

Magic in Early Christianity*

by DAVID E. AUNE, Chicago, Illinois

Contents

I. Introduction	1507
II. The Nature and Function of Magic	1510
III. Magic in Graeco-Roman Religions	1516
IV. Jesus and Magic	1523
V. Gospel and Aretalogy	1540
VI. The Magical Use of the Name of Jesus	1545
VII. Glossolalia and <i>Voces Magicae</i>	1549
VIII. Magical Prayer	1551
IX. Magical Motifs in Early Christian Literature	1555
X. Conclusions	1557

I. Introduction

Considered in relationship to early Christianity, magic has generally received a bad press. In one of the more recent articles on that subject, 'Magie und Aberglaube an den Anfängen des Christentums' by N. BROX¹, the author

* The author wishes to express his gratitude to a number of colleagues whose comments, suggestions and corrections have been incorporated into this article: professors C. THOMAS BROCKMANN, HANS DIETER BETZ, DAVID SCHROEDER and MORTON SMITH.

Abbreviations:

ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
PW	PAULY-WISSOWA, Realencyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum
SC	Sources chrétiennes
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum alten u. neuen Testament

¹ Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift, 83 (1974), 157.

describes magic „als ständig drohende Dekadenz und als überall anwesende Perversion von Religion und auch von christlichem Glauben“. Such was not always the case. Two generations ago the study of Graeco-Roman magic made a significant impact on New Testament studies through the careful, though sometimes erratic, studies produced by a number of German scholars associated with the so-called *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* (A. DIETERICH, R. REITZENSTEIN, A. DEISSMANN, W. HEITMÜLLER, F. PREISIGKE, O. BAUERNFEIND and others). More recently, the rise of the Biblical theology movement was accompanied by a strong reaction against the notion that ancient Mediterranean magic could have influenced early Christianity in any substantive way. The authors of many of the articles in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, most of whom consider themselves Biblical theologians, write as if they were involved in a conspiracy to ignore or minimize the role of magic in the New Testament and early Christian literature. However, for those who know the ways of birds there are signs in abundance that Graeco-Roman magic is again being considered a potentially fruitful subject which may illuminate important aspects of the religion of early Christians.

One important influence in the renewed interest in Graeco-Roman magic has been the revision and republication of the large corpus of Graeco-Egyptian magical papyri originally edited by K. PREISENDANZ and published in two volumes in 1928 and 1931. Careful corrections together with the addition of some supplementary material characterize this second edition of PREISENDANZ' *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri* [PGM], ed. A. HENRICHS, I (Stuttgart, 1973), II (Stuttgart, 1974). PREISENDANZ' third volume, consisting mainly of elaborate sets of indices to the first two volumes, was printed in 1941 but almost completely destroyed (along with Verlag B. G. Teubner) in 1943. Students of Graeco-Egyptian magic, therefore, await with great anticipation HENRICHS' revisions of this invaluable set of indices. Yet another important impetus for the renewed study of ancient Mediterranean magic was the discovery and publication by M. MARGALIOH of *'Sepher ha-Razim* [*'Book of Mysteries*] (Jerusalem, 1966), which was apparently a handbook of a Jewish magician, dated by MARGALIOH to possibly the third century A. D. An English translation of this Hebrew magical handbook has been made by MICHAEL MORGAN and will soon be published by Scholars Press. MARGALIOH's edition has been severely criticized by I. GRÜNWARD of Jerusalem, who believes that a more accurate edition of *'Sepher ha-Razim* is necessary.

A number of significant secondary studies which relate directly to the study of Graeco-Roman magic have appeared recently, a fact which further confirms a burgeoning scholarly interest in the subject. In M. SMITH's *'Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*' (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), the author devoted a short but superb discussion to affirming the widespread influence of ancient magic on Jesus and earliest Christianity (pp. 220–37). The next year saw appearance of J. M. HULL's *'Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*' (London, 1974), nearly half of which was devoted to a general discussion of the nature and features of Graeco-Roman magic; in spite of some rather serious flaws, HULL's book constitutes an important contribution to a seriously neglected subject. 'Jesus

the Magician' (New York, 1978) is the title of an important book by M. SMITH; in this study the author analyzes the New Testament evidence in the light of Graeco-Roman magical traditions, and concludes that Jesus is best understood in the role of a magician or sorcerer.

