particular, laid the foundations for future research. The work of Wolfng Kraus suggests interesting interpretations for Romans 3:25 and Hews.[3] Yet all these studies disregard, either partially or completely, the n-canonical texts, *Barnabas* and the *Gospel of Peter*, which date to und the same time as such late canonical texts as 2Peter and even had ionical status in some places.[4] The works of Helmut Koester and John minic Crossan are important in filling this gap.[5] The integration of this ent research on the non-canonical sources into a comprehensive analysis the influence of Yom Kippur on early Christianity is one of the main rposes of this chapter. I will also offer a number of fresh readings of w Testament passages and will especially relate to Matthew's Barabbas sode.[6]

In my analysis I focus on four guiding questions: Which elements of m Kippur can be perceived as having had an influence, and where? at kind of Yom Kippur (apocalyptic *imaginaire*, ritual, Leviticus 16)

Neuen Testament. Studien zum urchristlichen Verständnis der Heilsbedeutung des To- Jesu (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 88; Neuhen-Vluyn, 2001).

Kraus, *Der Tod Jesu als Heiligtumsweihe*, passim.

R.E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York, 1998), p. 767, gests the years 120–140 CE as most likely for 2Peter. For the dates discussed for *Bar- as*, see note 11, below.

Significantly, Young, "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the ught of the New Testament," and Kraus, *Der Tod Jesu als Heiligtumsweihe*, relegate r quite brief discussions of *Barnabas* to the appendix and in their conclusions do not ly pay heed to its implications. Even such an outstanding expert on Apocrypha as us Berger does not include *Barnabas* in his recent *Theologiegeschichte des Urstentums*. The subtitle, *Theologie des NT*, comes closer to the contents. Knöppler, *ne im Neuen Testament,* does not deal with non-canonical early Christian literature.

See H. Köster [Koester], *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* kte und Untersuchungen 65; Berlin, 1957); H. Koester, "Apocryphal and Canonical pels," *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980) 105–130; idem, *Introduction to the Testament. Volume One: History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age. ume Two: History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Berlin, New York and Philahia, 1982); idem, *Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development* (Philahia and London, 1990); J.D. Crossan, *Four Other Gospels* (Minneapolis, 1985); J.D. ssan, "The Cross That Spoke. The Earliest Narrative of the Passion and Resurion," *FORUM* 3/2 (1987) 3–12; J.D. Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke. The Origins of Passion Narrative* (San Francisco, 1988). See my criticism of his theory, below, 161–165.

The suggestion of K.A. Strand, "An Overlooked Old-Testament Background to 11:1," *Andrews University Seminar Studies* 22 (1984) 317-325, to see Lev 16 against background of Rev 11:1 has been rightly rejected by D. Aune, *Revelation* (3 vols; d Biblical Commentary 52A–C; Nashville [Tenn.], 1997–1998), vol. 2, p. 604, as too le and imprecise.

influenced the Christian text? What function does Yom Kippur have in the Christian text? What is the historical *Sitz im Leben* of this text?

The investigation is structured in the following way: The first four sections deal with the typological passages, those that compare Jesus to (1) certain animals (sacrificial goat, scapegoat) of the Yom Kippur temple rite, (2) its central sacrificer (the high priest), (3) its central cultic object (the kapporet; ἱλαστήριον) and (4) its aim (ἱλασμός). The fifth section briefly discusses the theses of scholars who link two early Christian hymns to the ritual of Yom Kippur. The final section places these investigations in historical context and provides a synthesis.

1. Christ and the Scapegoat: *Barnabas*, Matthew and Galatians

The imagery of the scapegoat rite of Yom Kippur had a tremendous impact on the development of the early narratives and interpretations of Jesus' death. The *Epistle of Barnabas* explicitly compares Jesus' Passion and Parousia to the scapegoat and the sacrificial goat. Implicit allusions are probably behind the scapegoat in the Barabbas episode of Matthew 27:15–23 and behind Galatians 3:10.13. The scapegoat probably influenced also the "Lamb of God" in John 1:29 and the Christological interpretation of the suffering servant in 1Peter 2:24. Here, an influence, if any, can be discerned only through a very wide understanding of the scapegoat rite and the Mediterranean rite of the *pharmakos* as catalysts.

I will refer also to the theories of two other scholars who attributed an especially strong influence to the scapegoat. John Crossan claims that the imagery of the scapegoat rite influenced an earlier form of the *Gospel of Peter* that was the source for all canonical passion accounts.[7] And according to A.H. Wratislaw, all four canonical versions of the Barabbas episode were influenced by the scapegoat rite.[8]

The section proceeds from the explicit to the implicit. I start (1.1) with a discussion of *Barnabas* and its proto-typology and an excursus on Crossan's theory; an analysis of Matthew 27:15–23 follows (1.2); then comes an excursus on the *pharmakos* and an interpretation of Galatians 3–4 (1.3); and the section ends with an investigation of those passages in which there are few traces of the scapegoat rite's influence: John 1:29 and 1Peter 2:22–24 (1.4). The first two cover the passages that come closest to being narratives, while the last three refer to theologoumena.

[7] See below, pp. 161–165.

[8] See pp. 165–171, below.

1 / The Tradition of Barnabas

The *Epistle of Barnabas* has a special place in this inquiry, since it interprets, extensively and in depth, the link between Jesus' death and Yom Kippur.[9] It is no surprise that Bultmann chose the typologies of *Barnabas* and Hebrews as the foremost examples of early Christian mythology.[10] No other text better exemplifies the crisis of the scandal of a messiah's death on the cross and the central role of typological interpretation in overcoming this calamity. Unfortunately, the central questions of authorship, place and time are points of controversy.[11] Some of the historical implications therefore remain hypothetical. Yet, since the Christian myth is still typological exegesis, not yet a narrative, its form points to an early time of composition, earlier than the earliest Passion Narrative (i.e. before 65). According to Helmut Koester, *Barnabas* 7 reflects the earliest stage of

[9] In recent years, *Barnabas* has been intensively studied. See R. Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant. The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, second series 82; Tübingen, 1996); J. Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas. Outlook and Background* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, second series 64; Tübingen, 1994); W. Horbury, "Jewish-Christian Relations in *Barnabas* and Justin Martyr," in: J.D.G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament first series 66; Tübingen, 1992; pp. 315–345); K. Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 42; Berlin, New York, 1971); P. Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif. L'Épître de Barnabé I–XVI et ses sources* (Études Bibliques 47; Paris, 1961); the commentaries by H. Windisch, *Die apostolischen Väter III. Der Barnabasbrief* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Ergänzungsband; Tübingen, 1920); P. Prigent and R.A. Kraft (eds., transls.), *Épitre de Barnabé* (SC 172; Paris, 1971); K. Wengst (ed.), *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übertragen und erläutert* (Schriften des Urchristentums 2; Darmstadt, 1984); and now also F.R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief. Übersetzt und erklärt* (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 8; Göttingen, 1999), pp. 285–317. Prostmeier's impressive commentary is excellent for the Greek passages, but suffers from unfortunate errors on Hebrew matters and on Jewish sources (e.g. p. 308 and note 37).

[10] Bultmann, "Mythos und Mythologie IV (im NT)," here p. 1279.

[11] Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, dates *Barnabas* to early in Nerva's time (pp. 27–28), preferring Alexandria without ruling out other places in Syria/Palestine and Asia Minor (pp. 36–42). Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant*, pp. 70–190, gives a broader range of time and does not specify any place. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, pp. 111–119, prefers Alexandria in the years 130–131 CE. On the setting of *Barnabas*, see also Horbury, "Jewish-Christian Relations in *Barnabas* and Justin Martyr." Some misunderstandings and distortions preclude the conclusion that the author of *Barnabas* was himself a halakhic expert, i.e. a rabbi, a priest or the Levite *Barnabas*. Prigent and Hvalvik suppose he was a Gentile writing for Gentiles.

Christian (Jewish) attempts to develop a narrative of Jesus' death with the help of exegesis.

> One can assume that the only historical information about Jesus' suffering, crucifixion, and death was that he was condemned to death by Pilate and crucified. The details and individual scenes of the narrative do not rest on historical memory, but were developed on the basis of an allegorical interpretation of Scripture. The earliest stage and, at the same time, the best example of such scriptural interpretation is preserved in the *Epistle of Barnabas*.[12]

Koester is countered by such scholars as Douglas Moo, Joël Green and Raymond Brown, who argue that the impact of exegetical-liturgical creativity on the invention of "facts" in the earliest Passion narratives was minimal.[13]

The interpretation of Yom Kippur in *Barnabas* 7 appears in the first part (chapters 2–16), which starts by elaborating the futility of the Jewish cult of sacrifice and fasting (chapters 2–3) and continues with a number of interpretations of the Passion (chapters 5–6). The suffering of the messiah is also the topic of chapters 7 and 8, which give a typological interpretation of the goats of Yom Kippur and the Red Heifer. Yet while the common topic connects chapters 5–8, the perspective and method of exegesis change as between chapters 1–6 and 7–8. In chapters 1–6, *Barnabas* has used *various* Old Testament prooftexts to expound on a single theme. In chapters 7 and 8, he uses *a single* prototype from the Jewish temple on which to base a broad Christological exegesis. In chapters 1–6, *Barnabas* argues from the *books of the Bible*; in chapters 7 and 8, he draws on *rituals* as text-like, interpretable units, à la Clifford Geertz. This is highly remarkable, since the use of post- or un-biblical Jewish tradition endows the Jewish cultic and literal interpretation of the Bible with prophetic qualities, and this stands in direct opposition to *Barnabas*' anti-Jewish hermeneutics, which repudiate attaching *any* soteriological significance to Israel.[14] On

[12] Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 224.

[13] D.J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield, 1983); J.B. Green, "The Gospel of Peter: Source for a pre-canonical Passion Narrative?," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 78 (1987) 293–301; idem, *The Death of Jesus. Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, second series 33; Tübingen, 1988); R.E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah. From Gethsemane to the Grave* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York, 1994).

[14] On the hermeneutics of *Barnabas*, see Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant*, pp. 103–131; Horbury, "Jewish-Christian Relations in *Barnabas* and Justin Martyr"; and Prigent and Kraft, *Épitre de Barnabé*, pp. 30–33. Contrary to Paul or Hebrews, for *Barnabas* the people of Israel lost their covenant already with the golden calf at Mount Sinai. *Barnabas* maintains that the authority of the Bible is timeless and

this basis, the primary investigators of *Barnabas*' traditions, Pierre Prigent, Robert Kraft, and, more recently, James Carleton Paget, concluded that *Barnabas* implemented an already existing typology.[15] I call this pre-Barnabian typology the "proto-typology" to distinguish it from the extant typology in *Barnabas*. Use of this proto-typology is attested in Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Hippolytus and perhaps some later exegetes, a point that will be investigated below.

1.1.1 The First Picture (*Barnabas* 7:3–5)

Barnabas 7 contains two distinct pictures, with minor digressions, which are constructed as question and answer like a catechesis:[16] Why did X happen? – In order to prophecy Y. The first picture starts with a goat, which is sacrificed on Yom Kippur for all the sins (7:4a). While the people mourn and fast, the priests alone eat this goat, "unwashed with vinegar." This goat, most probably the third goat sacrificed for the sins, had to be eaten by the priests.[17] The preparation with vinegar, however, is not mentioned elsewhere.[18]

unchanging, a literal interpretation of the commandments regarding the tabernacle and the sacrificial cult has *never* been correct. The construction of the temple and the maintenance of its sacrificial cult were a misinterpretation. The only function of the Old Testament is to prophesy the advent of the messiah. The typologies of *Barnabas* differ therefore from the usual concept of typology, in that the question of the historicity of the prototype is completely irrelevant. Even if the prototype may in some instances be considered historically, its *only* significance lies in its prophetic dimension.

