ming from the Indo-European "race"—Persian, Assyrian, Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Kurgan, etc.—centered around male deities, were hierarchical and violent, and held up men (at least certain men) as most worthy of honor and obeisance.

Whereas blood in the earlier cultures was associated with women, especially menstruation and childbirth and thus life, and was revered and held in awe, blood in the later androcentric cultures was linked with bloodshed of a more violent sort and thus death. The blood of Jesus shed by being violently killed is in stark contrast to the blood of a woman shed during childbirth. The myth of Jesus, however, announced that the blood of Jesus was necessary to obtain "everlasting" life; the blood of woman necessary to human life is thus devalued and lost: Mary gives birth to Jesus, but church tradition maintains that she did not suffer labor pains, and there is no "mess" to clean up, and thus the female side of the process becomes invisible.[1]

Do Walker's arguments mean that Christianity is entirely fraudulent and should be abandoned by sophisticated "post-moderns"? Is it possible to redeem these myths for ourselves as we move into the 21st century? If, with Walker, we start by admitting that much of this is mythology that has done great damage to many people for the benefit of a few, while also admitting, with the "Historical Jesus" and some feminist scholars, that the life-affirming aspects of the whole tradition are worth preserving, we can salvage it for the next generation. Instead of an all-male godhead, we can explore the possibilities of the ancient Father/Mother/Son or Mother/Son/Spirit trinity. We can admit that death is part of the cycle of life, but in no way hold up killing or bloodshed as necessary for salvation—except for the blood-letting of menstruation and birthing. The epitome of fatherhood/manhood would thus move from power over and power to kill to strong nurturing, opposition to injustice and evil, and creativity/craftsmanship/building. The female side of life—the virgin, mother, crone/wise woman/wisdom/Sophia—would not be subordinate, passive or weak, but rather a celebration of life, democratic decision-making, the upholding of women's worth, and healing, nurturing, creativity and fertility on behalf of the whole community.

[1] See Chris Knight, *Blood Relations: Menstruation and the Origins of Culture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991) for a fascinating account of menstruation and ancient societies' dealings with it and with women in general.

ARTEMIDORUS AND THE JOHANNINE CRUCIFIXION

Justin J. Meggitt
Jesus College, Cambridge

Perhaps one of the most distinctive features of the gospel of John is its conflation of the crucifixion and resurrection/exaltation motifs, something most visible in its use of the ambiguous term ὑψόω ("to lift up") to describe Jesus' fate in 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34. By using this word the author, in a shocking reversal of reality, transforms crucifixion from being a degrading and excruciating form of execution (that cast a malevolent shadow over all the inhabitants of the Empire)[1] into a means of achieving glory.

This is often held to be a striking innovation on the part of John, albeit one that may have come about as a result of his knowledge of the LXX, or his familiarity with Aramaic or Hebrew: in the LXX version of the fourth servant song (Isa 52:13ff.) the ideas of being lifting up and being glorified are combined (Ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα) whilst Aramaic possesses the word *zᵉqap* which means both to "lift up" and "to crucify," and Hebrew *násäh*, which has a similar double meaning and allows the pun found in Gen 40:13, 19, 20.[2]

However, in examining the possible influences upon John in this area little attention has been paid to the parallels that can be found between the Johannine interpretation of the crucifixion and

[1] See M. Hengel, *Crucifixion* (London: SCM, 1970). See also J. Massyingbaerde Ford, "The Crucifixion of Women in Antiquity," *JHC* 3 (1996), 291-309.

[2] Contrary to H. Hollis ("The Root of the Johannine Pun - ΥΨΩΘΗΝΑΙ," *NTS* 35 [1989], 476), the possible influence of násäh in Gen 40.13, 19, 20, had in fact been noted some years before by C. H. Dodd (*Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953], 377) and R. E. Brown (*The Gospel According to John: I-XII* [London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971], 146).

