* I:33–71," SBLASP (1980).

10. A. F. J. Klijn, "The Pseudo-Clementines and The Apostolic Decree," *NovT* 10 (1968) 308–12 and the literature cited therein.

11. More fully, "Thou art my Son; I have this day begotten thee" is for Luke 3:22 read by not only D and the Old Latin, but also by Clement of Alexandria, Methodius, Lactantius, Juvencus, Hilary, Faustus the Manichaean (quoted by Augustine, *Contra Faust*. lib. 23), and once by Augustine without remark (*Enchir. ad Laurent*. c. xlix), who states elsewhere (*De Consensus Evang*. lib. ii. c. 14) that it was found in some MSS., but was not present in the older Greek copies. Justin Martyr in his accounts of the baptism gives these as the words spoken by the voice (*Dial* cc. 88, 103). The second reference does not prove Justin drew from a Gospel, but this is strongly implied: "For this devil, at the same time as he [Jesus] went up from the river Jordan, after the voice was uttered to him 'Thou art my Son; I have this day begotten thee' is recorded in the memoirs of the apostles…" (E. W.

B. Nicholson, *The Gospel According to the Hebrews: Its Fragments Translated and Annotated* [London: Kegan Paul, 1879] 40, 93). The latest treatment of the Gospel according to the Ebionites was undertaken by D. A. Bertrand, "L'Evangile des Ebionites: Une Harmonie Evangélique antérieure au Diatessaron," NTS 26 (1980) 548–63. Bertrand concludes that the *Gospel of the Ebionites* was written in the first half of the second century, or if not, at least prior to Tatian's *Diatessaron* (c. 170–80 A.D.) Relevant to the discussion is Klijn's "Patristic Evidence for Jewish Christian and Aramaic Gospel Tradition," *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black*, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge University, 1979) 169–77. This study may be considered as supplemental to Klijn and Reinink's important tool, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish–Christian Sects* (Leiden: Brill, 1973). Earlier analysis of KP Jesus-*logia* also led L. L. Kline to the conclusion that KP drew from a harmonized sayings source (*The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo–Clementine Homilies* [SBL, 1975] 173). See further, Kline, "Harmonized Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementines Homilies and Justin Martyr," ZNW 66 (1975) 223–41. Against this is Strecker, "Eine Evangelienharmonie bei Justin und Pseudoklemens?" NTS 24 (1978) 297–316. On the relationship of the only complete sayings collection extant and the PsC, see Quispel, "L'Evangile selon Thomas et les Clementines," VC 2 (1958) 81–93.

12. The "natural Christology" of the Ebionites denied the Virgin Birth partly because Christ was a spirit of genius, so to speak, rather than a man. The above fragment of the Ebionite gospel makes clear that Christ was born in the river Jordan when Jesus the man was 30 years old. Thus what might well be regarded as a *spiritual* Virgin Birth obtains here. Like the Gospel of Thomas, the Ebionite evangel does not emphasize miracles. Achtemeier ("The Origin and Function of the Pre-Marcan Miracle Catenae," JBL 91 (1972) 198–221) points out: "There is no mention of any miracle in the Apostolic Fathers." References to miracles in the PsC exclude the Virgin Birth, and those in the KP (R 1:141; 3:60; H 19:22) are of a summary nature, intended to reflect on the character of Jesus' deeds in contrast to those of Simon the Magician. Although the KP does not appeal to the sign–refusal saying of Jesus (Mark 8:12 and parallels), the presence of a temptation narrative the KP (H 8:21; R 4:34) could suggest elements which are "anti-miraculous" — if Court's label of the sign–refusal and temptation pericopes is valid ("The Philosophy of the Synoptic Miracles," JTS 23 [1972] 8). According to Justin Martyr (*Apol*. 48), general summaries of Christ's miracles may be more dependent on the idea of fulfillment of the prophecy of Isa 35:5–7 than on any specific accounts of wondrous works (see Achtemeier, 199). On anti-miracle traditions generally, see J. D. Crossan, "Empty Tomb and Absent Lord," *The Passion in Mark*, ed. W. H. Kelber (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 135–52; R. P. martin, *Mark* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1972) 163–84; E. Bammel, "John Did No Miracle (John 10:41)," *Miracles in their Philosophy and History: Cambridge Studies* (London, 1962) II, 181–202. In any event, Jewish Christian gospel tradition refers to the Holy Spirit as the mother of Jesus, rather than to Mary. For example, Jerome reports: "But in that Gospel according to the Hebrews which is read by the Nazoraeans, the Lord says: 'A moment ago my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me up.' Nobody, however, must be scandalized because of this, because the Spirit is used in the feminine

gender with the Hebrews," (*Comm. in Esaim* 40:9–11; see *Patristic Evidence*, p. 225). Epiphanius states that the Ebionites deny that Christ was a man (*Pan* 30:14:5), while speaking of the Gospel of the Ebionites. If Christ is distinct from Jesus, whether or not Jesus the man had a physical virgin birth is, to carry Ebionite thought to its logical conclusion, an issue separate from the origin of the Christ spirit.

13. George Widengren's translation is "Baptism and Enthronement in Some Jewish–Christian Gnostic Documents," *The Saviour God: Comparative Studies in the Concept of Salvation*, ed. S. G. F. Brandon (Manchester University, 1963) 213.