[15] Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif*, pp. 99–110; R.A. Kraft, "The Epistle of *Barnabas*: Its Quotations and Their Sources," (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1961) (*non vidi*); Prigent and Kraft, *Épitre de Barnabé* on this verse; and Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, pp. 138–140. See also O. Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 56; Leiden, 1987), 307–313. Countering their approach, Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes*, suggests a school tradition, but he neglects the disparity of attitudes among the various traditions. James Carleton Paget combines both theses, elaborating the *creative* theology of the compiler *Barnabas*.

[16] On *Barnabas* 7, see Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, pp. 134–140; Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif*, pp. 99–110; Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes*, pp. 29–32; Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke*, pp. 115–233; and the commentaries, e.g. Prostmeier. However, the important article by Alon, "The Halakhah in the Epistle of *Barnabas*," appears in Prostmeier's bibliography, but not in his exposition of *Barnabas* 7. Also, Prostmeier notes similarities to the *Gospel of Peter*, but he does not refer to the important implications of Crossan's thesis.

[17] Num 29:11; *mMenah* 11:7 and Philo, *De specialibus legibus* 1:190 (*lectio difficilior*), see p. 32 note 77, above.

[18] Cf. the suggestions by Windisch and by Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif*, p. 102, referring to the paschal lamb.

> 3a But moreover when he was crucified he was given to drink vinegar and gall (ὄξει καὶ χολῇ). 3b Listen how the priests of the temple foretold this. Despite[19] the fact that a commandment was written that "whosoever does not keep the fast shall die the death," [cf. Lev 23:29] 3c the Lord commanded this (i.e. to eat), because he himself was going to offer the vessel of the spirit as a sacrifice for our sins, 3d in order that the type established in Isaac, who was offered upon the altar, might be fulfilled. 4a What then does he say in the Prophet? "*And let them eat of the goat which is offered in the fast for all their sins.*" 4b Attend carefully,– "*and let all the priests alone eat the entrails unwashed with vinegar* (ἄπλυτον μετὰ ὄξους)." 5a Why? Because you are going to give to me gall and vinegar to drink when I am on the point of offering my flesh for my new people, therefore you alone shall eat, while the people fast and mourn in sackcloth and ashes. 5b To show that he must suffer by them.[20]

The following table demonstrates the corresponding elements of the typology:

Cultic prototype	*Christian Myth*
3b Whosoever does not keep the fast shall *die the death*,	Death of Jesus
4 And let them eat of the goat which is offered in the fast for all their sins. ... And let all the priests alone eat the *entrails unwashed with vinegar*.	Jesus drinks *vinegar and gall*[21]
4 And let them eat of the *goat which is offered in the fast for all their sins.* ...And let all the priests alone eat the entrails unwashed with vinegar.	Jesus' death as *vicarious atonement*
4 And let them *eat of the goat* which is offered in the fast for all their sins.... And let all the priests alone eat the entrails unwashed with vinegar.	*Eating of Jesus' flesh*, most probably the Eucharist[22] and/or not fasting on Yom Kippur
4 And let them eat of the goat which is	Eating *only by the new (priestly)*

[19] The adversative meaning of the *Genitivus Absolutus* was rightly remarked by Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet*; and Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief*, in their commentaries on this verse.

[20] Slightly adapted transl. of Kirsopp Lake in LCL; I made use of the Greek in Prigent and Kraft, *Épitre de Barnabé*.

[21] This typology agrees with its prototype only under the condition that the unwashed status of the entrails implies that they still contain the gall: see L. Helm, *Studien zur typologischen Schriftauslegung im zweiten Jahrhundert. Barnabas und Justin* (Heidelberg, 1971), p. 12 (*non vidi*), quoted in Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet*, p. 199, note 118. The same strong allusion to Ps 69 (68):22 is contained only in the *Gospel of Peter* 5:16.

[22] This conclusion is drawn also by Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, p. 136, and Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif*, pp. 109–110. See the interpretation of Tertullian, below, pp. 156–158.

offered in the fast for all their sins. ...And let all the *priests alone eat* the entrails unwashed with vinegar.	*people,* i.e. the Christians
5a Fasting and mourning by the people	Fasting by the old people, i.e. Jews[23]

The eating of the flesh of the goat by the priests – i.e. probably the Eucharist – has a twofold function here. On the one hand, it commemorates the atoning effect of Jesus death as a sin offering, thus fulfilling the function of Yom Kippur. On the other hand, it distinguishes the identity of *Barnabas*' priestly community, which eats the Eucharist, from that of the fasting people (Jews), which does not. This picture would be impossible if *Barnabas*' community (still) observed the fast of Yom Kippur. We can, therefore, understand this passage as a polemic against Jews or Christian Jews observing Yom Kippur. This impression is confirmed by the name *Barnabas* uses for Yom Kippur, "the *fast*" and not "the Day of Atonement," as would be appropriate for a typology of the *temple* ritual).

The reference to the Aqedah (7:3d) looks like an interpolation into an earlier tradition.[24] Nevertheless, it is important, being one of the few early links between Yom Kippur and the Aqedah.[25]

1.1.2 The Second Picture (*Barnabas* 7:6–11)

The second picture (7:6–11) identifies Jesus with the scapegoat and with the sin-offering goat which is mixed up with the sacrificial goat. The comparison is one-sided, since the typology of the scapegoat is of much greater import.

> 6a Notice what was commanded: "Take two goats, beautiful and similar, and offer them, and let the priest take the one as a burnt offering for sins." 6b(7) But what are they to do with the other? "The other," he says, "is accursed (ἐπικατάρατος)." 7 Notice how the type of Jesus is manifested: 8a "And do ye all spit (ἐμπτύσατε) on it, and pierce (κατακεντήσατε) it, and bind the scarlet wool (τὸ ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον) about is head, and so let it be cast into the desert. 8b And when it is so done, he who takes the goat into the wilderness, drives it forth, and takes away the wool,

[23] *Gospel of Peter* 7:25–27; Luke 23:48.

[24] It interrupts the flow of the text, and the question in 7:4a continues the atoning death theme of 7:3c. The Aqedah could be dropped without causing a break. The text would then be: "The Lord commanded this because he himself was going to offer the vessel of the spirit as a sacrifice for our sins. 4a What then does he say in the Prophet? 'And let them eat of the goat which is offered in the fast for all their sins.'" Also, the Aqedah does not appear in the other witnesses to the *pre*-Barnabian tradition. However, it may have been the author of *Barnabas* who inserted it into his tradition, and not a later interpolator. Even if Tertullian is dependent on *Barnabas*, he had good reason to skip this line, which disturbs the flow.

[25] See p. 129, above, especially note 272.

> and puts it upon a shrub which is called Rachel,[26] of which we are accustomed to eat the shoots when we find them in the countryside: thus only the fruits of Rachel are sweet."9a What does this mean? Notice, "that the first (goat) is for the altar, but the other is accursed, and that the one that is accursed is crowned." 9b Because then they will see him on that day with the scarlet (high-priestly) robe (ποδήρη) on his body, and they will say, "Is not this he whom we once crucified and rejected (ἐξουθενήσαντες) and pierced and spat upon? Truly, it was he who then said that he himself was the Son of God." 10a But how is he like (to the goat)? For this reason: "the goats shall be similar, beautiful, and equal (ὁμοίους τοὺς τράγους καὶ καλούς, ἴσους)," in order that when they see him come at that time they may be astonished at the similarity of the goat. 10b See then the type of Jesus destined to suffer. 11a But why is it that they put the wool in the middle of the thorns (ἀκανθῶν)? It is a type of Jesus placed in the Church, because whoever wishes to take away the scarlet wool must suffer much because the thorns are terrible and he can gain it only through pain. 11b Thus he says, "those who will see me, and attain to my kingdom must lay hold of me through pain and suffering."[27]

The typology is again best grasped in a table:

Cultic prototype	*Christian Myth*
6a Take two goats, beautiful and similar, and offer them, and *let the priest take the one as a burnt offering for sins.*	{9a the first (goat) is for the altar} (refers back to the previous typology of the sin-offering goat and vicarious atonement)
6b The other is *accursed* (ἐπικατάρατος) 8a And do ye all *spit (ἐμπτύσατε) on it,* and *goad it (κατακεντήσατε),* and bind the scarlet *wool* about its head, and so let it be cast into the desert.	9b Is not this he whom we once *crucified* (ἐσταυρώσαμεν) and rejected (ἐξουθενήσαντες) and *pierced* (*κατακεντήσαντες*) and *spat upon* (*ἐμπτύσαντες*)?
9a But the other is accursed, and the one that is accursed is crowned...	9b Because then they will see him on that day with the long scarlet (priestly) robe on his body...
6a Take two goats, beautiful and similar, and offer them, ... 10a The goats shall be similar, beautiful, and equal.	10a in order that when they see him come at that time they may be astonished at the similarity of the goat.
8b And when it is so done, he who takes the goat into the wilderness, drives it forth, and takes away the wool, and puts it upon a shrub which is called Rachel, of which we are accustomed to eat the shoots when we find them in the country: thus of Rachel alone is the fruit sweet.	11a It is a type of Jesus placed in the Church, because whoever wishes to take away the scarlet wool must suffer much because the thorns are terrible and he can gain it only through pain. 11b Thus he says, "Those who will see me, and attain to my kingdom must lay hold of me through pain and suffering."

[26] There are many variant readings for this word.

[27] Slightly altered translation by Lake in LCL, based on SC.

Barnabas compares Jesus' way of suffering to that of the scapegoat. The goat is accursed (ἐπικατάρατος), which reflects Jesus being cursed by dying on the cross.[28] Both suffer the same torments – spitting and piercing.[29] The scarlet wool placed on the scapegoat's head represents the high-priestly scarlet robe of Christ at his Second Parousia.

The role of the sacrificial goat is marginal. Its sole significance lies in its similarity to the scapegoat, through which it will be recognized at the Second Parousia as identical to the one sacrificed. Here the author seems to have mixed two recognition motifs: by the scarlet robe and by similarity.[30]

The end of the chapter is an ecclesiological typology of the scarlet wool placed in the thorny shrub, which refers to the suffering and martyrdom of those who choose to follow Jesus. The scarlet wool therefore connects Yom Kippur, the atoning death of Jesus, martyrdom and the future kingdom.

As can be seen from the table, some of the details of the cultic prototype mentioned in the typology are not connected explicitly to a specific element of the Passion narrative. On the one hand, the presence of uninterpreted cultic elements – such as the fact that the goats have to be καλοί – demonstrates that *Barnabas* did not invent his cultic knowledge in order to match his interpretation. In some instances, such uninterpreted cultic elements may mean that their interpretation was assumed to be self-evident to educated readers and they were therefore "included implicitly." The more obvious an association, the slighter the allusion can be. For example, the curse of the goat is uninterpreted, but the crucifixion of Christ also does not have a prototype. Both are "loose ends," most probably presuming that the readers knew the connection between curse and cross and the interpretation of Deuteronomy 21:23 and 27:26. Another example is the casting of the scapegoat into the desert, which could easily have been interpreted by Jesus' suffering on Golgotha, outside of the city, as in Hebrews and Hippolytus, an interpretation not mentioned by *Barnabas*. Moreover, *Barnabas* does not exploit the death of the scapegoat, although this would have stressed the proximity to Jesus. Perhaps the way the

[28] Cf. Deut 21:23 and 27:26; and Gal 3:10.13. *Barnabas* most probably did not know Galatians: see note 93, p. 164, below.

[29] This is reflected in the parallel use ἐμπτύσατε / ἐμπτύσαντες and κατακεντήσατε / κατακεντήσαντες for Jesus and the scapegoat.

