

Dr. Elaine Phillips, Introduction to Biblical Studies, Session 14, Introduction to Extracanonical Lit.

© 2024 Elaine Phillips and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Elaine Phillips and her teaching on Introduction to Biblical Studies. This is session 14, Extracanonical Literature and Introduction.

We are moving at this point into a different unit in terms of our coursework, and in some ways our study of Dead Sea Scrolls and then selected Dead Sea Texts was kind of a bridge.

So, our first lecture here is going to deal with Extracanonical Literature simply by way of introduction. What is it? How do we talk about it? What are the boundaries? What are the main themes? means one of the things I'm going to point out as we move along is that as some scholars talk about this large, really unwieldy category called extracanonical literature, there's not necessarily a set rubric within which we can park some of these things. So, I'm going to be discussing some categories a little bit later on, and you'll recognize that those categories are one way of talking about extracanonical literature, but certainly not the only one.

I owe a debt of gratitude to James Charlesworth, who in his two-volume set has addressed them, and this is pretty much his framework with several tweaks. So here we go, and again, as usual, some introduction before we talk about specific categories and then specific texts within those categories. By way of our course focus so far, we've been talking about contexts.

That was a lot of what we did when we studied literary contexts. We talked about the various ways of interpreting, well, whether it's Torah or prophets or whatever. We talked about historical and geographical contexts, and a number of lectures on regions of the land and the importance of that.

So, there is a sense in which we are now moving back out to a literary context, but it's going to be a broader literary context because it's outside the canon, and it's going to give us a little bit of a look into some of the sociological religious contexts that are there as well. As I said a moment ago, this is a vast, vast, vast arena to study. So, for us, we're simply going to do some selected texts within this broad scope, and these are going to be a set of different texts that respond in one way or another to what is in the First or the Old Testament or Hebrew Bible.

Think of them as all very much tied into that. That's going to be an extremely important point, and we'll come back to it multiple times. I have here basically a multifaceted question, and if you need to remember what's going on in terms of

responding to this, why, right, and what got written, think of it in terms of the four Cs.

That is not a denominational label. We have four Cs now, and they all interface, so don't make separate category lines between them, but we want to talk about what really shapes the whole stuff that we're talking about. Canon is it.

I said a moment ago that these communities are responding in one form or another to what we call the Old or the First Testament because they saw this as sacred text. They viewed it as a sacred text, and obviously, if it's a sacred text, it's got a message, divinely revealed communication, and then I've thumbnail sketched, obviously, what we know of as the components of the canon. God's activities intervening in history, God's instructions, Torah, as well as the wisdom literature and the Psalms, calls to repentance in the prophetic literature, but think canon, right? They're writing in response to canon, and the they that I just mentioned are members of various communities.

They're communities of God's people. They're diverse communities. When we talk on the one hand, we're talking about people who are in Qumran, that's a particular community.

We're going to be talking about communities in other areas, such as Egypt and Jewish communities in Egypt. We're going to talk about the early Christian communities, right? They're diverse communities, all responding through their own lenses to canon. So diverse within the land, as well as the diaspora. I'm going to come back to the diaspora.

Our third C, commentary. This is what these communities did with regard to the canon, applying sacred text for the community, for the community's admonition, for the community's edification, for the community's encouragement.

So, canon, community, commentary, and then finally, continuity. Because obviously, canon was revealed sometime before that, depending on where we're talking, whether we're talking Torah or prophets or whatever. But this writing, this commentary, these communities writing the commentary were establishing connections between the promises that show up in the sacred text and the realities of where they were living, which were sometimes extraordinarily painful and difficult.

In fact, it goes back to one of the questions asked in the Psalms, have the promises failed? I was already asking at that point, and certainly, some of these communities were doing the same.

So, think again: our four Cs, canon, communities, commentary, and continuity, all working together as the shaping forces here. Now, I just want to review something that we've talked about already, but it's worth saying what's in the canon.

If these groups are responding to canon, then can we talk about the boundaries of canon? Now, there's a lot to be said about this, but let's talk in terms of whether there were recognized structures and boundaries of the canon at a certain point in time, i.e., first centuries B.C. and A.D.? And I'm going to say that's actually really late. I'm going to suggest that we have established canon long before that, but at least that is a point. The reason I would go to talk about an established sense within a variety of Jewish communities as to Torah, prophets, Nevi'im, which included both the writing of prophets as well as the historical material that included a narrative of prophetic voices, and then our writings.