14. Ibid., 214. See also L. Cerfaux, "Le Vrai Prophète des Clémentines," RSR 18 (1928) 143–63.

15. Schoeps, *Theologie*, 104–06; Jerome on Mic 5:4 refers to Symmachus, who renders "princes" by "Messiahs" (L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* [Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Soc., 1947] V, 130). Sukka 52b on Mic 5:4 identifies the Seven Shepherds as Adam, Seth, Methuselah, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, and David (R. Patai, *The Messiah Texts* [N.Y.: Avon, 1979] 271). The question of whether or not Symmachus was actually an Ebionite is discussed by R. A. Kraft, "Christian Transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures," *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Mélanges offerts a Marcel Simon* (Paris, 1978) 211–12. Palladius the historian (c. 365–425) in his *Lausiac History* records Origen's two years' sojourn with Juliana at Caesarea in Cappadocia, and Eusebius (HE 6:17) states that Juliana had "inherited" the books [memoirs "along with other translations of the Scriptures by Symmachus"] from Symmachus himself." This connexion has led some scholars to believe that Symmachus lived north of Syria. See S. Jollicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford, 1968) 94–99.

16. *Jewish Christianity*, p. 71. See also M. Eugene Boring, "Christian Prophecy and Mt 23:34–6: A Test Exegesis," SBLASP 1977 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 117–26.

17. Charlesworth took up this theme in his 1980 AAR/SBL presentation, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel in Intertestamental Literature," later published in *Ideal Figures in Judaism*, ed. J. N. G. Collins (SBL, 1978). Buchanan has argued that the angel of the Apocalypse was human ("John of Patmos and the Angel of Revelation," *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1977) I, 35ff.). On the nature of Ebionite apocalyptic, see H. D. Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism," JTC 6 (1969) 146–54. See also James Hope Moulton, "It is His Angel," JTS 3 (1902) 514–27.

18. G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London: Collins, 1973) 137, 252; see also J. R. G. Dunn, "Jesus the Prophet," *Furrow* 32:8 (1981) 487–95.

19. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," JBL 86 (1987) 25.

20. James A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith*, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1975) I, 90.

21. Fitzmyer, op. cit., 29, 30.

22. Patrick W. Shekan, "A New Translation of Qumran Texts," CBQ 25 (1963) 121; for a full translation of 4Q Testimonia, see Fitzmyer, "4Q Testimonia and the New Testament," TS 18 (1957) 513–37; reprinted in Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Scholars' Press, 1974) 79–81. For the presence of the Samaritan recension at Qumran, see J. Bowman, "Contact between Samaritan Sects and Qumran," VT 7 (1957) 184–89; and further, Bowman, *The Samaritan Problem* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1975).

23. Stanley Isser, "Dositheus, Jesus, and a Moses Aretalogy," *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, IV, 168.

24. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo–Clementine Homilies*, 148–49.

25. Isser, "Dositheus," 187, sees the Gospel parody *Toldot Yeshu* as "a reversal of a positive aretalogy: the miracle worker becomes a liar and a trickster." The original sense of the word *aretalogy* is shown by the Septuagint, where "to speak the wonders of God" is regularly rendered by *aretas legein*. Could the figure of Simon function also as a reversal of an aretalogy of *Jesus* which the Ebionites wished to combat? After all, the KP represents Simon/Paul as accusing Peter as one who "proclaims doctrines opposite to his [Jesus]" (H 17:4) while the reverse charge is hurled by Peter against Simon (H 17:19). Simon's proofs through wonders show an emphasis on miracles which the KP Peter disavows as a primary witness to the authenticity of one's claim (R 3:60; H 2:34). The KP has such bare reference to miracles of Jesus that it is a presentation of Jesus, the Prophet of Truth, over against the Gentile–Christian aretalogy of Jesus as Prophet of Wonders. On the whole question of an anti-miracle tradition, George Wesley Buchanan wrote, in a letter dated May 6, 1979 to the present writer:

> I have been working for about 25 years on a book on the Historical Jesus and now have it in first draft. It will still take a couple of years for it to hit the public, but I have also raised the question you raise about miracles. I agree that Mark 8:12 and parallels indicate that Jesus did not perform miracles. If he had only performed a couple before the Sanhedrin, he probably would have got off Scott–free…. Once you start with the principle that all prophecy is fulfilled in the days of the Messiah and deduce further that everything that is in the world is in the scripture, then you have only to be convinced that Jesus is the Messiah to invent all the miracles in the Gospels. Since this is the messianic age and Jesus is the Messiah, he must have fulfilled the prophecies of Isa 35, etc. He also must have performed all the miracles of Moses, Elijah, and Elisha, as well. Then you have only to fill in the details to show when; and how he performed all of them. To answer how he performed them and still had no witnesses, the authors show that he warned the witnesses not to tell anyone. This is all acceptable historiography in NT times.

This question of the role of miracles is essential to our knowledge of Ebionite Christology. Those signs which the KP does ascribe to Jesus are "signs of healing" after the fashion of those "remedies" which were "superinduced by the prayers of Moses"

and "then truth supervenes, as the physician upon the disease" (H 2:33).