The typological allusion to the story of Moses and the bronze snake in 3:14 (Num 21:9) is not a possible source for this idea as the term ὑστημι is employed in the LXX version of this verse, a word which does not carry such a double meaning.

material contained in Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*,[3] a text which has been neglected by students of ancient literature,[4] and particularly so by those specialising in the exegesis of the New Testament.[5] On a number of occasions in the *Oneirocritica* the cross is also transformed from an instrument of execution to one of exaltation.[6] For example, *Oneirocritica* 2.53 reads: ἀγαθὸν δὲ καὶ πένητι: καὶ γὰρ ὑψηλὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς καὶ πολλοὺς τρέφει <οἰωνούς> ("And it [crucifixion] is auspicious for a poor man. For a crucified man is raised up and his substance is sufficient to keep

[3] The standard, critical text of Artemidorus is that of Roger A. Pack, *Artemidori Daldiani, Oneirocriticon Libri V* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1963), which has superseded Rudolf Hercher, *Aretemidori Daldiani Onirocrition Libri V* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1864).

[4] The paucity of English translations of the book is indicative of this: prior to Robert J. White's rendering of 1975 (*The Interpretation of Dreams: Oneirocritica by Artemidorus* (Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes Press) the most recent translation into English had been the 1644 work of Robert Wood (*The Interpretation of Dreams, Digested into Five Books by that Ancient and Excellent Philosopher, Artemidorus* (London: Bernard Alsop). Until recently, even the small number of scholars who had taken the time to study the dream book were not keen to rescue Artemidorus from obscurity. Geer, for example, remarked that *The Interpretation of Dreams* "enjoys a well-deserved neglect." ("On the Theories of Dream Interpretation in Artemidorus," *Classical Journal* 22 (1927), 663).

[5] There have been some exceptions, for example, the recent work of Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), pp. 20-22, 32-35, 45-46, 74-75, and *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 22, 31, 152, 177. Artemidorus received some attention earlier in the century but then fell back into obscurity: S. Laukamm, "Das Sittenbild des Artemidor von Ephesus," ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ 3 (1930), 32-71.

[6] Although the reason for this is rather different than that found in John: dreams of crucifixion are interpreted as portending future success because of the perceived analogy between physical and social elevation. It should be stressed that this was only considered to be true for slaves, those with civic aspirations, and the poor (2.53; 4.49). (Crucifixion dreams were also auspicious for sailors, but for a different reason (2.53), but portended disaster for bachelors, business partners and individuals concerned about eviction (2.53)). For Artemidorus' reasoning see 2.25 and Luther H. Martin, "Artemidorus: Dream Theory in Late Antiquity," *Second Century* 8 (1991), 101-102.

The link between the physical elevation of crucifixion and social elevation was also made outside the world of the dream books, as Hengel has observed (*Crucifixion*, 40, n. 5). See Esther 5:14; Pseudo-Manetho 640; Marcus Junianus Justinus, *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi* 18.7.1522.7.9; Sallust, *Historiae* fr. 3.9.

The height of the cross was on occasion used to express contempt for the victim, as is illustrated by the satirical epigram attributed to Lucilius in the *Anthologia Graeca* which plays upon this association between physical and social elevation: "Envious Diophon, seeing another man near him crucified on a higher cross than himself, fell into a decline." (11.192 - see also Suetonius, *Galba* 9).

several birds"). We find in 4.49 fundamentally the same idea expressed: σημαίνοντος τοῦ δοκεῖν ἐσταυρῶσθαι δόχαν καὶ εὐπορίαν· δόχαν μὲν διὰ τὸ ὑψηλότερον εἶναι τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, εὐποριαν δὲ διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς τρέφειν οἰωνούς ("Crucifixion dreams signify honor and wealth—honor, because the crucified person is in a very high position, and wealth, because he provides food for many birds of prey"). Interestingly, whilst the verb ὑψόω is not itself used, the *Oneirocritica* employs the cognate ὑψηλός[7] in a similar manner to the way the term is employed in the fourth gospel. These parallels are not only particularly strong but also, by virtue of the nature of the source from which they come, extremely significant and raise the question of whether this feature of the fourth gospel should in fact be understood as an innovation at all, or whether it is more accurate to see it as something that expressed an idea which would have been quite familiar to those who lived in the Mediterranean world of the first century.