[30] Prigent has suggested that *Barnabas* mixes two typologies, one of which can be found in Justin (Passion plus Parousia) and the other in Tertullian (Passion plus Eucharist). Tertullian also mentions both typologies, but his depiction is clearer.

scapegoat met its death – by being hurled over a precipice – was too dissimilar from Jesus' form of death on the cross. Nevertheless, pagan and Jewish readers knew that the scapegoat/*pharmakos* had to die, as Jesus did. But, probably for the same reason that his readers presumed this anyhow, *Barnabas* does not choose to explicitly connect such notions as vicarious atonement to the picture of Yom Kippur.

1.1.3 The Interpretation of the Proto-Typology in Justin, Tertullian and Hippolytus

The following analysis heads simultaneously in two directions on the time scale: chronologically forward to the interpretations of *Barnabas*' tradition in the second century, and chronologically backward to the proto-typology, *Barnabas*' source. History of impact and history of tradition will then complement each other.

• • • • •

JUSTIN: Justin refers to the typology in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, a work written around 160.[31] In the context of chapter 40, Trypho asks Justin for proofs that Jesus was the Messiah, who had to suffer and is expected to return gloriously (39). Justin answers with a typological exegesis of the Passover sacrifice (40) and the goats of Yom Kippur (40) and continues with typologies on the shewbread as Eucharist (41) and the twelve bells on the high-priestly vestment as apostles (42).

> 40:4 And the two goats of the fast were ordered to be similar. One of them was the scapegoat (ἀποπομπαῖος), the other was to be an offering. They were prophecies for the two appearances (παρουσιῶν) of Christ. For the first appearance, at which the elders of your [Jewish] people and the priests sent him away as a scapegoat, laid hands on him and killed him; and for his second appearance, since you will recognize at this very place of Jerusalem him who was dishonored by you and [made] an offering for all those sinners who want to repent and fast what Isaiah calls a fast and tear asunder *the strangling of enforced contracts* [Isaiah 58:6], and observe the other things that are similar to those that have been reckoned by him, which also I myself inquired about, [and] those things that the believers in Jesus do. 5 And know that even the offering of the two goats, which had to be offered on the fast, similarly took place nowhere except in Jerusalem![32]

Justin's Yom Kippur typology is clearly more concise than that in *Barnabas*, better organized and less ambiguous. The reference to the two appearances of Christ is unmistakable, and the typology gives equal attention

[31] On Justin and Judaism, see Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy*.

[32] My translation of *Dialogue with Trypho* 40:4–5; Greek text in M. Marcovich (ed.), *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone* (Patristische Texte und Studien 47; Berlin, New York, 1997). Justin refers back to this typology in *Dialogue with Trypho* 46:2 and 111:1. *Dialogue with Trypho* 15 includes a long passage from Isa 58 on the fast.

to both goats. The scapegoat refers only to the Passion, the sacrificial goat to the Second Parousia. Some motifs from *Barnabas* are missing, e.g. the eating of the goat and the scarlet wool. Apparently, Justin's text is not a reworking of *Barnabas* but depends directly on the proto-typology. This is shown, for example, by the reference to the death of the scapegoat, a fact Justin could not have learnt from the Bible or from *Barnabas*, but only from Jewish tradition.[33] Justin explicitly interprets the theological implications of the sacrificial goat typology of Christ as vicarious atonement for all sinners. This is somewhat strange considering the association of the scapegoat, not the sacrificial goat, with the Passion. The reference to Jerusalem as merely a sacrificial place is a favorite idea of Justin's and was therefore most probably inserted by him.[34] Furthermore, Justin refers to Isaiah 58 in the context of Yom Kippur and is the earliest text to do so. Was Isaiah 58:6 already part of the Jewish Haftarah, at least in some synagogues?[35] Finally, compared to *Barnabas*, Justin inverts the role of the priests and the fasting. The priests are the evil faction,[36] whereas the people who fast are counted among the repenting believers. Yet Justin underscores that these believers fast a real fast – i.e. one of the kind Isaiah described and not one according to the common Jewish practice – a fact suggesting that this reference is not only a typology of past rituals but also a jibe at the observance of Yom Kippur's fast by Justin's Jewish and Jewish-Christian neighbors.

.....

TERTULLIAN: In *Against Marcion*, the Yom Kippur tradition (3:7:7–8) is part of a long complex of Christological typologies of the Old Testament.[37] The same passage also appears, almost word for word, in *Against the Jews* 14:9–10. Both works were written in the first decades of the third century, and most scholars agree that the two are mutually dependent; but they disagreee as to which of the two deserves priority.[38] For our purposes, this dispute is less relevant.

In both books Tertullian's aim is to prove that Jesus is the Messiah of the Old Testament. While Marcion argues that Jesus could not be the Messiah of the Old Testament because the Jews, the experts in understanding the Old Testament, *still expect* the glorious coming of a Messiah, Tertullian claims that the Messiah came and died in a humble way, but that he will come *again*, gloriously.

> If I may, moreover, give an interpretation of the two goats, which were offered on the fast, do they not also prefigure the two modes of Christ? They were alike (*pares*), and very similar (*consimiles*) to the appearance of the Lord, since he will not come in any other form, having to be recognized by those by whom he had been wounded (*laesus est*).
>
> One of these [goats], however, was bound with scarlet (*circumdatus coccino*), cursed (*maledictus*), spat upon (*consputatus*), pulled around (*conuulsus*), and pierced (*compunctus*), and driven by the people out of the city into perdition (*perditionem*), being thus marked with the visible signs of the Lord's passion.[39] Yet the other [goat], by being offered up for sins and given to the priests of the temple for food (*pabulum*), signified indications of the second appearance, when – after all sins have been expiated – the priests of the spiritual temple, i.e. the church – feast as a sort of flesh offering (*quasi uisceratione*) of the Lord's grace, while the others fast from[40] salvation.[41]

The identity of a humble and then glorious Messiah is proven for Tertullian by the similarity of the two goats. The maltreated, expelled scapegoat represents the Passion of Jesus; the sacrificial goat, eaten by the priests, symbolizes simultaneously the eschatological meal at the Second Parousia as well as its ritual anticipation, the Eucharist.[42] Like *Barnabas*, Tertullian polemicizes against participation in the Jewish fast and enjoins participation in the Christian Eucharist instead. Ritual, here, has the function of defining the borders of the collective.

Tertullian certainly knew Justin's writings and used them. However, scholarship is divided over the question of whether Tertullian was acquainted with *Barnabas* or with the proto-typology. Their typologies are

[33] See all commentators besides Wengst.

[34] Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy*, p. 310.

[35] Cf. Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 15; and see the section on the readings, above, pp. 54–59, especially p. 55–56.

[36] Do the elders in this context reflect an oral tradition similar to Matt 27:20?

[37] Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 3:5–24.

[38] H. Tränkle (ed.), *Edition de QSF Tertulliani Aduersus Iudaeos* (Wiesbaden, 1964), pp. xlix–liii, favors the priority of *Against the Jews*, dating it before 207/8.

[39] The parallel tradition in *Against the Jews* 14:9 adds: "qui coccinea circumdatus ueste et consputatus et omnibus contumeliis adflictus extra ciuitatem crucifixus est."

[40] An important manuscript of the parallel tradition in *Against the Jews* 14:9 reads "ad salutem" ("for salvation") instead of "a salute," as given in *Against Marcion*. The latter matches the context better, the former may have entered the text through a scribe in Tertullian's rigoristic tradition.

[41] My translation of the text from R. Braun (ed.), *Tertullien Contre Marcion. Tome III (Livre III)* (SC 399; Paris, 1994). On this passage, and its relation to *Barnabas* and Justin, see the notes in the text editions and the discussions in Windisch, *Die apostolischen Väter III. Der Barnabasbrief*, pp. 346–347; Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif*, pp. 107–108; and Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, pp. 138–140; A. Louf, "Caper emissarius ut typus Redemptoris apud Patres," *Verbum Domini* 38 (1960) 262–277, here pp. 265–270, and Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke*, pp. 131–133.

[42] See V.A. Gramaglia, "Visceratio: semantica eucaristica in Tertulliano?," in: F. Vattioni (ed.), *Sangue e antropologica nella teologia. Atti della VI settimana, Roma 23–28 nov. 1987* (Rome, 1989; vol. 3, pp. 1385–1417), p. 1416, who investigated the collective, sacrificial and eschatological connotations of this pagan technical term.

very similar and the relevant differences are few in number.[43] Tränkle assumes that Tertullian knew *Barnabas*. Against this, Prigent and (more hesitantly) Carleton Paget argue that Tertullian is based on the proto-typology and on Justin.[44] We cannot exclude a third possibility that Tertullian knew all three the proto-typology, Justin and *Barnabas*.

.....

HIPPOLYTUS: Hippolytus of Rome (d. 235) was one of the most prolific Christian authors of his time. A fragment in the Catenae on Proverbs contains his interpretation of Proverbs 30:31b (LXX), which views "the goat leading the flock" simultaneously as sacrificial goat and as scapegoat, and both as types of Christ:[45]

> *And a goat as leader of the flock*
> Since, it says, this is
> who was slaughtered for the sins of the world
> and offered as a sacrifice
> and sent away to the Gentiles as in the desert
> and crowned with scarlet wool on the head by the unbelievers
> and made to be a ransom for the humans
> and manifested as life for all.[46]

The mention of the "scarlet wool" (κόκκινον ἔριον) makes very plausible that it is a variety of the Yom Kippur typology known to *Barnabas*, Justin and Tertullian; however, the poetic form and the brevity of the fragment render an exact comparison difficult. Two elements of the interpretation

[43] Tertullian has two further details: (a) *conuulsus* (torn/pulled); and (b) the mention of *perditio* as the destination of the scapegoat. Tertullian lacks two other elements: (a) an *interpretation* of the scarlet ribbon (the ribbon itself is included); and (b) details of the Eucharist (unwashed entrails with vinegar). Finally, Tertullian inverts the order of presentation (first Passion/scapegoat, then Parousia/Eucharist/sacrificial goat).

[44] Tränkle, *Edition de QSF Tertulliani Aduersus Iudaeos*, pp. lxxvi–lxxxii; Prigent, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif*, p. 108; and Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, pp. 139–140.

[45] Hippolytus, fragment 75. The first to connect this passage to the Yom Kippur typology was A. Zani, "Tracce di un'interessante, ma sconosciuta, esegesi midrašica giudeo-cristiana di Lev 16 in un frammento di ippolito," *Bibbia e Oriente* 24 (1982) 157–66, whose perceptive article escaped the meticulous bibliographical researches of Carleton Paget and Hvalvik.

[46] My translation of *Καὶ τράγος ἡγούμενος αἰπολίου.* Οὗτος γάρ, φησίν, ἐστὶν ὁ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας κόσμου σφαγεὶς καὶ ὡς θῦμα προσαχθεὶς καὶ ὡς ἐρήμῳ εἰς ἔθνη πεμφθεὶς καὶ κόκκινον ἔριον ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων στεφανωθεὶς καὶ ἀνθρώπων λύτρον γεννηθεὶς καὶ τοῖς πάντων δειχθείς. Text in M. Richard, "Les fragments du commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur les Proverbes de Salomon," *Le Muséon* 79 (1966) 65–94, here p. 94. Cf. also the shorter version preserved in Pseudo-Anastasius: Τράγος ἡγούμενος αἰπολίου ὁ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τοῦ κοσμοῦ σ φαγιασθείς (quoted ibidem). The same tradition is also printed under the name of Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in Prouerbia* (PG 64:737C–D).

are not found in *Barnabas*, Justin or Tertullian and may from the pen of Hippolytus himself: (a) the explanation of the scapegoat as *ransom* for humankind; and (b) the sending away as the mission to the Gentiles.[47] As in Hebrews 13:11–13 the "sending away" is based on an inversion of the conception that abandoning the camp entails ritual pollution. In the new epoch of salvation history, salvation is no longer inside the camp but in the previously impure desert among the previously impure Gentiles.