26. Isser, "Dositheus," 186: "…but the 'true prophet' or 'prophet like Moses' theme was current among them (Samaritans) at least in the first century A.D., if not earlier." See also, Isser, "Jesus in the Samaritan Chronicles," JJS 32:2 (Autumn, 1981) 166–194. Isser states that Origen was mistaken to have used the term "messiah" as part of Dositheus' claim to be "the predicted prophet" of Deut 18 (p. 193). Therefore a Prophet–Messiah expectation (— distinct from the Mosaic eschatological prophet —) is difficult to establish. Jesus, according to Samaritan sources, claimed to be a prophet and also "the Messiah to come in the *future*" (ibid. 194).

27. Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity*, 65–68. For Samaritan beliefs on the return of Moses, see J. Bowman, "Early Samaritan Eschatology," JJS 6 (1955); J. MacDonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans* (1964) 362–71. For parallels in Qumran, see N. Wieder, "The 'Law Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," JJS 4 (1953) 158–75; "The Idea of a Second Coming of Moses," JQR 46 (1956) 356–364; H. M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (Philadelphia: SBL, 1957) 99ff. On the identification of Qumran documents as Ebionite, see the remarkably conjectural but stimulating articles of J. L. Teicher of Cambridge, JJS 2–5 (1951–54) and "The Essenes," *Studia Patristica* 1 (1957) 540–45, where he appeals to Josephus' account (*War* 2:8:10) of persecution of the Essenes by the Romans, as proof that the Essenes were Christians (as Philaster of Brescia reports) since Jews were never forced under torture to recant at the hands of Romans. (Philaster states that the Essenes were a monastic order which regarded Jesus not as the Lord or Son of God but as a prophet and just man.) To the present author's knowledge, no scholar has refuted Teicher's challenge to accepted Qumran dating: "Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Antiquity* 37 (1963) 25–30. Yet, see James H. Charlesworth, "The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases Among the Qumran Essenes," *Rev Q* 10:2 (1980) 213–33.

28. *Jewish Christianity*, 67–8.

29. B. Murmelstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," WZKM (*Vienna Oriental Journal*) 35 (1928) 272–3; Schoeps, *Aus Fruchristlicher Zeit* (Tubingen, 1950) 8ff.; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, V, 12 n. 28; 83 n. 30; 130 n. 142. On the anointing of Adam, see Wm. H. Shea, "Adam in Ancient Mesopotamian Traditions," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (1977) 27–41, esp. 32; also, Niels-Erik Andreasen, "Adam and Adapa: Two Anthropological Characters," AUSS 19:3 (Fall, 1981) 563–68. Arguing for Gnostic provenance, see A. Altman, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends," JQR N.S., 35 (1944–5) 371–91.

30. R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Versions of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1906) intro.; also, J. C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second–Century Sources," SBLASP (1978) 1, 315–22. For contrasting exegeses of Micah 5:4, for comparison to Symmachus and the Seven Pillars of the World, see K. J. Cathcart, "Notes on Micah 5:4–5," *Bib* 49 (1968) 511–14.

31. Samson H. Levey, "The Targum to Ezekiel," HUCA 46 (1975) 149–50.

32. Strecker presents this as established in "The Kerygmata Petrou," *New Testament Apocrypha* II, 108. For the most recent treatment of anti-Paulinism in the PsC, see Gerd Lüdemann's forthcoming *Paulus, der Heidenaposte*, Band II: *Antipaulinismus im fouken Christentum* (Gottingen; March, 1983) chapter 11.

33. Schoeps' translation in *Paul*, 83–4; compare also with Strecker, op. cit., 122–3; Thomas Smith (*Ante–Nicene Fathers* Vol. VIII [Grand Rapids, 1978] reprint) 323–24, did not have the Rehm texts before him. See also A. Salles, "Za Diatribe Anti-Paulinienne dans le Roman Pseudo–Clémentine et l'Origine des Kérygmes de Pierre," RB 64 (1957) 516–51.

34. Strecker, "On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," *Orthodoxy*, 258.

35. *Galatians*, 48: *Peter in the New Testament* (1973) 25.

36. Victor Paul Furnish, "The Jesus–Paul Debate; from Bauer to Bultmann," BJRL 47 (196) 342–81.

37. *Jewish Christianity*, 42–46.

38. For the latest treatment of this, see Charles W. Hedrick, "Paul's Conversion/Call: A Comparative Analysis of the Three Reports in Acts," JBL 100 (1981) 415–32.