And I would suggest that those are in place in the Jewish communities' minds, at least by the time we have this book called Ecclesiasticus, not to be confused with Ecclesiastes, but Ecclesiasticus, which is translated into Greek, and we know the date from the prologue because the grandson of the author translated it into Greek. He did so in 132 B.C. because he's talking about a Ptolemaic ruler in Egypt who was ruling at the time that he did it. And as he's talking about translating his grandfather's work from Hebrew into Greek three times in the prologue, three times, he makes a distinction between law, prophets, and other books, i.e. three parts in that third category he's calling other books, has such disparate types of stuff all the way from Psalms to wisdom literature to Chronicles to Daniel, that he simply calls it other books.

But he makes a distinction between those three and his grandfather's writing. Now, his grandfather was known as Jesus ben Sirach, which is another title for this book. So, grandpa's probably writing about 180 B.C. And already, his grandson says, there's a sense in his grandfather's mind that what he's writing is important, mind you, but it's not the same as Torah, prophets, and that third category that he calls other books.

If I had the time, if we had the time, we would read our way through that prologue, but I encourage you to do it because there's a very clear sense that already for this group of folks, by the way, this is in Egypt, Alexandria, second century B.C., already there's a sense of what's going on here. We also have Luke, as Jesus is on the road to Emmaus talking to the disciples, and then they come up to the upper room, and Jesus has to explain to them that according to the law of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms, he was to suffer and rise again according to the scriptures. Paul will make that same point in 1 Corinthians 15, according to the scriptures, but we've got it in Luke, those three things.

And then in the Dead Sea text 4QMT, we also have maybe a reference to these three separate sections of an acknowledged, authoritative, divinely revealed text, Books of Moses, Book of Moses, Prophets, and then the third one from David to the generations. Why do I say all that? It's not to go off on a tangent so much, but simply to say that there seems to have been already early on a pretty good sense of what was canon by at least the second century B.C. and well into our first century A.D. One of the reasons this is interesting, and we're not even going to go here at this point, but if we're going to do a lecture on the deuterocanonical books, Ecclesiasticus, again, not to be confused with Ecclesiastes in the actual canon, but Ecclesiasticus, the Wisdom of Ben Sirach, is included within these deuterocanonical books, which is in the Septuagint, but again, those are a later edition, I would suggest, and our prologue actually recognizes that. Well, that's a digression.

Let's circle back now and talk about why studying this extracanonical stuff can be so helpful, because, you know, sometimes people look at it and say, well, it's not the Bible. Why do we even spend some time on it? So just kind of a grocery list of why we're focusing. It's going to give us some historical background through a number of different lenses to be sure, but it's going to give us historical backgrounds.

There are others that do this, but we certainly learn what happened in those years between the time that Malachi basically closed down the Old Testament, at least according to some understandings of dating these texts, and then the gospel narratives open up. Also, in addition to historical information, we have a good sense in terms of what's going on in the philosophical, religious, and sociological climate there as well. There seems to be, especially during those times when these people were suffering drastically in these centuries under oppression from outsiders of one kind or another, how do you, how are you faithful during that? How do you deal with this present struggle? How do you understand it? How do you understand the nature of God, especially since, at some of these points, he's seen so far away? So, these kinds of questions will recur for them.

In addition to simply historical backgrounds, we see something about the complexity of Judaism. I've said before that it's very important to understand Judaism's plural, lest we just sort of monolithically set it into one category and leave it there. I have Jacob Neusner's writings to thank for this, who emphasizes over and over and over again the multiple and complex nature of Judaism, and he will call it Judaisms.

So even though your spell check will revolt when you put Judaisms there, continue to do it anyway if you're writing about it. Then you can see some of these other issues that are part of it. Here's our real takeaway.

Actually, they're all takeaways, but this is an important one as well because, you know if we're scholars of the Bible, we want to know how best to interpret it. And you have in these texts examples of interpretation, examples of how, again, going

through our four C's, how the canon was understood by communities in order to write commentary and make it applicable, create that continuity. If nothing else, as you read these selected examples of texts, and I hope explore some others, you will see that these communities were absolutely infused with biblical text in ways that we could take a lesson from.