.....

THE PROTO-TYPOLOGY AND ITS INTERPRETATION OF YOM KIPPUR: After this brief survey of the history of the proto-typology's impact, I want to return to its pre-history. A reconstruction of the extent and content of the Christian Jewish proto-typology brings us back to an earlier period, before the composition of *Barnabas*. *Barnabas* refers to a source that its author calls "the prophet." Another reference to a source may be entailed in the expression "the priests of the temple foretold this."[48]

It is relatively easy to reconstruct the elements of the (Jewish) halakhic regulations for the ritual, which were part also of the Christian Jewish proto-typology. Since acquaintance with halakhic traditions is more likely for the Christian Jewish proto-typology than for later generations, those elements that go beyond Leviticus 16 and exist in later Halakhah are most probably ancient.[49] If this supposition holds, then the following elements form parts of the proto-typology:

a) the similarity between the goats[50]
b) their beautiful appearance[51]
c) the mistreatment of the scapegoat[52]
d) the cursing of the scapegoat[53]
e) the killing of the scapegoat[54]
f) the red woolen ribbon placed on the scapegoat's head[55]

[47] The former comes from Mark 10:45. The idea of Christ the scapegoat being sent on a mission to the Gentiles appears in Origen, *Homily on Leviticus* 9:3:2 (SC 287:80–82); cf. also the positive interpretation of the desert in *Homily on Leviticus* 9:4:1 (SC 287:84).

[48] *Barnabas* 7:4a and 7:3b; but 7:3b is a much more ambiguous phrase and could refer to the content of the sentence rather than its speakers.

[49] See especially Alon, "The Halakhah in the Epistle of *Barnabas*," pp. 302–305.

[50] *Barnabas* 7:6a.10a; Justin, Tertullian; *mYoma* 6:1.

[51] *Barnabas* 7:6a; *yYoma* 6:1, 43bc.

[52] *Barnabas* 7:8a (spitting and piercing); Tertullian (spitting, piercing, pulling around); *mYoma* 6:6 (pulling hair). Zech 12:10; Isa 50:6 and *Gospel of Peter* 5:16.

[53] *Barnabas* 7:6b(7).9a; Gal 3:10.13; *mYoma* 6:4.

[54] Justin; *mYoma* 6:6; cf. Tertullian (driven into perdition).

[55] *Barnabas* 7:8a; Tertullian; Hippolytus; *mYoma* 4:2.

g) before pushing the scapegoat over the precipice, the ribbon is put on something else[56]

h) the eating of the sin-offering goat, probably in a special manner[57]

In addition, elements in one or two traditions, which appear in the biblical descriptions, are probably part of the proto-typology:

i) the offering of the sacrificial goat[58]

j) the sending out of the scapegoat[59]

k) the fasting of the people[60]

Perhaps the motif of the people's mourning, which is missing in the Bible, but appears in some early Jewish traditions, was also part of the proto-typology.[61]

In addition, a reference to Zechariah 3 seems to have been part of the proto-typology.[62] *Barnabas* mentions the high priest's ποδήρης appearing in Zechariah 3.[63] Tertullian interprets Zechariah 3 extensively in direct juxtaposition to the Yom Kippur passage. Justin knows it as well.[64] An association of Zechariah 3 and Yom Kippur also exists in Jewish (non-Christian) sources.[65] As we shall see, this point is extremely important to understand the earliest stage of the high-priestly Christology.[66]

It is more difficult to determine the *interpretations* that the Christian Jewish proto-typology connected to the halakhic regulations of Yom Kippur, since the interpretations of *Barnabas* and Justin are very different, and since Tertullian might be acquainted with Justin and perhaps *Barnabas* and therefore not be an independent witness. However, we can be sure that the link between the abused scapegoat and the Passion was part of the proto-typology. The motif of the similarity between the goats was definitely connected to the Second Parousia, yet it is unclear which goat.[67] The tie

[56] *Barnabas* 7:8b.11a; *mYoma* 6:6.

[57] *Barnabas* 7:4b; Tertullian; Num 29:11; *mMenah* 11:7; *De specialibus legibus* 1:190 (*lectio difficilior*).

[58] Lev 16:15; Justin, Tertullian.

[59] Lev 16:10.20–22; *mYoma* 6; *Barnabas* 8a; Justin, Tertullian.

[60] Lev 16:29–34; 23:27–32; *Barnabas* 7:5a; Justin; Tertullian.

[61] *Barnabas* 7:5a; Justin (repenting, fasting, Isa 58:6); on the mourning, see *Jubilees* 34; Jonah; and see above, p. 34, note 98.

[62] Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy*, p. 309.

[63] *Barnabas* 7:9.

[64] Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 3:7:8; Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 116–117.

[65] See pp. 92–94, above.

[66] See pp. 194–197, below.

[67] *Barnabas* seems to link the scapegoat and the red ribbon not only with the Passion but also with the Second Parousia; Justin clearly refers to the sacrificial goat, while Tertullian may be interpreted as referring to the third, sin-offering goat, which was eaten (and which according to Halakhah did not have to be similar to the other two).

between the intriguing consumption of another (specially prepared) goat and the Eucharist, mentioned by *Barnabas* and Tertullian, may belong to the original strand, especially if Tertullian is independent of *Barnabas*. Because the proto-typology shows an intimate knowledge of the details of the scapegoat ritual, it is possible that his source used an eyewitness account[68] or even an early sort of *Seder Avodah*.[69]

Excursus: Did the Scapegoat Rite Influence the Earliest Account of the Passion? John D. Crossan's Thesis

In his ingenious and highly controversial "The Cross Spoke" (1988), John Dominic Crossan implies that the scapegoat ritual influenced the canonical Passion narratives, via what he calls the "Cross Gospel," the earliest Passion account, which he has reconstructed, a redacted version of which is contained in the *Gospel of Peter*.[70] According to Crossan's theory, the formation of this Cross Gospel proceeded in four stages.[71] The starting point (stage 1) is that the community does not know details beyond the general understanding that people are scourged and tortured before being crucified. This understanding is confirmed and further enhanced by such prophetic texts as Isaiah 50:6 and Zechariah 12:10, which add some details (e.g. striking, spitting, and piercing) to the description of the

[68] Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Tradition," p. 165.

[69] This idea was suggested to me by Timothy Thornton at the 13th Oxford Patristic Conference 1999. I hesitated for a long time before adopting the suggestion, but it is difficult to account otherwise for the wealth of precise halakhic regulations in *Barnabas*. Similarly, Philo betrays an intriguing acquaintance with the halakhic rules of Yom Kippur. In general, the need to occupy the fasting people with prayers makes some type of liturgical reenactment probable. Kister's recent article "5Q13 and the *'Avodah*," points in the same direction. See the discussion above, p. 44–45. The possibility of an eyewitness for the rite of removing the red ribbon from the scapegoat and binding it to something else is less likely.

[70] For introductory questions to this work, see the introduction to the edition of M.G. Mara, *Évangile de Pierre* (SC 201; Paris, 1973); the appendix in Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, pp. 1317–1349, whose bibliography includes older works; and cf. Crossan, *Four Other Gospels*, pp. 124–181. The *terminus ad quem* of the *Gospel of Peter* is the time of Serapion of Antioch around 200 CE. A date around 100–150 is *opinio communis*: see Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, pp. 1341–43; J.D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus. The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco, 1991), pp. 433–434. Some scholars date it even earlier, to the first century: see Koester, "Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels." For the place, Antioch is favored by Brown, while Mara, *Évangile de Pierre*, prefers Asia Minor. The papyri usually come from Egypt.

[71] Crossan follows earlier suggestions of Martin Dibelius, Jürgen Denker and Helmut Koester. See M. Dibelius, "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der Leidensgeschichte des Petrus- und Johannesevangeliums," *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 33 (1918) 125–150; J. Denker, *Die theologiegeschichtliche Stellung des Petrusevangeliums* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, 23. Reihe, 36; Bern, Frankfurt am Main, 1975); Koester, "Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels," pp. 126–130.

ortures (stage 2).[72] In the third stage, the rite of the two Yom Kippur goats joins the pro-
phetic sources with further details and adds a primary narrative sequence. This stage is
he first to be preserved in an extant text of *Barnabas*.[73] In the fourth stage, a fully-
ledged narrative is formed and the scene of the mocked king with the motifs of wearing
robe and being crowning are included. However, the explicit allusions to Jesus as
capegoat are dropped. This stage is reflected in the Cross Gospel,[74] which was used by
he pre-Markan Passion Narrative. Both were used by the other canonical Gospels
stage 5). Crossan's claim that *all* canonical and extra-canonical Passion narratives are
ltimately dependent on an exegetical reworking of Yom Kippur's ritual is probably the
ost far-reaching thesis proffered to date regarding the influence of Yom Kippur on
arly Christianity.

Crossan's theory has sparked mainly critical responses.[75] His critics concentrate on
efuting the priority accorded to the Cross Gospel over the canonical Passion narratives,
e. the transition from the fourth to a fifth stage. Their argumentation is based on the
ontention that the similarities between the *Gospel of Peter* and Mark (only these two)
re too few to suppose that they share a direct literary dependency (in either direction).[76]
he vocabulary and word order of no canonical gospel follows the *Gospel of Peter* for
ore than two or three words.[77] Furthermore, Mark, Matthew and John preserved the
rimitive traditions" of *Barnabas*, which are not part of Crossan's Cross Gospel.[78] On
e other hand, many details of the *Gospel of Peter* that would suit the narratives of the

[72] This stage continued into the time of the formation of the Canonical Gospels. For an
alysis of some selected passages, see already Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel*
assion Narratives, esp. pp. 139–144, who objects to Koester's and Crossan's approach.

[73] Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke*, pp. 114–159.208–217.

[74] Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke*, pp. 122 and 157, and see the tables on p. 143 and
158. A short version of his theory, albeit without reflection on *Barnabas*, can be found
Crossan's article, "The Cross That Spoke."

[75] See the discussion of Crossan's theory in Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*,
. 1317–1348, especially 1332–38. Cf. A. Kirk, "Examining Priorities: Another Look at
e *Gospel of Peter's* Relationship to the New Testament Gospels," *New Testament*
udies 40 (1994) 572–595; G.W. Nickelsburg, "Review of: John Dominic Crossan, The
oss that Spoke. The Origins of the Passion Narrative (San Francisco: Harper and Row,
88)." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 59 (1991) 159–162; R.H. Fuller,
eview of: John Dominic Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke. The Origins of the Passion*
rrative (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988)" *Interpretation* 45 (1991) 71–73; J.C.
eat, "The Two Manuscript Witnesses to the Gospel of Peter," in: D.J. Lull (ed.),
ciety of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers (Atlanta [Ga.], 1990; pp. 391–399);
een, "The *Gospel of Peter*: Source for a *pre*-canonical Passion Narrative?"; and
Neirynck, "Review of: John Dominic Crossan. Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots
Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus (San Francisco, CA:
perCollins, 1995)," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 71 (1995) 455–457. There
far fewer voices in favor of Crossan's theory, most notably Koester, *Ancient*
ristian Gospels, pp. 216–240, but note his critique on pp. 219–220.

[76] Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, pp. 1327–28.

[77] Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, pp. 1332–33.