39. George D. Kilpatrick, "Galatians 1:18," *New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson* (Manchester University, 1959) 144–49. Against Kilpatrick's rendering of the verb *historeo* as "getting information from," is Betz, *Galatians*, 76. Who is right? We know the definition of *historia* from Clement of Alexandria: the encyclopadia collection of data on all sorts of matters (Str VI:11:90:3). Elsewhere, Clement refers to the information on pagan religion and cults condensed into the *Protrepticus* as *historia* (Str VII:4:22:3). See Raoul Mortley, "The Past in Clement of Alexandria," *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, Vol. 1: The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*, ed. E. P. Sanders (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 194–263. From the context of Paul's argument, the emphasis is against Peter as a source for Paul's gospel. Betz cites Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine and Ambrosister in support of the interpretation that Gal 1:18 refers to an informal "visit" only. No one will wish to dispute the fact that Paul disclaims Peter as a source for both kerygma and apostolic authority. But does this mean that Paul had no interest in what Peter had to say, even though Paul ends up disagreeing with Peter? A trip to Jerusalem for Paul could not have been casual. This would be inconsistent with the very serious nature of Paul's personality. What was their conversation about — the weather? A visit to Jerusalem must have been a pilgrimage for any Christian at that time. Paul went to Jerusalem as a Christian, filled with love for Christ. How could Paul have not been filled with some curiosity as to what Jesus was like on earth? True, Paul's second journey to the Holy City was different, but the first visit occurred before fourteen years of opposition and controversy had left its emotional and ideological scars on Paul. *Galatians* is a bitter reminiscence, charged with contempt — a document of

apostolic and kerygmatic mutiny, such that the rank of the apostles including Peter, "makes no difference to me" (Gal 2:6). (See David M. Hay, "Paul's Indifference to Authority," JBL 88 [1969] 36–44.) Paul was not ignorant of what Peter had to say, but rejected what Peter represented. On Gal 2, C. K. Barrett comments that Peter "scarcely comes short" of proclaiming another Jesus ("Cephas and Corinth," *Abraham unser Vater* [ed. O. Betz *et al*; Leiden: Brill, 1963] 10–11). If the gospel of Peter centred on the historical Jesus, by contrast Paul's does not. By his own admission, Paul "determined not to know anything save Christ and him crucified" (I Cor 2:2); "Yea, though we had known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth would we know him so no more" (2 Cor 5:16). The Epistle of James curiously knows nothing of the passion of Christ, neither does Q nor the Thomas–evangel. There is something very deliberate, not ignorant, in the formulation of Paul's rival gospel. How is this to be explained? In Paul's own city of Tarsus, two principal deities were worshipped, identified by the Greeks with Zeus and Hercules, who were commonly called the Father and the Son. The death by fire and the resurrection of the Son were celebrated yearly. Cults of this form were very widespread. Influenced by this background, and working within this pagan religious environment, it is natural that Paul would have conceived of expressing the faith of Christ in familiar non-Jewish modes to communicate Christ to non-Jews. (See C. H. Talbert, "The Myth of a Descending–Ascending Redeemer in Mediterranean Antiquity," NTS 22 [1976] 418–39). No NT account shows more clearly the historical distinction between Paul's Christianity and pre-Pauline Christianity(ies) than the episode in Acts 18–19 involving Apollos and the disciples at Ephesus. See J. L. Teicher, "The Teaching of the Pre-Pauline Church in the Dead Sea Scrolls — VI," JJS 4 (1953) 139–153. Further, on *historesai Kephan*, see TDNT, 3:391; BAG, 383; Moulton and Geden, *Lexicon*, 503; and elsewhere.

40. The present writer has not yet accessed R. Ring's dissertation, *The Meaning and Significance of II Peter 3:15b–17* (Ph.D.: University of Chicago, 1955), nor to that of D. Schmidt, *The Peter Writings: Their Redactors and Their Relationships* (Ph.D. thesis: Northwestern University, 1972)

41. Smith's translation, p. 95, n. 3. See also *Jewish Christianity*, 51.

42. Schoeps, *Paul*, 55–8.

43. H. Chadwick, *The Circle and the Ellipse: Rival Concepts of Authority in the Early Church* (Oxford University, 1959) 4, 15, 13.

44. Juan B. Cortes and Florence M. Gatti, "The Son of Man and The Son of Adam," *Bib* 49:4 (1968) 457–502.

45. Cortes, 466–70.

46. Cortes, throughout, and further, WZKM (1929) 51ff.; Schoeps, *Paul*, 190.

47. *Paul*, 190.

48. *Le Problème Littéraire et Historique du Roman Pseudo–Clémentine: Etude sur le Rapport entre*

le Gnosticisme et le Judéo-Christianisme (Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan, 1930); "Wandlingen in der neuern Forschungsgeschichte des Urchristetums. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Problem: Theologie und Geschichtswissenschaft," *Discordia Concors*, Edgar Bonjour Festschrift (1968).

49. Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity*, 128–29.

50. "Die Neuentdeckten Qumrantexte und das Judenchristentum der Pseudoklemetinen," *Neutestamentliche Studien fur Rudolf Bultmann* BZW 21 (1954) 35–51; a partial English translation of Cullman's 1968 article is provided in *Trajectories*, 264–65.

51. *Essays on the Semitic Background of the NT*, 460. In conclusion, Fitzmyer writes: "I rejected the idea that either the Qumran or the Pseudo–Clementine dualism was Gnostic. I do not intend to claim that there is no Gnosticism at all in the PsC." (479–80).

52. John J. Gunther, "Syrian Christian Dualism," VC 25 (1971) 81–93.

53. Koester, *Trajectories*, 125; Strecker, "On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," *Orthodoxy*, 258–59.

54. *Oxford Bible Atlas*, ed. H. M. May (Oxford, 1978) 126; see also E. Bickerman, "La Coele–Syria: Notes de Géographie Historique," RB 54 (1947) 256–68.