Yet most studies of the fourth gospel have completely ignored these parallels.[8] The few references to Artemidorus in commen-

[7] See also 1.76: εἰ δέ τις ὑψηλός ἐπί τινος ὀρξοῖτο, εἰς φόβον καί δέος πεσεῖται· κακουργὸς δὲ ὢν σταυρωθήσεται διὰ τὸ ὕψος καὶ τὴν τῶν χειρῶν ἔκτασιν.

[8] The following works lack any reference to these parallels: John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St John* (2nd ed.; London: SPCK, 1978); Jürgen Becker, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (2 vols.; Würzburg: Echter, 1979-1981); G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (Milton Keynes: Word, 1987); T. L. Brodie, *The Gospel According to John* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (I-XII)*; R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971); D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1991); Ernst Haenchen, *John* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); A. T. Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1991); E. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel* (2 vols.; London: Faber and Faber, 1949); R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956); Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972); Alfred Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile* (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1921); G. H. C. MacGregor, *The Gospel of John* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928); J. Marsh, *Saint John* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968); H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World* (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1929); J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to John* (London: A & C Black, 1968); D. A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1975); R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (3 vols.; Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oates, 1968); S. Schulz, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972); J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1908); B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St John* (London: John Murray, 1908).

taries have been cursory,[9] and the source has been dismissed out of hand as irrelevant in understanding the development of John's unusual treatment of crucifixion. However, the parallels we have noted are more important than has hitherto been recognised because they are not, as often supposed, merely between John and a rather obscure and idiosyncratic *text* (and therefore of little consequence) but between John and its *popular cultural context,* which is crucial to take note of if the fourth gospel is to be approached in a genuinely historical manner and not in the decontextualised, docetic manner that has so often been the case.[10]

Such a claim might at first appear surprising, but two factors support this assertion. Firstly, Artemidorus wrote in a world in which faith in oneirology was almost universal, and its findings were accepted by most people, regardless of their gender, class or relgious/ethnic identity.[11] Although it might seem strange to a modern reader, oneirology was not marginal but central to the culture of the Empire within which the fourth gospel was written. Secondly, the *Oneirocritica* itself is an accurate guide to the interpretations that were common in this period, not the idiosyncratic, unrepresentative creation of its author. It is a unique repository of oneiric traditions—traditions which were surprisingly uniform, with symbols such as the cross being understood in a similar way in widely different locations. Artemidorus collected his material

The recent *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament* (ed. M. E. Boring, et al., Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995) also fails to mention Artemidorus. Instead a much more tenuous parallel is drawn between the third century CE work Pseudo-Callisthenes (*Historia Alexandri Magni* 2.21.7-1) and John 3:14.

[9] W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1925), 53; J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St John* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1928), 1.114; 2.708; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel,* 377, and M. J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon St Jean* (Paris: Gabalda, 1936), 81.

[10] For a discussion of the significance of "popular culture" in interpreting the New Testament see Justin Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1998), pp. 15ff.