They knew their texts. And if we were to mention, well, maybe three words out of a text, that wasn't a proof text. That was a reminder to the listening or reading community of the whole context within which something was happening.

So, there's a focus on biblical texts simply infusing what they were saying, understanding, and so forth. Well, here we come to the challenge of categories. As I mentioned a moment ago, not everybody agrees with how to apportion this unwieldy collection, but we'll try these.

And you'll notice that some of these categories are categories simply based on a person's name. Others, on the other hand, are based on genre or sub-genres of literature. We are going to, in our next couple of lectures, pick up on examples from some of those genres.

But as we deal with certain named individuals, today will be the only exposure you get to them. I will read you selected examples. Pseudepigrapha.

I'm going to deal a lot more with pseudepigrapha in our next couple of lectures, but the term itself means that these are falsely attributed writings. And I'll say more about how that works within their contexts, why they're falsely attributed, and what they're shaped to do. But for now, that is a huge category within our extracanonical literature.

We also have, moving from that genre label, falsely attributed writings, to a person himself. Philo or some folks would actually pronounce that Philo, I suppose. But notice his dates.

He's going to be writing in just about the time Jesus was living. A Jew from Alexandria. This is important because, as my next little word says, the Alexandrian community, being Hellenistic Jewish community, having absorbed that whole worldview of Neoplatonism, Philo was also infused with that, but he was Jewish.

And here he's got his Hebrew Bible scriptures, and he's got in those Bible scriptures, he's got narratives of God who interacts with his creation. Well, this doesn't sit really comfortably with Neoplatonic thinking, and one of Philo's missions seemed to have been to make the narratives in the Hebrew Bible palatable for the worldview within which he lived and the Jewish community in Alexandria functioned. So, we do see, by

the way, he writes some other things too, kind of historical character, but by and large, we've got an ongoing allegorizing of Hebrew scriptures.

And in a moment, I'm going to read you some examples from that, but let's get through our categories first, and then we'll come back to his allegorizing. We have Josephus. Josephus is, generally speaking, mentioned whenever we want to know something about something historical in between the close of the Old Testament and the opening of the New Testament.

Josephus, if you know his history, started out being one of the significant governors up in the Galilee, as you can see. He too is a first-century person, but he will live through and survive by his own wiles the Jewish revolt when the temple fell in A.D. 70, and he's going to write about it. But as part of his surviving, he went over to the Romans.

This is a long and convoluted story, but in so doing, he writes about these things, not just to write about them but to be kind of an explainer of Judaism to his Roman audience. So, he will write a book, not only on the Jewish wars, a more focused thing, but a book series, books, I should say, entitled *The Antiquities of the Jews*. And we're going to look at some excerpts from the *Antiquities*, particularly because it'll give us some very interesting interfaces and understanding of the sects that we talk about during that time.

So, we'll come back to some examples from Philo and Josephus momentarily. We also have the Dead Sea Scrolls. We've already looked at some examples of Dead Sea Scrolls.

Notice again, we've moved from pseudepigrapha, a genre, to Philo, Josephus, both genres but individual writers, to Dead Sea Scrolls, which are primarily about a location and a community. You've seen the problems with categories here, especially since some of our Dead Sea Scrolls are pseudepigraphic in nature. So, there is certainly an interface.

In another lecture, a little farther down the pike, we're going to deal with some rabbinic materials, sometimes called Talmudic, but I will call them rabbinic materials. So, I'll unpack that more in a different lecture. These bold face things you can see are going to get a little more press.

They, too, are vast in terms of communities, as well as the genre of materials. And then Targums, Aramaic translations of the scriptures. We will not spend any more time on those in our time forward.

Let's just do a couple of examples from the Philo material, are allegorizing, and then some from Josephus himself. As I said, Philo allegorizes his way through the Hebrew

Bible. So, we have an allegorical treatment of Genesis 3. And again, just to revisit for ourselves Genesis 3, the serpent has beguiled Eve and Adam.

They have tasted of the fruit. They have been expelled from the garden. And verse 24 says the Lord God placed in front of the Garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the Tree of Life.

Now I'm going to read some of 927, just to give you a flavor of what Philo sounds like, and then see if we can do some interesting things with connections. So, as I'm reading, just let yourself think about perhaps some possible word connections with New Testament material. And one of the things I want to kind of get your antennas up for is the following.

Philo uses the word *logos* a lot. He uses that word a lot. This particular translation that I'm reading from will translate *logos* as reason.