55. Koester, *Trajectories*, 133: "The pattern of 'apostolic' tradition which appears under the name of the apostle Judas Thomas in eastern Syria may be compared to the Peter tradition in Coelesyria…and the Paul tradition in Asia Minor…. The purpose of such claims was to establish the legitimate apostolic doctrine and succession in the anti-Gnostic controversy…. However, the Pauline tradition in Asia Minor and the Petrine tradition in western Syria belong to a different pattern. There is no doubt that these traditions had their ultimate origin in the actual, historical missionary activity of these apostles in the areas in which their names survived; i.e., they were already in existence before the weapons of the anti-heretic controversy had been forged."

56. Ephraim Isaac: "An Obscure Component in Ethiopian Church History," *Le Muséon* 85 (1972) 241.

57. For the latest critical treatment of the Pella-flight tradition, see Gerd Lüdemann, "The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Evaluation of the Pella–Tradition," *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* , ed. E. P. Sanders (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) Vol. 1, 161–73, 245–54, and the literature surveyed therein. Arguing for the origin of Matthew in Pella, see H. D. Slingerland, "The Transjordanian Origin of St. Matthew's Gospel," JSNT (1979) 18–28.

58. Ibid., conclusion.

59. Schoeps, "Ebionitische Apocalyptikin Neuen Testament," ZNW 51 (1960) 101–111. English Abstract: "The voluntary exodus of the Jewish Christian church to Pella

immediately prior to the Jewish war 66–70 A.D. was the result of a secret prophecy in Jewish apocalyptic style in its Ebionite form. It has its reflection in the apocalyptic passage of Matt 24 and parallels, as well as in Rev 12:4–17. And the exhortation of Galilee (which at the time included Transjordania) as the land of promise and resurrection (cf. Matt 4:4–16; Mark 14:28 and 16:7f)." This exegesis originated with Renan's chapter on the Apocalypse in *Antichrist*, (Boston, 1897) esp. pp. 317–18 on Pella exodus. The present writer has not yet accessed W. K. Hedrick's dissertation, *The Sources and Use of Imagery in Apocalypse 12* (Th.D.: Graduate Theological Union, 1971)

60. Robert Huston Smith: "Pella of the Decapolis: An American–Australian expedition reconstructs 7,000 years of history in the Jordan Valley," *Archaeology* 34:5 (Sept/Oct 1981) 46–53. Also, forthcoming reports are to appear in the *Annual of the Dept. of Antiquities of Jordan* (ADAJ) and BASOR; Smith, "A Sarcophagus from Pella: New Light on Earliest Christianity," *Archaeology* 26 (1973) 250–56. Ancient historical texts pertaining to Pella are compiled in *Pella of the Decapolis, Volume I: The 1967 Seasons of the Wooster Expedition to Pella* (Wooster, Ohio: The College of Wooster, 1973). See also *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume (Nashville, 1976) 651f.

61. J. S. Trimingham, *Christianity among the Arabs in Pre-Islamic Times* (1979) 54.

62. Op. cit., 93.

63. Strecker, "On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," *Orthodoxy*, 271.

64. Robert Joly, *Le Dossier d'Ignace d'Antioch* (University of Brussels, 1979); reviewed by M. Slusser, TS 41 (1980) 206–207.

65. *Theologie*, " 'Gnostischer Ebionitismus': die Elkesaiten," 325–34.

66. Quispel, *Gnostic Studies* Vol. I, p. 96; see also Vol. II: *The Gospel of Thomas and Jewish Christianity* (Ned. Hist. Arch. Inst. te Istanbul, 1975) throughout.

67. Gunther, "Syrian Christian Dualism," 86, quoting C. S. C. Williams, "Eznik's Resume of Marcionite Doctrine," JTS 45 (1944) 65–73.

68. Gunther, 89.

69. Gerd Lüdemann, "The Successors…," 253 n. 69; see also Koch, *A Critical Investigation of Epiphanius' Knowledge of the Ebionites* (Ph.D., 1976) 222–24.

70. Fr. Bellarmino Bagatti, *The Church from the Circumcision* (Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1971) 25. For an express mention of Ebionites in rabbinical literature (*b. Shabbat* f. 116) see Luitpold Wallach, "The Textual History of a Aramaic Proverb (Traces the Ebionean Gospel," Vol. 60:4 (Dec. 1941), pp. 403–415 [407].

71. Koch, op. cit., 223.

72. Koch, ibid.

73. Lüdemann, ibid., 254; Jack Finegan, *Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim, 1969), "Jewish Christianity," 46–59, esp. p. 57 (for translation of Pan 30:2:9).