[78] Nickelsburg, "Review of: John Dominic Crossan, The Cross that Spoke," here
161.

canonical gospels are omitted by all of them.[79] Finally, if Matthew, Luke and John had indeed used the *Gospel of Peter* in addition to Mark, one would have expected some agreement between two of the canonical gospels against Mark (in the style of Q), but there is none.[80]

These arguments undermine Crossan's thesis of an influence of the scapegoat rite on *every* early Passion account. Yet what is the relationship between the Yom Kippur typology in *Barnabas* and the *Gospel of Peter*? Scholars have long recognized a conspicuous proximity between *Barnabas* 5 and 7 and two scenes in the *Gospel of Peter*: the mocking (3:6–9) and the drinking on the cross (5:15–16).[81] The first passage reads:

> 3.6 But having taken the Lord, running (τρέχοντες), they were pushing (ὤθουν) him and saying, "Let us drag along (σύρωμεν) the Son of God now that we have power over him." 7 And they clothed him with purple (πορφύραν) and sat him on a chair of judgment, saying, "Judge justly, King of Israel." 8 And a certain one of them, having brought a thorny crown (στέφανον ἀκάνθινον), put it on the head of the Lord. 9 And others who were standing there were spitting (ἐνέπτυον) in his face, and others slapped (ἐράπισαν) his cheeks. Others were jabbing him with a reed (καλάμῳ ἔνυσσον); and some scourged (ἐμάστιζον) him, saying, "With such honor let us honor the Son of God."[82]

Most of the details of the mocking of Jesus as recounted in the *Gospel of Peter* appear in *Barnabas*.[83] Matthew and John each bring only part of the traditions, which are common to *Barnabas* and the *Gospel of Peter*.[84] Mark and Luke are even more different from *Barnabas* and the *Gospel of Peter*. Therefore, Koester can conclude: "It is evident that the mocking scene in this gospel [the *Gospel of Peter*] is a narrative version that is directly dependent upon the exegetical tradition which is visible in *Barnabas*."[85]

Beyond the clear correspondences, John Dominic Crossan suggests three further connections between motifs in the *Gospel of Peter* and *Barnabas*. The Yom Kippur traditions of *Barnabas* were transformed by the *Gospel of Peter*. First, the scarlet wool of the scapegoat was combined with the priestly cloak (ποδήρης) from Zechariah 3:1–5 and became the purple robe of the mocked king.[86] Second, the scarlet wool on the head of the

[79] Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, p. 1333.

[80] Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, p. 1333.

[81] E.g. Mara, *Évangile de Pierre*, p. 21, note 2.

[82] Slightly changed translation from Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, pp. 1318–19; Greek text in Mara, *Évangile de Pierre*.

[83] a) spitting [ἐμπτύω] *Gospel of Peter* 3:9, *Barnabas* 7:8a; b) piercing [νύσσω] *Gospel of Peter* 3:9, [κατακεντέω] *Barnabas* 7:8a; c) crowning *Gospel of Peter* 3:8, *Barnabas* 7:8; d) clothing in (red) robe *Gospel of Peter* 3:7; *Barnabas* 7:9; e) slapping the cheeks [ῥαπίζω τὰς σιαγόνας] *Gospel of Peter* 3:9; *Barnabas* 5:14; scourging [μαστίζω] *Gospel of Peter* 3:9; *Barnabas* 5:14. See Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 222–227.

[84] Matt and John: crowning with crown of thorns (John: thorny crown), clothing with scarlet cloak/purple robe. Matt: spitting (Matt 27:30). John: piercing, slapping, scourging (John 19:1.3.34.37). But note also the dissimilarities: Matt and not *Gospel of Peter*: giving reed as scepter, hitting with reed, mocking, leading away (Matt 27:28–31).

[85] Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 227.

[86] *Gospel of Peter* 3:7; *Barnabas* 7:9.

scapegoat, which was put *on* the thorns in the bush, became the crown *of* thorns on the head of the mocked king.[87] Finally, Crossan hypothesizes that *the reed* piercing the side of Jesus reflects the instrument in the historical temple ritual with which the scapegoat was pierced.[88] Helmut Koester accepts Crossan's two former points and, more hesitantly, also Crossan's interpretation of the reed, yet he warns that the two manuscripts of the *Gospel of Peter* show great variation[89] and any philological arguments with respect to the text have to be viewed with reservations.[90]

Parallels exist also in the scene of giving gall and vinegar to Jesus on the cross (*Gospel of Peter* 5:15–16):

> 5:15 But it was midday, and darkness held fast all Judea; and they were distressed and anxious lest the sun had set, since he was still living. [For] it is written for them: "Let not the sun set on one put to death." 16 And someone of them said, "Give him to drink gall with vinegar (ποτίσατε αὐτὸν χολὴν μετὰ ὄξους)." And having made a mixture, they gave to drink.[91]

Again, the *Gospel of Peter* and *Barnabas* are more similar to each other than to the canonical gospels. First, Jesus is given gall *and* vinegar, matching Psalm 69 (68):22 only in the *Gospel of Peter* and in *Barnabas*, not in the canonical gospels.[92] Second, Deuteronomy 21:23 is quoted only in Peter's Passion narrative, not in the canonical Passion narratives. *Barnabas* does not quote Deuteronomy 21:23, but he refers to the consequence of the death on the wood – the curse. Galatians 3:10–13 mentions both explicitly, but it is unlikely that either the *Gospel of Peter* or *Barnabas* depended on Galatians. Probably, all three knew independently the tradition of the crucified as cursed scapegoat.[93]

Crossan's own observation that "explicit allusions to Jesus as scapegoat do not remain in the tradition as it proceeds and develops"[94] impedes scrutinizing his argument for evidence of the Yom Kippur traditions. The details of the abuse in the *Gospel of Peter* are based on *prophetic* passages. None of them necessarily depends on the scapegoat

[87] *Gospel of Peter* 3:8; *Barnabas* 7:8.11.

[88] *Barnabas* 7:8 mentions only the act not the instrument. Crossan bases his claim on the *Sibylline Oracles* 1:360–75 and 8:285–309, independent of the canonical Passion narratives, but drawing on the earliest Christian Passion traditions connected to the scapegoat rite. According to Crossan, *Sibylline Oracles* 1:360–75 depends on 8:285–309. Since the former passage was written before 150 CE, the latter has to be earlier than 150 CE: see Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke*, pp. 133–139, especially 135.

[89] Treat, "The Two Manuscript Witnesses to the Gospel of Peter."

[90] Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 224–225.

[91] Slightly changed translation from Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, p. 1319; Greek text in Mara, *Évangile de Pierre*.

[92] *Gospel of Peter* 5:16; *Barnabas* 7:3.5.

[93] J. Carleton Paget, "Paul and the Epistle of *Barnabas*," *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996) 359–381, does not discuss this specific passage but concludes that *Barnabas* had no knowledge of Paul. It is not impossible that the view of crucified saints as cursed scapegoats is *pre*-Christian and was applied to other crucifixions before Jesus. The polemical weight of the argument against proto-Christianity would have been slighter but the existence of a counterargument does not silence the argument.

[94] Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke*, p. 142.

ritual.[95] Crossan's theory concerning the transformation of the three motifs of the scarlet ribbon, the thorns and the reed is too speculative. For example, regarding the association of the scarlet ribbon with the cloak of the soldiers, Matthew is closer to *Barnabas* than to his presumed source, the Cross Gospel, as we shall see in the following section.[96] Crossan suggests that the scapegoat ritual introduced a first narrative sequence into the various prophetic passages. Yet the sequence of those details of the scapegoat rite mentioned in the proto-typology (abuse, leading out of the city, killing) is very similar to those basic facts that could be known historically. As I show in the section that follows, Matthew probably perceived exactly the same proximity of the historical events as given in his source, Mark, to the ritual sequence of the scapegoat rite and decided to formulate the Barabbas episode along the lines of the "lottery"[97] between the goats that constitutes the introduction to the Yom Kippur ritual.

The ritual of Yom Kippur did not influence *every* early Passion account, as Crossan suggested.[98] The Yom Kippur typology of *Barnabas* is one of the branches in the development of the canonical Passion narratives, rather than their root. However, it is a very early branch and it displays a great similarity to the *Gospel of Peter*, yet without entailing a direct interdependence between them. The evidence suggests that the relationship to the canonical gospels and to the *Gospel of Peter* was based on shared oral traditions of prophetic typological exegesis, not on the Yom Kippur typology.

1.2 Barabbas as Scapegoat in Matthew 27:15–23

> 27:15 Now at the festival the governor was accustomed to release a prisoner for the crowd, whom they wanted. 16 At that time they had a notorious prisoner, called Jesus Barabbas. 17 So after they had gathered, Pilate said to them, "Whom do you want me to release for you, Jesus Barabbas or Jesus who is called the Messiah?" 18 For he realized that it was out of jealousy that they had handed him over. 19 While he was sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent word to him, "Have nothing to do with that innocent man, for today I have suffered a great deal because of a dream about him." 20 Now the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds to ask for Barabbas and to have Jesus killed. 21 The governor again said to them, "Which of the two do you want me to release for you?" And they said, "Barabbas." 22 Pilate said to them, "Then what should I do with Jesus who is called the Messiah?" All of them said, "Let him be crucified!" 23 Then he asked, "Why, what evil has he done?" But they shouted all the more, "Let him be crucified!" 24 So when Pilate saw that he could do nothing, but rather that a riot

[95] Isa 50:6: spitting, scourging, slapping the cheeks. Zech 3: clothing with the robe (though not red). The Hebrew text of Zech 12:10 mentions piercing (דקר). While the LXX misread (רקד), the other Greek versions translated דקר. *Gospel of Peter* and *Barnabas* reflect two different translations. John 19:34.37 gives both Greek verbs.

[96] Matt 27:28 labels the red of the cloak that the soldiers put around Jesus κοκκίνη, like the crimson of *Barnabas*' scapegoat, while the *Gospel of Peter* uses purple (πορφύρα). Matthew is closer to *Barnabas* than is the *Gospel of Peter*.

[97] Interestingly, Crossan does not regard the scapegoat lottery as background to the Barabbas episode, though this could have embellished his thesis further.

[98] For different reasons, I object to René Girard's highly reductionist theses, e.g. in *The Scapegoat* (Baltimore, 1986), that see the scapegoat in practically every realm of life.

was beginning, he took some water and washed his hands before the crowd, saying: "I am innocent of this man's blood; see to it yourselves." 25 Then the people as a whole answered, "His blood be on us and on our children!" 26 So he released Barabbas for them; and after flogging Jesus, he handed him over to be crucified.[99]

he episode of Barabbas in the Matthean version gains depth when under-ood vis-à-vis the lottery of the goats in the Yom Kippur ritual.[100] The lease of Barabbas has caused some trouble for historians as well as egetes.[101] On the literary level, the change in the people's attitude to-ard Jesus from the exultations upon his entry to the release of Barabbas ems too abrupt, and the explanation that the high priests and scribes ought about this conversion with only a few words seems flimsy. The evity of the exposition is disconcerting; the people are manipulated too sily. Matthew abolishes the careful distinction regarding the sponsibility for the death of the Messiah that he had kept up to this point, tween the neutral disposition of the people and the evil inclination of its aders. The notorious statement: "His blood be on us and on our ildren!" transfers the responsibility to the whole people. With this involment of the bystanders, the narrator accuses them of being of the same rty as the active perpetrators.

On the historical level, apart from what is related in the Gospels, no idence for a *privilegium paschalis*, the release of prisoners before festils, especially Pesach, has yet been found. Even such conservative scholrs as Raymond Brown, who want to preserve the historicity of the story, ate: "There is no good analogy supporting the historical likelihood of the stom in Judea of regularly releasing a prisoner at a/the feast [of Passer]."[102] Brown suggests a historical nucleus behind the story: a certain sus Barabbas, who was subjected to similar claims of revolt, was re-

[99] Matt 27:15–26, NRSV.