And so, whenever you hear reason in this translation, think *logos*. And maybe I'll even put *logos* in there from time to time. Notice, by the way, as I continue, or as I start reading this section, Philo does also have kind of an interesting understanding of his own, his own, how should we say, intellectual, spiritual acumen.

So here we go on Philo, section 27 and following. Philo speaking, I have also, on one occasion, heard a more ingenious train of reasoning from my own soul, which was accustomed frequently to be seized with a certain divine inspiration. It told me that in one living and true God, there were two supreme and primary powers: goodness and authority.

And by the way, I'm just going to pause. I should have said this earlier. In the section prior to this, he's already taken yet another allegorical approach to identifying these cherubim.

So, this isn't the first thing he said. He's already explored what these cherubim might mean through another whole set of lenses. But at any rate, there are two supreme and primary powers: goodness and authority.

And that by his goodness, he had created everything. And by his authority, he governed all that he created. The third thing, which was between the two and had the effect of bringing them together, was *logos*, reason.

For that it was owing to *logos* that God was both a ruler and good. Now he's going to expound on that a minute, so just hang with me. Of this ruling authority and of this goodness being two distinct powers, the cherubim were the symbols.

But of reason, logos, the flaming sword was the symbol. For reason is a thing capable of rapid motion and impetuous. And especially the reason of the creator of all things is so inasmuch as it was before everything, passed by everything, conceived before everything, and appears in everything.

Now, that's where I would want to stop, but let me just give a little bit more of a sense of how he goes on and develops this, and then we'll just parse it out ourselves a bit. And do thou, O my mind, receive the impression of each of these cherubim unadulterated, thus becoming thoroughly instructed that about the ruling authority of the creator of all things, and about his goodness, you may have a happy inheritance because there is a conjunction and combination of these two powers. God is good, and God is powerful, and we have a reverential awe of God.

I'm skipping a little bit. Let the flaming sword teach you that these things might be followed by prompt and fiery logos combined with action. Well, of course, as we hear that, we probably have some echoes of some New Testament passages with this.

As I said a moment ago, logos, reason, and by the way, there's a whole range of semantic implications of logos, so it's not just word or not just reason. Correspondence is another one. But possibly we would be thinking of John 1 and how logos is used in that context.

Possibly we would be thinking of Colossians 1, because Philo is going to say, before all things, through all things, by all things. And then we're probably thinking of Hebrews chapter 4, where you've got the logos that's living and active, piercing and penetrating. You know, that was the way this particular sword, again, the allegory that Philo is presenting of the cherubim and the cherubim have the logos between them.

There's that three-someness there as well that shows up. Now, I'll just say this, and of course, I am trampling in the New Testament territory, so I don't want to say too much, but this is the first century. And in the first century, we have a whole wider context within which this term is being used by authors who write in Greek.

In Aramaic, we also have an emphasis on word and the word. It's memra, and you have the memra that's showing up, sorry, memra that's showing up, kind of mediating as well in some of the translations of Aramaic stuff that we have. So there seems to be a wider context within which something is happening here that's perceived as mediating between the authoritative divine goodness of God and what's needed by human beings.

Now, of course, what John does in chapter 1, verse 14 is radical, and it's something Philo and probably the rest of his crew could never conceive of because John 1, 14

says, and the word became flesh, and tabernacled, tented among us, and we beheld his glory. That's bringing all that divineness into an incarnate form, and of course, we could go on from there. But that gives us a little bit of a sense, even through those tiny sections of Philo, of something about the wider philosophical religious thinking of our first century.

Well, let's spend just a little bit of time with Josephus. This is antiquities, as I said, antiquities and writing antiquities. Josephus was writing for a Roman audience, and so he's going to help them understand not just events as they're articulated in the Old Testament, but beyond that.

And, of course, once we get to the first century, Josephus himself is living through this, and so he's going to describe some sects. I will spot-read through this. This is chapter 1 of book 18.

Book 18, by the way, is a really helpful book. So here we go. The Jews had, for a great while, three sects of philosophy peculiar to themselves.

The sect of the Essenes, the sect of the Sadducees, and the third sort of opinion was that of those called Pharisees. Of which sects, although I've already spoken in the second book of Jewish wars, I will touch upon them now. As for the Pharisees, they live meanly, i.e. spartanly, and despise delicacies and diet.