74. Schoeps, *Theologie*, 334–42; *Jewish Christianity*, 136–40; A. Schlatter, "Die Entwicklung des Judischen Christentums zum Islam," *Evangelische Missions–Magazin* 62 (1918) 251–64; M. Roncaglia, "Elements Ebionites et Elkesaites dans le Coran," *Proche–Orient Chretien* 21 (1973) 101–26; J. Dorra–Haddad; "Coran, Predication Nazareenee," POC 23 (1973) 148–55; W. Atallah, "L'Evangile Thomas et le Coran," *Arabica* 23 (1976) 309–11; Henri Corbin, "Divine Epiphany and Spiritual Birth in Ismailian Gnosis: Ebionite and Ismailian Adamology," *Man and Transformation, Eranos–Jahrbuch* 23 (1954) (N.Y.: Pantheon 1964) 76–94; Harry Austryn Wolfson: "It happens that the Koran, while rejecting the orthodox Christian type of Christology, upholds the Ebionite type of Christology…. We know that Christians as a minority group in Muslim countries were not entirely impervious to Muslim influence. We know also that the Christian Arabic literature, through its discussions of all sides of the Christological problems, had kept alive among Christians in Muslim countries a knowledge of the Ebionite type of Christology of the heretical Samosatenians, Arians, and Macedonians and also a knowledge of all the arguments in favor of it," (*Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*, Vol. 21 [Harvard University, 1977] 412–13); Wolfson also wrote, "Ebionism represents the view of the original Jewish followers of Jesus…" (*The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* [Harvard University, 1956] Vol. 1, 587). The importance of Wolfson's historical position is given prominence in *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 55; Danielou writes: "Schoeps identifies Jewish Christianity with Ebionism and claims primacy for the heterodox sect;…. Recently, Wolfson has also taken up this thesis." The present writer has not yet been able to access John Flanagan's (University of Utah) unpublished paper, "Oriental Christians in Pre-Islamic Arabia: A Consideration of a Special Problem of Origin and Development" (1981). Also, on possible PsC influence on Qur'anic thought, see A. Ahrens, "Christliches im Qoran," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morenlandischen Gesellschaft* 84 (1930) 56–60, 64.

75. *Jewish Christianity*, 36–37.

76. Pp. 314–16. Trimingham does not discuss the tradition that Waraqa ibn Nawful (a cousin of Muhammad's first wife Khadija, referred to on p 263 of *Christianity…in Pre-Islamic Times*) upon embracing Christianity, wrote down Gospels in Hebrew or Aramaic (see *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, p. 631).

77. Giulio Basetti-Sani, *The Koran in the Light of Christ: A Christian Interpretation of the Sacred Book of Islam* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1977) 54, 56, 58. This Christian apologist attacks Schoeps (p. 57), but a world-ranking Islamicist, Arthur Jeffrey, favored Schoeps' hypothesis of the presence of Ebionite doctrines in the Qur'an: "Professor Schoeps on Judaeo-Christianity," ATR 33 (1951) 169–73.

78. For the most immediate reference, see Rodwell's *Koran* (N.Y.: Everyman's Library, 1974) p. 130, n. 4: "Antioch, to which Jesus is said to have sent two disciples to preach the

unity of God, and subsequently Simon Peter. This vague story, and that of the seven sleepers in Sura xviii, are the only traces to be found in the Koran of any knowledge… on the part of Muhammad, of the history of the Church subsequent to the day of Pentecost or of the spread of the Christian religion." Over 1300 years after the Quran, this exegesis persists even in Bahá'í *tafsir* on this passage ('Abdu'l-Bahá, "The Wisdom of the Apostles," *Star of the West* Vol. 13, No, 7 [Oct. 1922] 180–81; cf. *Star* 9:2 [Apr 1918] 23). On the seven sleepers of Surah 18, see Hugh W. Nibley, "Qumran and the Companions of the Cave," *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1965) 177–198.

79. Rodwell's translation.

80. *Theologie*, 334–42; *Jewish Christianity*, 136–40.

81. Ephrain Isaac, "An Obscure Component in Ethiopian Church History: An Examination of Various Theories Pertaining to the Problem of the Origin and Nature of Ethiopian Christianity," *Le Muséon* 85 (1972) 225–58; Isaac, *A New Text–Critical Introduction of Mashafa Berhan* (Leiden: Brill, 1973) Chapter Four, "The Jewish Christian Background of *MB*: The State of Jewish Christianity in the Time of its Completion," 53–75; Isaac, "Another Note on Luke 6:1," JBL 100 (1981) 96–7.

82. "Obscure Component…," 234.

83. "Component," 235.

84. "Component," 228.

85. "Component," 240.

86. "Component," 242–43.

87. Isaac, *Mashafa Berhan*, 61.

88. MB, 54–59.

89. MB, 62.

90. Hasan M. Balyuzi, *Muḥammad and the Course of Islám* (Oxford: George Ronald, 1976) 34; "The Negus wept until his beard was wet…," Ibn Ishaq, *Life of Muhammad*, p. 151.

91. R. W. Cowley, "The Identification of the Ethiopian Octateuch of Clement, and its Relationship to the other Christian Literature," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 27 (1978) 37–45.

92. Shlomo Pines, "The Jewish Christians of the Early Centuries of Christianity According to a New Source," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* Vol. 2, No. 13 (Jerusalem, 1966) Excursus II, "The Gospel of Barnabas," 73.

93. Wolfson, *Studies…*, 411; Pines, "New Source," 40; "only the rank of a prophet."

94. Wolfson, 412–13.

95. Pines, 47. It is interesting that the Qaraites occasionally called themselves *noserim*, i.e., the Hebrew name for Christians, and habitually refer to themselves in prayers as "the poor" (Pines, 48). See also Leon Nemoy, "Al–Qirqisani's Account of the Jewish Sects and Christianity," HUCA 7 (1930) 317–97; Nemoy, "The Attitude of the Early Karaites towards Christianity," *Salo W. Baon Jubilee Volume* (N.Y., 1975) II, 697–716; Daniel J. Lasker, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages* (N.Y.: KTAV, 1977).