[100] On general questions relating to the Barabbas episode I used the commentaries by own, *The Death of the Messiah*; U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26–28)* vangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament I/4; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 02); D.C. Allison and W.D. Davies, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the spel According to Saint Matthew. Vol. III Commentary on Matthew XIX–XXVIII* (Innational Christian Commentary; Edinburgh, 1997); and D.A. Hager, *Matthew 14–28* ord Biblical Commentary; Dallas [Tex.], 1995).

[101] On this passage, see the articles by H.A. Rigg, "Barabbas," *Journal of Biblical erature* 66 (1945) 417–456; and H.Z. Maccoby, "Jesus and Barabbas," *New Testament dies* 16 (1969 / 70) 55–60; and the long discussion in the commentary by Brown, *The ath of the Messiah*. See also J. Merkel, "Die Begnadigung am Passahfeste," *Zeitschrift die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 6 (1905) 293–6.

[102] Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, pp. 818 and 819.

leased at the same time as the crucifixion of Christ.[103] Against this, skeptical scholars such as John Crossan object that so isolated an incident would be highly improbable under Pilate, who was well known to be rigorous in pursuing his activities against the religious authorities and would not have retreated in the face of local powers. Crossan gives theological-literary reasons for the emergence of the story of Barabbas. For him, the scene illustrates a double mistake – of the Romans on the political level and of the high priests on religious level. "The Jewish authorities chose the (religiously) wrong person to release. The Roman authorities chose the (politically) wrong person to crucify."[104]

More than a hundred years ago A.H. Wratislaw proposed an exegetical basis for the Barabbas episodes,[105] a typology that is based on the two goats of Yom Kippur. He enumerates these points of similarity:

a) Two "victims" are presented (Jesus-Barabbas).
b) They are similar to each other (both are named Jesus and Son of the Father).
c) They symbolize opposed powers (Jesus, the peaceful Messiah of God; Barabbas, the murderer, as Messiah of the people).
d) There is a lottery/election between the two as to who is to be released and who is to be killed.
e) A "confession" is pronounced ("His blood be on us").

Wratislaw's theory of an exegetical genesis for the Barabbas story was not accepted in the commentaries and fell into oblivion.[106] However, if one applies the typology not generally to all passion accounts but only to Matthew, the quality of the argument improves considerably. A comparison between Matthew and its *Vorlage*, Mark, reveals some highly interesting redactional changes. Only in Matthew do the people choose

[103] The same unconvincing conclusion is drawn by Allison and Davies, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 3, p. 583. The data about amnesties in ancient Assyria and Greece in R.L. Meritt, "Jesus Barabbas and the Paschal Pardon," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985) 57–68, are too early to be relevant historically but may still have been influential as a literary model.

[104] J.D. Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots of Antisemitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus* (San Francisco, 1995), p. 112.

[105] A.H. Wratislaw, "The Scapegoat-Barrabas," *Expository Times* 3 (1891/92) 400–403.

[106] In fact, Wratislaw was not the first to interpret the Barabbas episode against the background of the scapegoat rite. Origen had already made this connection: see *Homily on Leviticus* 10:2:2 (SC 287:134). This exegesis is also found in Pseudo-Jerome's seventh-century *Commentary on Mark* 15:11 (CSL 82:71): see the translation and notes in M. Cahill (transl.), *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation* (New York, Oxford, 1998). On the medieval influence of this exegesis, see Louf, "Caper emissarius ut typus Redemptoris apud Patres," p. 274.

etween two figures with the same first name, Jesus of Nazareth and *Jesus* arabbas. This reading, put in parentheses in Nestle-Aland[27], is preserved y important witnesses and is accepted as original in most commen-aries.[107] The identity of the names of Christ and Barabbas, preserved only y Matthew and not in the other Gospels, has two mutually exclusive xplanations. Either he had access to an original tradition about the histor-al Jesus Barabbas and the other Gospels kept silent about the identity of ie names because it was offensive to them – as it was, for example, to the opyists and to Origen[108] (the objections against the historicity of the story ave already been mentioned), or Matthew embellished his *Vorlage* by ntroducing names for the nameless.[109] He thereby deliberately reinforced ie similarity between the two opposed prisoners.

Three further changes by Matthew, compared to his *Vorlage*, foster the npression that he wanted to emphasize the choice: *either* Jesus of Naz-reth *or* Jesus Barabbas (*see table*). While he usually followed closely the ording of Mark in the Passion account, here he changes three sentences. e reformulates (1) the question by Pilate; (2) the description of the opaganda of the high priests and the elders; and (3) the repetition of the uestion by Pilate:

Mark 15	Matthew 27
?: Θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ουδαίων; Do you want me to release for you the King f the Jews?	17: Τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν· *Ιησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ιησοῦν* τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν; Whom do you want me to release for you, *Jesus Barabbas or Jesus* who is called the Messiah?
1: ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς But the chief priests stirred up the crowd) to ave him release Barabbas for them instead.	20: ἵνα αἰτήσωνται *τὸν* Βαραββᾶν *τὸν δὲ* Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν (Now the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds) to ask for *Barabbas and* to have *Jesus* killed.
	21:Τίνα θέλετε *ἀπὸ τῶν δύο* ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν. Which *of the two* do you want me to release for you?

[107] The apparatus of Nestle-Aland[27] gives the following witnesses: the Old Syriac, Θ, e ferrara-group, 700* and some other uncials in Matt 27:16; also some manuscripts of igen of Matt 27:17, who comments on this.

[108] E.g. Allison and Davies, *Commentary on Matthew*, vol. 3, p. 584, note 20.

[109] He does this also in other instances, e.g. Matt 9:9; 26:3.57.

In so doing, Matthew underscores the contrast between the two homonymous men (both called Jesus) and the choice between two similar entities. The people choose between Jesus A and Jesus B, who are very similar in name but extremely different in character. This description agrees with the halakhic ruling regarding the two goats on Yom Kippur. On the one hand the Mishnah demands similarity in look and value, on the other hand the ritual destinations of the two goats are totally different. While the one goat is slaughtered and its blood brought into the holy of holies, the other goat is sent from the sanctuary into the desert.

Of the three further Matthean additions to his Markan *Vorlage* (the dream of Pilate's wife; Pilate washing his hands at the end of the act; and the double confession, announcing Pilate's innocence and the guilt of the people), the latter two may be connected to Yom Kippur.[110] Usually, Pilate's washing of hands and the confession are explained against the background of the ritual of the heifer in Deuteronomy 21:1–9. On the detection of a murder by unknown persons, representatives of the suspected village have to wash their hands and announce a confession of innocence similar to that of Pilate: "Our hands did not shed this blood, nor were we witnesses to it. Absolve, O Lord, your people Israel, whom you redeemed; do not let the guilt of innocent blood remain in the midst of your people Israel."[111] Yet, like the heifer ritual of Deuteronomy 21:1–9, the scapegoat ritual, too, ends with a confession and a subsequent washing.[112] Among the biblical descriptions of temple rituals, Yom Kippur stands out as the only ritual with a washing *after* the procedures.[113] Regarding the distinct connections between the Barabbas story and the scapegoat ritual, and presuming that Yom Kippur was an important event and conception for every Jew, I suggest that these features of the Matthean Barabbas story were formed not *only* by Deuteronomy 21 but *also* had the ritual of the goats of Yom Kippur as a catalyst.

In view of this evidence I also suggest that five halakhic prescriptions of Yom Kippur played a role in Matthew's formulation of the passage:

a) The lottery of the two goats
b) The similarity of these goats
c) Their contrasting destinations
d) The confession over the scapegoat
e) The washing of the hands at the end of the ritual

[110] The dream of Pilate's wife has no meaning against the background of the ritual of Yom Kippur.

[111] Deut 21:7–8.

[112] Lev 16:21–24.

[113] In reality, of course, priests would have washed themselves after the temple service.

The reasons for connecting the first three prescriptions are much stronger than for the last two, which may be explained by referring to Deuteronomy 21 but closely match the typology of the Yom Kippur ritual. When set against the historical reading by Brown, it illustrates most of the Matthean *Sondergut* and redactional changes in the Barabbas story.[114]

In addition, Koester suggests there is an allusion to the scapegoat rite in Matthew's version of the mocking of Jesus, which follows the Barabbas episode. Matthew 27:28 changes Mark's term for the *red* cloak the soldiers put around Jesus, from πορφύρα (purple) to κοκκίνη (scarlet). Koester proposes that Matthew wanted to allude to the scarlet wool tied around the scapegoat, which in *Barnabas* 7 is called τὸ ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον.[115] In general, κοκκίνη/שני carries a notion of atonement.[116] Commentaries usually refer to the cheaper price of scarlet, which is made from worms and not nails and matches better the mocking by simple soldiers and not rich generals. However, a search for the expression χλαμὺς κοκκίνη in TLG 8 yielded only Matthew 27:28 and its commentaries. It is therefore an exceptional combination of words. Dale C. Allison suggests a third explanation, referring to *Targum Onkelos* Genesis 49:11, where the messianic garment is made from scarlet (צבע זהורי).[117] The three interpretations are not mutually exclusive. Yet Koester's thesis implies a transition from the typology of Jesus with the sacrificial goat in the Barabbas episode to a scapegoat typology in the mocking.

What theological idea did Matthew want to convey with his allusions to the scapegoat rite in the mocking scene? I suggest that he embellished his *Vorlage* in order to include aspects of the people's guilt and how the believers achieve atonement. The labels Jesus of Nazareth and Jesus Barabbas symbolize two aspects of the historical Jesus. Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, as God wants him to be, while Jesus Barabbas is the Messiah as the people want him to be. The people usurp the role of God on Yom

[114] For this reading, the question of historicity is almost irrelevant – with the exception of a possible historical tradition of the name Jesus Barabbas. While the conclusions suggest that the episode is not historical, the theory – that Matthew reformed his tradition on the basis of the lottery between the goats on Yom Kippur – is not dependent on any ahistoricity of the story.

[115] Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 225–226.

[116] See R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im Alten Testament* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 83; Berlin, 1963), pp. 73–78; O. Michel, "Kokkinos," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 3 (1938) 812–815; and K.-M. Beyse, "שני" *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 8 (1995) 340–342; and Gen 38:30; Lev 14; Num 19. Also πορφύρα has cultic connotations including the high-priestly garments (Exod 25:4; 26:1.31, etc.; Sir 45:10), but not atonement.

[117] Allison and Davies, *Commentary on Saint Matthew*. vol. 3, p. 602.

Kippur in choosing between the two goats, Jesus of Nazareth and Jesus Barabbas. As scapegoat they choose the wrong goat, Jesus Barabbas, who is released in their midst (and consequently pollutes them), and hence as sacrificial goat, the wrong goat, Jesus of Nazareth, whose blood, spilled at the wrong place, also pollutes them. Matthew mocks the temple ritual, and the people disregard the atonement in Jesus.[118]

Excursus: The Catalytic Function of the Pharmakos *and the Scapegoat*

Many Greek cities had collective purification rites – which scholars term "*pharmakos* rites" – showing some parallels to the biblical scapegoat rite.[119] Usually, the rite includes the expulsion (sometimes even the killing) of a marginal member of society, ideally a king or a virgin, in reality more likely a beggar or a stranger.[120] In Athens at the festival of Thargelion and in times of distress, two ugly men were fed for a certain time – one with black figs as purification for the women, the other with white figs as purification for the men – then killed or driven across the border. In Massilia in cases of epidemic, a poor man was fed and clothed expensively for one year and then led round the walls of the city and thrown from a precipice or chased away. Similar rituals existed in Abdera, Leukas and other cities of the Mediterranean and the Middle East. B. Hudson McLean suggests that this common Mediterranean rationale stands behind three Pauline passages, Romans 8:3, Galatians 3:13 and 2Corinthians 5:21.[121] Since he does not claim specifically influence by Yom Kippur, I will not delve further into his thesis.