They follow the conduct of reason. When they determine that all things are done by faith, they do not take away the freedom from men of acting as they think fit. So he's seeing the Pharisees as walking that very interesting line in terms of sovereignty of God, freedom of humans.

Since their notion is that it hath pleased God to make a temperament whereby what he wills is done, but so that the will of men can act virtuously or viciously. The Pharisees also believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them and that under the earth, there will be rewards or punishments, according to how they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life. And the latter should be detained in the everlasting prison, but the former shall have the power to revive and live again in the resurrection, on account of which doctrines they are able greatly to persuade the body of the people.

In other words, folks like to hear this. He says a little more. I'll skip.

Second, the doctrine of the Sadducees is this. Souls die with the bodies. Nor do the Sadducees regard the observation of anything besides what the law enjoins them, for they think an instance of virtue to dispute with those teachers of philosophy with whom they frequent.

When they become magistrates, as they are unwillingly and by force sometimes obliged to be, they turn themselves to the notions of the Pharisees, because the multitude would not otherwise bear them. So, the Sadducees, he's saying, are kind of playing it as best they can for their own good. Those are Pharisees and Sadducees.

Now let's just briefly read about Essenes. Again, a sect that may have become associated with Qumran. Probably did.

The doctrine of the Essenes is this. All things are best described to God. Essenes teach the immortality of souls and esteem that the rewards of righteousness are to be earnestly striven for, and when they send what they have dedicated to God into the temple, they don't offer sacrifices because they have more lustrations of their own that are pure, on which account they are excluded from the common court of the temple, but they offer their sacrifices by themselves.

Yet, is their course of life better than that of other men? Having all things in common, a rich man enjoys no more of his own wealth than the one who has nothing at all. There are about 4,000 men that live this way.

They neither marry wives nor are they desirous of keeping servants, thinking the latter tempts men to be unjust, and the former gives the handle to domestic quarrels. As they live by themselves, they minister to one another. Those are the three main sects that we know.

Josephus goes on and describes what he calls a fourth sect. I won't read all about it, but he says there is a fourth sect of philosophy. Judas the Galilean was the author.

These men agree in all other things with the Pharisees, but they have an inviolable attachment to liberty, and they say that God is to be their only ruler and lord. And of course, when we read Josephus' wars, which I won't do at this point because we don't have time, but as he describes the final fall of Jerusalem to the Romans, one of the tragedies that come out very clearly is the absolute antipathy and ferocity of these various zealots, Sicaria and others, against each other. So frankly, Jerusalem falls because of them as much as the Roman onslaught.

So, Josephus talks about the sects of Judaism. Josephus, as you may know from your New Testament courses, also describes Jesus. Now, I'm going to read this to you and want you to recognize one thing that I should have said earlier but didn't, and it runs like this.

Because Josephus had been a Jewish turncoat, leaving the Jews and going over to the Romans, centuries of Jewish scholarship pretty much would have nothing to do with him. It wasn't until about the 20th century that Jewish scholars began to say this was a worthwhile thing really to consult. So, Josephus is preserved in the church, by the

church, various branches of it, and the suggestion is that some of the things we read in, this is Book 18, Chapter 3, maybe additions by Christian scribes because, of course, we have in our culture a distinct sense of this is somebody's book, don't tamper with it.

But boundaries like that were a little more fluid, and so the suggestion is perhaps we have in this description of Jesus some additions. But having said that, we can point out those additions. We could even take them out if we wanted to, and we would still see Josephus describing an extraordinary person who does miracles, after whom a whole, as he calls it, tribe of Christians will follow because no Christian author is going to call the whole development of the church a tribe.

Let me read it for you. Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as received the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles.

He was the Christ. Now, that's one place where people suggest maybe the church has added that in, but carrying on. When Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had him condemned, those who loved him at first did not forsake him.

The next line is thought maybe to be an addition. For he appeared to them alive again on the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and 10,000 other wonderful things concerning him. Even if that's an interpolation, notice all that has been said already.

Someone who's wise, someone who's doing remarkable works, someone whom Pilate arranged to have crucified, and then the closure of this section. The tribe of Christians so named after him is not extinct to this day. Now, Josephus, we could do more with that, but we also want to do one more thing in terms of what Josephus has to say, because he will talk very shortly after this point, even though Josephus has kind of that, what am I trying to say, a summary sketch of Jesus earlier on.