[11] N. Lewis, *The Interpretation of Dreams and Portents* (Toronto: Samuel Stevens, 1976), 6. See also, R. MacMullen, "Social History in Astrology," *Ancient Society* 2 (1971), 105-115; also Arthur J. Pomeroy, "Status and Status-Concern in the Greco-Roman Dream-Books," *Ancient Society* 22 (1991), 51-74; R. K. Gnuse, *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus: A Traditio-Historical Analysis* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 34-128; and Patricia Cox Miller, *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

during careful fieldwork[12] (undertaken in a fashion not unfairly compared with that of a modern anthropologist by the important classical scholar John Winkler)[13] in which the author not only made use of the published interpretations of famous oneirologists but also interviewed the rather more infamous popular market-place dream interpreters, the "beggars, charlatans and buffoons"[14] who made sense of the dreams of the non-elite (e.g., the poor man mentioned in 2.53). Indeed, his fieldwork was not just careful but extensive: he travelled widely in the course of his research,[15] visiting, amongst other places, Ephesus, Smyrna, Cyzicus, Laodicea, Miletus, Pergamum, Alexandria, Cyllene, Corinth, Puteoli, and Rome, and took every opportunity to double-check his findings.[16]

The conceptual and verbal parallels that we have observed are therefore far more telling than they might at first appear. It will not do to argue that John's handling of the crucifixion had its origins solely in Christian reflection on the fourth servant song, or in the polysemous quality of an Aramaic or Hebrew term: it is difficult to see how the conflation of the crucifixion/exaltation motifs could have occurred without the gospel being, at the very least, affected by similar ideas about crucifixion that were evidently present in the environment in which the writer(s) lived and breathed.

[12] Artemidorus' recognition of the significance of the variety of regional and ethnic cultural variations (e.g. 4.4; 1.8) is particularly salutary for New Testament scholars who are on occasion too quick to employ catch-all, homogenising terms such as "Graeco-Roman."

[13] See John J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 26.

[14] *Oneirocritica* 1. praef.

[15] *Oneirocritica* 5. preaf.

[16] It could be objected that the *Oneirocritica* was written after John: the mention in 1.26 of the games founded in memory of Hadrian in 138 CE and the ill Marcus Cornelius Fronto (born c. 95 CE) referred to in 4.22 are the *termini post quos* in dating the *Oneirocritica,* whilst the reference to Artemidorus in Galen's *Corpus medicorum Graecorum* 5.9.1, which dates from around 176 CE, provides a *terminus ante quem.* However, the variety of written and oral traditions that Artemidorus drew upon were, by their nature, the product of a number of generations of inherited, conservative, folk wisdom.

It certainly cannot be argued that the *Oneirocritica* was somehow dependent upon John for its unusual interpretation of crucifixion as the *Oneirocritica* shows no knowledge of Christianity whatsoever, of the Johannine or any other kind.

For a discussion of the dating of the *Oneirocritica* see Price, "The Future of Dreams," 10, n.18; and Arthur S. Osley, "Notes on Artemidorus," *Classical Journal* 89 (1963), 65-67.

The *Oneirocritica* is now undergoing something of a renaissance in classical studies but as we have observed, few New Testament scholars have paid it much attention.[17] This is particularly ironic given the current interest in applying anthropological approaches to New Testament exegesis,[18] something to which Johannine studies has not remained immune.[19] But this unusual piece of literature has much to offer and will, no doubt, yield further results for New Testament exegetes willing to engage with its intriguing contents.