Some Church Fathers indeed provide evidence for an awareness by Christians of the *pharmakos* rituals from at least the second century.[122] They compare Jesus' death not

[118] For the sake of comprehensiveness, I would like to mention another thesis regarding Matthew and Yom Kippur, put forward by J. Massingberd Ford. She suggests seeing the whole Sermon on the Mount and particularly the Pater Noster as a composition "on the occasion of Yom Kippur." However, her arguments are insubstantial: see J. Massingberd Ford, "The Forgiveness Clause in the Matthean Form of the Our Father," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 59 (1968) 127–131. At the end of the short article she summarizes the arguments of, "Yom Kippur and the Matthean Form of the Pater Noster," *Worship* 41 (1967) 609–619 (*non vidi*).

[119] See J. Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 87 (1983) 299–320; and McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, pp. 65–104.

[120] "In historical reality the community sacrificed the least valuable members of the polis, who were represented, however, as very valuable persons. In the mythical tales ... we always find beautiful or important persons, although even then these scapegoats remain marginal figures: young men and women, and a king": Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," p. 307. Moreover, most heroes of the Greek myths offer themselves voluntarily. For a comparison with earlier studies of the scapegoat see his extensive bibliography in note 2, p. 299. It may be interesting that an opposite relationship between myth and ritual practice exists between the Mishnah *Yoma* ("the ritual") and Lev 16 ("the myth").

[121] See McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, pp. 105–145.

[122] A fully elaborate version of this argument can be found in D. Stökl, "The Christian Exegesis of the Scapegoat between Jews and Pagans," in: A.I. Baumgarten (ed.),

only to the scapegoat and all other biblical sacrifices but also to legends about kings sacrificing their lives to avert epidemics or natural catastrophies, i.e. to avert evil. These mythical tales are closely connected to the *pharmakos* rituals.[123] Clement of Rome writes:

> Let us also bring forward examples from the heathen. Many kings and rulers, when a time of pestilence has set in, have followed the counsel of oracles, and given themselves up to death, that they might rescue their subjects through their own blood. Many have gone away from their own cities, that sedition might have an end....[124]

Origen answers Celsus:

> They (the disciples) dared not only to show to the Jews from the sayings of the prophets that he was the one to whom the prophets referred, but also showed to the other nations that he who was crucified quite recently accepted this death willingly for the human race, like those who have died for their country to check epidemics of plague, or famines, or stormy seas. For it is probable that in the nature of things there are certain mysterious causes which are hard for the multitude to understand, which are responsible for the fact that one righteous man dying voluntarily for the community may avert the activities of evil daemons by expiation, since it is they who bring about plagues, or famines, or stormy seas, or anything similar. Let people therefore who do not want to believe that Jesus died on a cross for men, tell us whether they would not accept the many Greek and barbarian stories about some who have died for the community to destroy evils that had taken hold of cities and nations. Or do they think that, while these stories are historically true, yet there is nothing plausible about this man (as people suppose him to be) to suggest that he died to destroy a great daemon, in fact the ruler of daemons, who held in subjection all the souls of men that have come to earth?[125]

Alexander of Lycopolis confirms this line of thought from a pagan perspective in Egypt around 300 CE:

> For to maintain, according to the Church doctrine, that he [Jesus] gave himself up for the remission of sins gains some belief in the eyes of many people in view of the stories told among the Greeks about some persons who gave themselves up for the safety of their cities.[126]

I have argued elsewhere that the rise of the scapegoat-typology was probably fostered by the fact that its rationale was easily understandable to non-Jewish converts because of its

Sacrifice in Religious Experience (Studies in the History of Religions [Numen Book Series] 93; Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 2002; pp. 207–232).

[123] See Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," pp. 300–307.

[124] *1Clement* 55:1 – Kirsopp Lake's translation in LCL. It was H.S. Versnel's fascinating article "Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis," in: J.W. van Henten (ed.), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyriologie* (Leiden, 1989; pp. 162–196), that drew my attention to these passages.

[125] Origen, *Against Celsus* 1:31.

[126] Alexander of Lycopolis, *Contra Manichaei Opiniones Disputatio* 24, quoted according to Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, vol. 2, pp. 486–487.

comparability to their own cultural institution of *pharmakos* rites and the etiological tales connected to these rites.[127]

1.3 The Redemptive Curse: An Allusion to the Scapegoat in Galatians 3?

In the eyes of ancient Jews, every person crucified was cursed: Deuteronomy 21:23 states "anyone hung on a tree is under God's curse."[128] Accordingly, the earliest followers of Jesus had to find an answer to the cognitive dissonance of a cursed Messiah: How can a *cursed* Messiah bring *salvation*? Paul addresses this question only in Galatians 3, especially in verses 13–14:[129]

> 3:10 For all who rely on the works of the law are under a curse (κατάραν); for it is written, "Cursed (Επικατάρατος) is everyone who does not observe and obey all the things written in the book of the law." [Deut 27:26 LXX][130] 11 Now it is evident that no one is justified before God by the law; for "The one who is righteous will live by faith." [Hab 2:4] 12 But the law does not rest on faith; on the contrary, "Whoever does the works of the law will live by them." [Lev 18:5] 13 Christ bought us free from the curse (κατάρας) of the law by becoming a curse (κατάρα) for (ὑπὲρ) us – for it is written, 'Cursed (Επικατάρατος) is everyone who hangs on a tree' [cf. Deut 21:23] – 14 in order that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles, so that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.[131]

Paul does not explicitly answer the "how" question of the salvific curse of Christ. Some (mostly earlier) commentators express the opinion that behind Galatians 3:13 stands the concept of Jesus as a scapegoat.[132] The point of departure is the paradoxical description of Christ having become

[127] See Stökl, "The Christian Exegesis of the Scapegoat between Jews and Pagans."

[128] LXX: κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου.

[129] A number of exegetes see a parallel in the concept expressed in 2Cor 5:21. For a survey of interpreters who saw here an allusion to the scapegoat, see Young, "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the Thought of the New Testament," pp. 344–349; and L. Sabourin, "Christ made 'sin' (2 Cor 5:21). Sacrifice and redemption in the history of a formula," in: idem and S. Lyonnet, *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice. A Biblical and Patristic Study* (Analecta Biblica 48; Rome, 1970; pp. 187–296), especially pp. 269–289. Among new exegetes are McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, 108–113; and J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids [Mich.] and Cambridge [UK], 1998), p. 217. I do not see any philological basis for endorsing this claim and refer to the discussion in Young. Even if ἁμαρτία is understood against a cultic background, i.e. חטאת, the connection is to Lev 4 rather than to Lev 16.

[130] Note, that Paul changes the verb slightly and that he omits the explicit reference ὑπὸ θεοῦ, since this would not match his understanding of Christ fulfilling God's will.

[131] NRSV, slightly altered.

[132] See the list in McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, pp. 18–19, and add, most importantly for their extensive interpretation, Young, "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the Thought of the New Testament," pp. 344–349; and Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion." H.D. Betz, *Galatians. A*

of departure is the paradoxical description of Christ having become κατάρα as a substitute "for us" (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). Yet these commentators do not offer philological explanations beyond the general similarity in the theological ideas. Almost 20 years ago, Daniel Schwartz proposed an ingenious philological argument, which regrettably has not been awarded due attention in subsequent commentaries.[133] He based his claim on Paul's peculiar use of the verb ἐξαποστέλλω in Galatians 4:4–7, a passage related to Galatians 3:13–14.[134]

> 4:4 But when the fullness of time had come, God sent (ἐξαπέστειλεν) his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, 5 in order to redeem (ἐξαγοράσῃ) those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children.[135] 6 And because you are children, God has sent (ἐξαπέστειλεν) the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, "Abba! Father!" 7 So you are no longer a slave but a child, and if a child then also an heir, through God.

Only here (Galatians 4:4 and 4:6) does Paul use ἐξαποστέλλω. It proclaims two different paths to salvation for Gentiles and for Jews by the sending Christ. God saved the Gentiles by sending Christ to declare that the former slaves (Gentiles) have become sons and co-heirs. Paul does not expound (to the Galatian Gentile audience?) on how the *Jews* were saved by the sending of Christ. Schwartz points to Paul's peculiar use of ἐξαποστέλλω for expressing sending, whereas in all other instances Paul employs

Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, 1979), p. 151, suggests an intermediate solution: "Most likely, the statement is based upon a *pre*-Pauline interpretation of Jesus' death as a self-sacrifice and atonement (see also Gal 1:4; 2:20).... Jesus death interpreted by means of the Jewish concept of the meritorious death of the righteous and its atoning benefits."

[133] Among the more recent commentaries, I checked J.L. Martyn, *Galatians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 33A; New York, 1997); J.D.G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Black's New Testament Commentary Peabody [Mass.], 1993); R.N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Word Biblical Commentary 41; Dallas [Tex.], 1990). Only R.Y.K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids [Mich.], 1988), refers to Schwartz – in a note, without further discussion. Also McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, does not refer to Schwartz, though he would have supported his thesis. The only sympathetic reference I found was R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, "Sacred Violence and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3:13). The Death of Christ as a Sacrificial Traversy," *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990) 98–118, here pp. 114–115.

[134] Thematically and stylistically 3:13–14 is connected to 4:4–5: Jesus buys the Jews free; the verb ἐξαγοράζω appears only here in Paul; the sentence has a parallel structure (double ἵνα). See Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion"; and e.g. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 216.

[135] The NRSV translates υἱός as child and the plural as children.

πέμπω[136] or ἀποστέλλω.[137] Schwartz suggests that Paul is alluding to the Septuagint, where ἐξαποστέλλω appears frequently, although only twice in a similar context to Galatians 4 (the sending of X redeems Y): Leviticus 14 (the sending of the bird in the purification of the leper) and Leviticus 16 (the sending of the scapegoat), two rituals that are intimately connected. This context may have triggered Paul's choice of ἐξαποστέλλω. "Paul does not need to explain how sending forth Christ saved the Jews, for already the word ἐξαπέστειλεν, at least in his own mind if not in that of his readers, carried the meaning: Christ's action was that of a scapegoat."[138] A perceptive reader of the Septuagint and of Paul may notice this connotation of ἐξαποστέλλω in the context of salvation.

McLean tentatively suggests another philological connection to Yom Kippur. Paul's use of ἐπικατάρατος instead of κεκατηραμένος in the quotation of Deuteronomy 21:23 might refer to the scapegoat, since *Barnabas* uses this word in his description of the scapegoat and this verse probably belonged to his halakhic source.[139] Although, as McLean himself states, Paul's choice of ἐπικατάρατος may be strongly influenced by Deuteronomy 27:26, the independent references to this tradition in *Barnabas* and in the *Gospel of Peter* speak for Paul using an existing tradition.[140]

I would like to add a third suggestion: that the use of ἐξηγόρασεν in Galatians 3:13 might perhaps be a pun on the similar sound of the rare verb ἐξαγορεύσει in Leviticus 16:21.

Lev 16:21	[Ααρων]	ἐξαγορεύσει	ἐπ'	αὐτοῦ [τράγου ἐπικατάρατου]	πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας	τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ
Gal 3:13	Χριστὸς	ἐξηγόρασεν	ἐκ	τῆς κατάρας	τοῦ νόμου	ἡμᾶς

In the first covenant, Aaron *confesses*, *on* the (cursed) scapegoat, the iniquities of the children of Israel. In the second covenant, Christ *redeems* the (Jewish) sinners; he renders them *free from* the curse of the law and turns himself into their scapegoat. While I hesitate to interpret the release of the believers as a high-priestly act, the language suggests that Paul used this inverting pun.