He does have a description of John the Baptist's death, which you will recognize fitting with what we know from the gospel. This happens to be chapter 5 of book 18. He has spent the first section, which I'm not going to read to you, describing war, altercation, Herod.

This is our Herod Antipas guy, and there's going to be a Herod the Tetrarch that shows up in here as well, and there's a king named Aretas, and there is a wife in there, and there's been some battles. Let me close down section 1 of chapter 5 and move ahead. They, this is Aretas and his gang and the Jews, raised armies on both sides and prepared for war.

They sent their generals to fight instead of themselves, and when they joined the battle, all of Herod's army was destroyed. That's pretty sobering. Section 2, now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and then very justly as a punishment for what he did, Herod, against John, who was called the Baptist, because Herod slew him, who was a good man and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as true righteousness towards one another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism.

When many others came to crowd around him, for they were greatly moved or pleased by hearing his words, John's words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion, Herod thought it best to put him to death and prevent any mischief he might cause and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of what should be too late, because of course we've had that Herod Antipas, Herod Philip, white thing going on there. Accordingly, John was sent a prisoner out of Herod's suspicious temper to Machaerus. This, by the way, is a fortress on the east side of the Dead Sea, one of Herod the Great's numerous fortresses.

So, he's sent to Machaerus, he was there put to death. Now, the Jews, as I said, had an opinion that the destruction of his army was sent as a punishment upon Herod and a mark of God's displeasure against him. So, we see a very interesting set of details actually added by Josephus with regard to John the Baptist.

Let me read you just one more because, as we know, we have a Herod dynasty, right? And so, our Herod dynasty is going to be Herod the Great, who did all the building of that fortress just mentioned. Once Herod the Great dies, we've got Herod the, sorry, Herod Antipas, and then following that is going to be Agrippa the First, Agrippa the Second. Josephus is going to describe for us the death of Herod Agrippa, the, let me define where I am here, yes, Herod Agrippa, and this is going to sound, I think, like something that you might know from the Book of Acts.

So here we go. When Agrippa had reigned three years over all of Judea, he came to the city of Caesarea, out by the sea, built by Herod the Great, formerly called Stratos Tower, and there he exhibited shows in honor of Caesar. Upon his being informed, there was a certain festival, at which festival a great multitude got together, as such were of dignity.

On the second day of the shows, Herod put on a garment made wholly of silver, and a contexture truly wonderful, and came into the theater. You know, there was a theater in Caesarea. It's a Hellenistic city, after all, built by Herod the Great.

He came early in the morning, at which time the silver of his garment, being illuminated by a fresh reflection of the sun's rays upon it, shone out in a surprising manner and was so resplendent as to spread a horror over all who looked intently upon him. And presently, his flatterers cried out, one from one place, another from another, that he was a god. Upon this, the king did neither rebuke them nor reject their impious flattery, but a severe pain arose in his belly and began in a most violent manner.

He looked upon his friends and said, I whom you call to God and commanded presently to depart this life. Well, providence thus reproves the lying words you just now said to me. I, who was by you called immortal, am immediately hurried away by death.

And, of course, that's Josephus' incredible description of what we have in the Book of Acts, the same event happening in that context. Well, this is our introduction. What have we done so far? We've got a sense for both these communities and the persons who are representing certain communities that there is authoritative scripture.

We also have a sense that they are intent on taking canonical authoritative text and figuring out how to apply it to their own contexts. Just to remind ourselves, Philo has a context. It's Neoplatonic in its thinking.

How is he going to apply what the scriptures are saying to them? We learn historical backgrounds for some New Testament developments, and Josephus has helped us considerably with that. And then, just mentioned this a moment ago, Philo gives us even just a small window, just a small window. And of course, if you were to read all these wonderful pages of Philo, big book, you'd get a good sense.

Here it is, waiting in front of you. A really good sense of the elaborate ways that they took to interpret things through that lens of Neoplatonic thinking. Well, that is going to be the jumping off place to the next thing we're going to study, which is Enoch, the literature attributed to our biblical character Enoch.

It's pseudepigrapha. We're going to take a bit of a stopping point here because Enoch is its own lecture. So enough for now.

This is Dr. Elaine Phillips and her teaching on Introduction to Biblical Studies. This is session 14, Extracanonical Literature and Introduction.