96. Pines, "Judaeo-Christian Materials in an Arabic Jewish Treatise," PAAJR 35 (1967) 198.

97. Ibid., 198–99.

98. Op. cit., 197.

99. Pines, "The Jewish Christians…According to a New Source"; reviews varied wildly. Among them see: R. McL. Wilson, "The New *Passion of Jesus* in the Light of the New Testament and Apocrypha," *Neotestamenta et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (Edinburgh: Clark, 1969) 264–71; R. A. Kraft, JBL 86 (1967) 329; Ernst Bammel, "Excerpts from a New Gospel?" *NovT* 10 (1968) 1–9; Tjitze Baarda, "Luke 12:13–14," *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (1975) 130–55; S. M. Stern, "New Light on Judaeo-Christianity?" *Encounter* (May, 1967) 53–57; David Flusser, "The Conclusion of Matthew in a New Jewish Christian Source," ASTI 5 (1967) 110–112; Pines, " 'Israel, My Firstborn' and the Sonship of Jesus: A theme of Moslem Anti-Christian Polemics," *Studies in Mysticism and Religion* (Festschrift for G. G. Scholem; Jerusalem, 1967) 177–78.

100. Pines, "The Jewish Christians….," 16; 25; 6; 26–28.

101. Ragg and Ragg, *The Gospel of Barnabas* (Oxford University, 1907); The English deist John Toland was the first to draw notice to Ebionite and Muslim elements in Barnabas: *Nazarenus: or, Jewish, Gentile, and Mahometan Christianity, containing the history of the ancient Gospel of Barnabas* (London, 1718); on Toland, see Patrick, "Two English Forerunners of the Tubingen School: Thomas Morgan and John Toland," *Theological Review* 59 (1877) 562–603; Henning G. Reventlow, "Judaism and Jewish Christianity in the Works of John Toland," *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1977), Vol. III, 111–116; Max Wiener, "John Toland and Judaism," HUCA 16 (1941) 215–42; Toland's *Nazarenus* was recently rendered into French (1969). The English edition is very difficult to access. Essentially, Toland's thesis is "the Nazarens [sic] or Ebionites are by all Church–historians unanimously acknowledged to have been the first Christians" (p. 76) which was "the true and original Christianity" (p. 5) "wholly metamorphosed and perverted" by Paul (p. 24) and that "Tis, in short, the ancient Ebionite or Nazaren System…[which is]…perfectly conformable to the tradition of the Mahometans" (p. 17) such that "what the Mahometans believe concerning Christ and his doctrine, were neither the inventions of Mahomet, nor yet of those Monks who are said to have assisted him in the framing of his *Alcoran*; but that they are as old as the

time of the Apostles…" (p. 84). Toland likewise appeals to *Barnabas*.

102. Luigi Cirillo and Michel Fremaux, translators; and Henri Corbin *Evangile de Barnabe: Researches sur la Composition et l'Origine* (Paris: Becuchesne, 1977); see also, Jan Slomp, "The Pseudo–Gospel of Barnabas: Muslim and Christian Evaluations," *Al–Mushir* 18 (1976) 15–19; and further, Slomp, "The Gospel in Dispute," *Islamochristiana*: Vol. 4, ed. M. Borrmans, *et al.* (Rome: Pontifico Instituto di Studi Arabi, 1978) 67–112; J. M. Magnin, "En Marge de l'Ebionisme l'Evangile de Barnabe," POC 29 (1979) 46–64. On Muslim criticism of Christianity generally, see Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Kalam* (Harvard University, 1976) 304–54; Laurence E. Browne, *The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia* (N.Y., 1967) 109–25; J. Windrow Sweetman, *Islam and Christian Theology* (London, 1955) II, 1, 178–309; Edward Granville Browne, "A Parallel to the Story of the Mathnawi of Jalalu'd–din Rumi of the Jewish King who Persecuted the Christians," *Islamica* 2 (1926) 129–34; H. Hirschfeld, "Muhammadan Criticism of the Bible," JQR 13 (1901) 222–40; Moshe Perlmann, *Ibn Kammuna's Examination of the Three Faiths* (University of California, 1971) p. 82 is typical: "His [Jesus'] disciples continued for a long time with this adherence to the Torah, before they began to break its laws and declared that the Torah was abrogated. Most of this goes back to the apostle Paul."

103. Pines, "The Jewish Christians….," 73.

104. Pines, 37; see also Wolfson, "An Unknown Splinter Group of Nestorians," *Revue de Etudes Augustiniennes* 6 (1960) 249–53; Quispel, "Discussion," 87.

105. CMC 86:1–9. Albert Heinrichs, "Mani and the Babylonian Baptists: A Historical Confrontation," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77 (1973) 54–55:

> The Pseudo-Clementines and Elchasai coincide in that they propagate the cyclic incarnation of the True Prophet…. Some of the baptists were so impressed by Mani's performance as a theologian that they regarded him as the True Prophet…. This doctrine…forms, in combination with the docetism of Marcion and Bardaisan, the basis of Mani's christology.