[136] Paul uses πέμπω eleven times in the authentic letters: Rom 8:3; 1Cor 4:17; 16:3; 2Cor 9:3; Phil 2:19.23.25.28; 4:16; 1Thess 3:2.5; three times in the epistles of doubtful authenticity: Eph 6:22; Col 4:8; 2Thess 2:11; and the composita in the following verses: προπέμπω: Rom 15:24; 1Cor 16:6.11; 2Cor 1:16 (four times); συμπέμπω 2Cor 8:18.22 (twice); ἀναπέμπω in Phlm 12 (once).

[137] Rom 10:15; 1Cor 1:17; 2Cor 12:17.

[138] Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion," p. 261.

[139] See pp. 159–160, above.

[140] McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, p. 136.

Schwartz himself remarks that his thesis works only with respect to those readers who are well acquainted with the Greek Bible. Galatians is addressed to a completely Gentile community, however, Paul clearly presumes in other parts of the Epistle that his addressees are able to understand a quite complex exegetical argumentation.[141] McLean's argument for a cross-cultural apotropaic rite as background to this passage supports Schwartz, in that most Mediterranean people, pagans and Jews, knew some form of the widespread concept that the sending of X (a "scapegoat" or *pharmakos*) provides a release from impurity, sin and/or divine punishment.[142] In any case, the alternative explanations to Galatians 3:10.13 do not explain the strange idea of a *curse* having a redemptive function. References to the vicarious deaths of martyrs explain neither Paul's use of a *curse* at this point nor the question of how a *curse* could possibly have a salvific function. If Paul had wanted to refer to the concept of vicarious atonement in Jewish martyrdom ideology, he would probably have preferred other concepts than a curse. The suggestion of Schwartz and his predecessors, slight as the basis for their argument is, looks the most plausible.

1.4 The Scapegoat as Catalyst? John 1:29 and 1Peter 2:24

In two other New Testament passages, the Lamb of God in John 1:29 and the Servant Song in 1Peter 2:24, the idea of Jesus expiating sin by its removal has been explained by some against the background of the scapegoat rite.[143]

1.4.1 John 1:29

Three backgrounds have been suggested for the origin of the concept of the "Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world"[144] – the suffering servant, Passover and the scapegoat.[145] Each has its merits and demerits. The

[141] U. Schnelle, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (UTB für Wissenschaft: Uni-Taschenbücher 1830; Göttingen, ²1996), p. 123 (mainly Gentile Christians; probably Hellenistic citizens).

[142] A more definitive answer can be given after an extensive discussion about the importance of sacrificial connotations. There is hardly an issue, more hotly discussed in Pauline studies. See examples of the opposing views – in favor of the sacrificial atonement concept is Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, pp. 212–223; against it are C. Breytenbach, *Versöhnung. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 60; Neukirchen, 1989), passim; and McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, pp. 22–64.

[143] For another possible allusion in 1John 4:10, see p. 206, below.

[144] Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου (John 1:29, NRSV).

[145] Dodd has suggested a fourth background: an apocalyptic ruler as in Revelation: C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge [UK], 1953), pp. 230–238. This suggestion has been refuted by C.K. Barrett, "The Lamb of God," *New*

suffering servant of Isaiah 53 is compared to a lamb (53:7), which vicariously bears (53:5.8.10–12) the sins (53:4) and finally dies (53:12). C.F. Burney has suggested that an Aramaic version of Isaiah 53 using טליא, which means servant as well as lamb might be responsible for the term "Lamb of God."[146] According to the second theory, the Passover Lamb plays a central role in John's description of the death of the Messiah in 19:36. However, the question of an expiatory function of the paschal lamb is highly controversial.[147] The third suggested background is the scapegoat.[148] The scapegoat is said to bear the sins. Yet the scapegoat is not a lamb, and furthermore, any specific reference to sending out or cursing is missing in John 1.[149]

Testament Studies 1 (1954–55) 210–218; and see idem, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament; Göttingen, 1990), p. 200. See J. Frey, "Die 'theologia crucifixi' des Johannesevangeliums," in: A. Dettwiler and J. Zumstein (eds.), *Kreuzestheologie im Neuen Testament* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 151; Tübingen 2002; pp. 169–238), especially pp. 208-209, for the reasons against a fifth background, the Tamid, a theory recently revived by P. Stuhlmacher, "Das Lamm Gottes – eine Skizze," in: H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer (eds.), *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion (FS M. Hengel)* (Tübingen, 1996; vol. 3, pp. 529–542).

[146] C.F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford, 1922), pp. 104–108); cf. J. Jeremias, "Amnos, arên, arnion," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1 (1933) 342–345.

[147] The blood of the paschal lamb has an apotropaic function in *Jubilees* 49:3 and Heb 11:28. Some refer to 2Chr 30:15–20, Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicae* 2:312 and the late Midrash *Exodus Rabbah* 15:12 (ed. Mirkin 174) as conceiving of the paschal lamb as atoning but only the last passage from *Exodus Rabbah* clearly makes this association. For arguments against the existence of this conception in the first century, see Stuhlmacher, "Das Lamm Gottes – eine Skizze," pp. 529–531. Frey, "Die 'theologia crucifixi' des Johannesevangeliums," p. 210, points out that John might be the earliest instance of an atoning understanding of the Passover sacrifice.

[148] On this argumentation, see Young, "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the Thought of the New Testament," pp. 352–256 and the commentaries quoted there. Barrett, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, is more hesitant. Among newer commentaries K. Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 4/1; Stuttgart; Berlin; Köln, 2000), pp. 83–84, assumes that the scapegoat, the Passover lamb, and Isa 53 stand in the background.

[149] R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (4 vols; Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament 1; Kent, 1968), vol. 1, p. 300 (explicitly); and R.E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (i–xii). Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Anchor Bible Garden City, N.Y., 1966), pp. 58–63 (implicitly) do not regard the scapegoat as being among the motifs in the background. However, the philological arguments, that the verbs used in Lev 16:22 (λαμβάνω) and Isa 53:4.12 (φέρω, ἀναφέρω) do not match αἴρω in John 1:29 and that the Passover lamb was called not ἀμνὸς but πρόβατον, are not very strong, considering the Aramaic background of the author of the

In sum, Isaiah 53 explains best the Johannine tradition. The paschal lamb and especially the popular scapegoat rite may have served as catalysts. Unless we find an early Jewish source connecting Isaiah 53 to the *imaginaire* of Yom Kippur, the assumption of such a catalytic function remains completely hypothetical. That later Johannine tradition conceives of Jesus' death as atoning, probably with Yom Kippur looming in the background, becomes clearer in 1John 2:2 and 4:10, as is discussed below.[150]

1.4.2 1Peter 2:22–24

Admonishing his community in their own time of affliction to take Jesus' suffering as an example, the author of 1Peter reworks the fourth song of the Servant of God in Isaiah 53:

> 2:22 *He committed* no sin
> *and no deceit was found in his mouth.* [Isaiah 53:9b]
> 23 When he was insulted (λοιδορούμενος), he did not return insult (ἀντελοιδόρει);
> when he suffered (πάσχων), he did not threaten (ἠπείλει);
> he entrusted himself to the one who judges justly.
> 24 *He himself carried* (ἀνήνεγκεν) *our sins*
> in his body *upon* the wood [cross] (ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον) [Isaiah 53:4.11.12],
> so that free from sins,
> we might live for righteousness;
> *by his wounds* you *have been healed* [Isaiah 53:5].

Some exegetes have connected the Christological song in 1Peter 2:22–24 to the imagery of the scapegoat, referring to the mention of insult, vicarious suffering, and the strange notion of Jesus carrying sins "upon the wood."[151] Furthermore, some see a connection to Deuteronomy 21:23 in the use of "wood" to refer to the cross (as in Galatians 3:13).[152]

Gospel. See Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 1, pp. 105–111, on the various theories on the exact character of this Aramaic background.

[150] See pp. 205–207, below.

[151] See the list of exegetes who see here an allusion to the scapegoat, in Young, "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the Thought of the New Testament," pp. 349–352; also K.H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe, der Judasbrief* (Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 13/2; Freiburg, Basel, Vienna, 1961); and, more hesitantly, N. Brox, *Der erste Petrusbrief* (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar 21; Zürich, Einsiedeln, Köln, Neukirchen-Vluyn, ²1986), p. 138 "Vielleicht ist auch das Bild vom ehrlosen, verfluchten, aber schuldlosen Sündenbock (Lev 16,20–22) im Spiel, jedenfalls aber der Gedanke der Sühne."

[152] E.g. C. Bigg, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (International Critical Commentary; New York, 1901), p. 147.

However, there is no indication here of a direct influence of the scapegoat imagery.[153] The correspondence to the scapegoat imagery stems from the passage being a reworking of Isaiah 53, which in turn may be based on the scapegoat ritual.[154] This pertains to the motif of the silence, the vicarious suffering and the bearing of sins *upon* the wood.

In the peculiar formulation that Jesus carried the sins in his body *upon* the wood (τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον), 1Peter employs a word with a cultic notion, ἀναφέρω, usually alluding to an offering on an altar. It was adopted from the Greek of Isaiah 53:12. Since a presentation of sins is unimaginable, the author is most likely referring to Jesus' body as offering. Unlike *Barnabas* or Galatians, however, 1Peter 2:22–24 does not mention the sending or the curse.[155] While in Acts 5:30 and 10:39 and Galatians 3:13 the use of ξύλον for "cross" clearly alludes to Deuteronomy 21:23, this is not so in all passages, as its occurrence in Acts 13:29 shows. In 1Peter 2:24, any connotation of curse is missing (λοιδορούμενος in Greek has no undertone of curse); I do therefore see an allusion to Deuteronomy 21:23 as a possible but not necessary conclusion. While "insult" does not appear in Isaiah 53, I do not see any reason to suppose that the author included it in order to allude thereby to the scapegoat. It is probably based on a Passion tradition and Jesus' ethical message of non-retaliation in Matthew 5:38–48, in connection with the silence of the lamb in Isaiah 53:7.[156]

In sum, the scapegoat ritual may, at most, have served as a catalyst for applying Isaiah 53 to Christ, similar to the instance of the Lamb of God in John 1:29.[157]

[153] Against the scapegoat as background, see e.g. J.H. Elliott, *1 Peter. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 37B; New York, 2000), p. 352; P.J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 1996), p. 202; L. Goppelt, *Der Erste Petrusbrief* (edited by Ferdinand Hahn; Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 12/1; Göttingen, 1978), p. 210, note 71.

[154] On the scapegoat ritual behind Isa 53, see above, pp. 116–117. The connection of 1Pet 2:22–24 to Isa 53 is clear: 1Pet 2:22 – Isa 53:9 ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. 1Pet 2:24 – Isa 53:4: οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει. Isa 53:11: τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει. Isa 53:12: αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν. 1Pet 2:25 – Isa 53:5: τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν.

[155] As P.J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, p. 202, confirms.

[156] Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, p. 200, referring to Mark 14:61; 15:5; Matt 26:62–63; 27:12; 27:14; Luke 23:9; John 19:9.

[157] Cf. Young, "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the Thought of the New Testament," p. 356: "It must be stressed that this is far from saying that the scapegoat was a type of Christ; the evidence is such as to leave open the *possibility* that the language of taking away of sin in John 1:29 and 1Pet 2:24 *may* have behind it the language of the scapegoat ritual" (emphasis in the original).