---

[17] The reason for this neglect remains elusive, but the coalescence of a number of prejudices concerning the character and presumed contents of oneiric literature may explain this state of affairs. Albrecht Oepke for example, in his influential entry in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, remarked: "For all its scientific aspirations the ancient interpretation of dreams is little more than a mixture of fatalism, superstition and filth." ('ὄναρ', *TDNT* 5:228). Yet such accusations are misguided. Oneirology did not *aspire* to being scientific. The systematic, empirical rigour with which Artemidorus approached his subject matter should not be seen as a parody of 'science' but fully in keeping with the definitions appropriate to his context. Oneirology was accepted as a field of scientific inquiry by the most rational 'scientists' of Artemidorus' day: Galen, for example, the embodiment of all that was rational in ancient medical science, was quite content to use knowledge acquired in dreams as the basis for a number of his operations (*Opera* 16.222-3). We should recognise the *contemporary* nature of the classifications of knowledge we are familiar with, and not let these stand between us and a fair reading of the *Oneirocritica*. (See S. R. F. Price, "The Future of Dreams: From Freud to Artemidorus," *Past & Present* 113 [1986], 22-31). Nor is it fair to say that oneirology was concerned with "superstition" — a term employed since classical times to describe a belief founded upon ignorance, a faith that stems from an unreasonable conception of the world. Yet the decision as to what is ignorant or unreasonable is clearly a subjective one. One person's superstition is another's religion, as we can see in the designation of early Christianity as a *superstitio* by the likes of Tacitus (*Annales* 15.44.4), Suetonius (*Nero* 16.2) and Pliny (*Epistulae* 10.96.8). "Filth" is also an inappropriate definition of the concerns of oneiric literature. The *Oneirocritica* contains much that is disturbing to even the most broad minded of individuals and it is no surprise that many NT scholars recoil at the thought of wading through tales of coprophagy (3.23) necrophilia (1.80) and paedophilic incest (1.78), but Artemidorus is not fixated by such material: it appears in the *Oneirocritica* merely because he seeks to provide a comprehensive taxonomy of oneiric experience. We should not condemn Artemidorus for the consequences of his rigour. Cox Miller has also noted Oepke's failings in *Dreams in Late Antiquity*, pp. 9-11.

[18] E.g., Bruce Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights From Cultural Anthropology* (London: SCM, 1981); Idem, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1986); Bruce Malina and Richard Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992); J. Neyrey, *Paul in Other Words* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990).

[19] E.g., J. Neyrey, *An Ideology of Revolt: John's Christology in Social Science Perspective* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

ΣΥΖΥΓΟΣ IN PHIL 4:3 AND THE AUTHOR OF THE "WE-SECTIONS" IN ACTS[1]

Eduard Verhoef

The identity of the person, or persons, referred to by the word σύζυγος in Phil 4:3 has puzzled scholars for many years. The meaning of this word is clear: yokefellow, comrade.[2] Compare the Latin *coniunx*. The noun σύζυγος can be used for a co-worker, for a friend, and also for a spouse. We read in Phil 4:2-3:

> 2. Εὐοδίαν παρακαλῶ καὶ Συντύχην παρακαλῶ τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν κυρίῳ. 3. ναὶ ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ, γνήσιε σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνου αὐταῖς, αἵτινες ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ συνήθλησάν μοι μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν συνεργῶν μου, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς.
>
> 2. I entreat Euodia and I entreat Syntyche to agree in the Lord. 3. And, I ask you also, true yokefellow, help these women, for they have labored side by side with me in the gospel together with Clement and the rest of my fellow workers, whose names are in the book of life.[3]

In which way can we understand σύζυγος in Phil 4:3? Several interpretations have been suggested:[4]

1. Some authors, for example Clement of Alexandria, argued that Paul's wife is meant.[5]

2. A next group of biblical scholars interpret this word as the Christian community of Philippi.[6]

---

[1] This is a slightly revised version of a paper presented to the 1997 International SBL-Meeting in Lausanne. I would like to thank J. W. van Arenthals for her remarks on this text.

[2] LSJ, 1670. Cf. W. Bauer, K. Aland, B. Aland, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, ^{6}1988), 1548; and *LPGL*, 1278.

[3] So the Revised Standard Version.

[4] See G. F. Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC 43; Waco: Word Books, 1983), 179-180; and J. Gnilka, *Der Philipperbrief* (HTKNT 10/3. Freiburg/Basel/Wien, ^{3}1980), 166-167.

[5] O. Stählin and L. Früchtel, *Clemens Alexandrinus* II, *Stromata I-VI* (3d ed.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960), 220. Cf. Origen, *Comm. Rom.*1.1 in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae Tomus* XIV (Paris, 1857), 839.