Critical of Heinrichs' study is J. Kevin Coyle, "The Cologne Mani–Codex and Mani's Christian Connections," *Eglise et Theologie* 10 (1970) 179–93. On the Elkesaites and the Quran, Quispel conjectures:

> Baptists (Sabians) were mentions in the Koran in three places (II, 59; V, 73; XXII, 17) as members of a recognized religion of the Book, which, according to Mohammad's precepts, was to be tolerated along with Judaism and Christianity…. But as a working hypothesis we are quite justified in assuming even now that these Sabians, the Baptists of the Koran, should be identified with the Jewish Christian Elkesaites. This would mean that Mohammed was acquainted both with the existence and the view of the Jewish Christians. (*Gnostic Studies*, Vol. II, 229.)

106. Udo Schaefer, *The Light Shineth in Darkness* (Oxford: George Ronald, 1977):

> Years ago, when I became acquainted with the founder of the Christian religion in the faith of the original community through H. J. Schoeps's *Theologie und Geschichte des Juden–christentums*, the standard work on the subject, I was deeply impressed. … [T]he Bahá'í, oriented towards the doctrine of cyclically recurring revelation and convinced of the mission of Islám, finds these results of research — in the light of unity of religions — extremely instructive, because they are a sufficient explanation for the discrepancy between orthodox Church doctrines and the doctrine of the post-Biblical religions, and because they show where the original truth was preserved; not in the pagan–Christian Greater Church based on Paul, but in the Jewish Christianity contemptuously branded as 'Ebionism'. (Pp. 87, 84.)

Choice magazine, a bibliographic tool greatly respected by librarians, selected Dr. Schaefer's book as one of the top 250 academic books reviewed for the year 1978. However, as the book is apologetic in nature, invoking scholarship but not furthering it, this work was not reviewed by scholarly journals.

107. 'Abdu'l-Bahá, *Star of the West*, Vol. 8, No. 6 (June 24, 1917) 60: "The extreme asceticism of the saints was superstition. The monasticism of the Christian church was mistaken. St. Paul was responsible for much of this…." 'Abdu'l-Bahá, *The Promulgation of Universal Peace: Discourses by 'Abdu'l-Bahá During His Visit to the United States in 1912* (Wilmette: Bahá'í, 1922; 1943; 1982) 275: "In ancient times and medieval ages woman was completely subordinated to man…. Glimpses of this may be found even in the epistles of St. Paul." 'Abdu'l-Bahá took issue with all of the cardinal dogmas of the Church except for the Virgin Birth. Space does not permit the lengthy documentation involved. On Jewish Christianity, 'Abdu'l-Bahá expressly praises the first Jewish converts (*The Secret of Divine Civilization* (Wilmette: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1957) 82–3). However, when the subject of "the Judaising portion" of "primitive Christianity" was brought up by a minister who interviewed 'Abdu'l-Bahá in London on September 10, 1911, the Persian sage did not deviate from the topic under discussion, *viz*., the Bábís, and thus did not respond to the minister's reference to Jewish Christianity (*Star of the West*, Vol. 2, No. 11 (September 27, 1911) 77.

108. Earlier this century, Ameer 'Ali arrived at this historical position: "The Ebionites most probably represented the beliefs of the original companions of the Prophet of Nazareth." (*The Spirit of Islam* [1922] xxxix.) In his famous article, "Christianity from the Islamic Standpoint," Ameer 'Ali directly links Ebionite Christianity with Islam: "The Moslem belief probably is in accord with that of the primitive Christians — of the Ebionites, 'the sect of the poor,' to whom Jesus had preached and among whom he had lived. It has nothing in common with Pauline Christianity," (*Hibbert Journal* 4:2 [1906] 247); "Christianity from the Islamic Standpoint" was trice reprinted: *Christianity: Some Non-Christian Appraisals*, ed. D. W. McKain (N.Y.: McGraw Hill, 1964) 225–41); *Syed Ameer Ali on Islamic History and Culture*, ed. Wasti (Lahore, 1968) 79.) See also, Robert R. Hann, "The Undivided Way: The Early Jewish Christians as a Model for Ecumenical Encounter?" JES 14:2 (Spring 1977) 233–48.

109. J. N. Farquhar, *Modern Religious Movements in India* (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1967) 149. Compare with Jacob Vellian's notice, "The Jewish Christian Community of India," *Judaism* 20 (Winter 1971) 104–107; and *The Malabar Church*, ed. Vellian (Rome, 1970).

110. V. P. Furnish, "The Jesus–Paul Debate: From Baur to Bultmann," BJRL 47 (1965) 342–81.

111. 1979: James the Just; 1980: *Pseudo-Clementines*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1983: I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. William Stoever of Western Washington University for extensive critiques of several drafts of this paper; to Steven Scholl of the Institute of Islamic Studies at McGill University for remarks on the Ebionism/Islám section; and to Carol Lenhard for word-processing.

March 24, 2012: My thanks to Ms. Bobbi Lyons, of Ontario, Canada, for her excellent and highly professional word-processing/proofreading of the scanned 1983 manuscript, for her meticulous attention to detail and accuracy, and for her helpful editorial recommendations, and to Jonah Winters, for inviting Bobbi Lyons to take on this project and also for posting on Bahá'í Library Online.