A number of shorter studies which pertain to our subject have also appeared which focus on the relationship between Christianity and magic in the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era. Mention should be made of A. A. BARB's 'The Survival of Magic Arts' in: *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. MOMIGLIANO (Oxford, 1963); like N. BROX, the author regards magic as a perversion of religion. Particularly noteworthy for a brilliant application of the structural-functional method of contemporary anthropological and sociological theory is P. BROWN's 'Sorcery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity', in: *Witchcraft: Confessions & Accusations*, ed. M. DOUGLAS (London, 1970). Despite the title of N. BROX's 'Magie und Aberglaube an den Anfängen des Christentums', *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*, 83 (1974), 157–80, the author devotes most of his discussion to Origen, Chrysostom and Augustine; the stubborn persistence of magical practises among Christians despite official ecclesiastical opposition is attributed to the nature of *Volks Glaube*. BROX's article, which has much to commend it, should be read in light of J. ENGEMANN's 'Zur Verbreitung magischer Übelabwehr in der nichtchristlichen und christlichen Spätantike', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 18 (1975), 22–48, in which evidence for magical practises in clerical circles is discussed.

All of the publications discussed above appear to be symptomatic of a basic shift in the intellectual climate in which ancient Mediterranean religion and society have been studied. The rise of the structural-functional method in sociology and anthropology and the phenomenological method in comparative religions have provided scholars with theoretical frameworks in which the value judgments of the observers are regarded as an improper intrusion into the subject matter. Hence it is becoming increasingly less intellectually respectable to regard ancient Mediterranean magic (no less than the magic of modern primitive societies) pejoratively. A different, but no less significant shift has occurred in the historical and cultural perspective from which New Testament scholarship has interpreted early Christian life and literature. The tendency of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* to regard early Christianity as a syncretistic phenomenon within the broader context of Graeco-Roman paganism gradually gave way to a more exclusive focus on Judaism as the primary social and religious matrix of early Christianity by the Biblical theology movement (a tendency reinforced by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947). More recently there has begun a perceptible shift on the part of New Testament scholars toward a more comprehensive emphasis on Graeco-Roman society and culture as the broader context within which both Judaism and early Christianity must be understood.

The specific objectives of the present study are three in number: (1) to summarize and criticize much of the work that has already been accomplished on the subject of the relationship of ancient magic to early Christianity, (2) to

provide a more comprehensive and consistent theoretical framework within which the study of magic and early Christianity might be pursued in a more satisfying and productive manner, and (3) to highlight the lacunae which currently exist in scholarly research. The vastness of the subject matter makes it necessary that our discussion be limited to the more important and relevant aspects of our topic.

II. The Nature and Function of Magic

For more than a century the nature and function of magic and its relationship to religion has been discussed endlessly. Prior to World War II, the discussion of magic was generally hampered by two widely-held presuppositions: that magic is easily separable from religion, and that magic is a decadent cultural phenomenon. Between the two World Wars, anthropologists turned from an earlier preoccupation with religious origins in primitive societies to more general ethnographical interests. Since World War II the seminal work of E. E. EVANS-PRITCHARD, *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande* (Oxford, 1937), appears to have again made the study of religion and magic respectable, this time within a structural-functional framework. EVANS-PRITCHARD himself recommended a moratorium on the anthropological use of the terms "religion" and "magic" as mutually exclusive phenomena capable of clear definition. He, with many other anthropologists, have come to speak more inclusively of "religio-magical" phenomena². Two discrete notions lurk behind this hyphenated adjective: (1) the distinction between magic and religion is at best ambiguous, and (2) magic, in view of its interrelationship with religion, cannot be dismissed as unimportant. EVANS-PRITCHARD regards the attempt to understand magic as a universal idea with a unique essence as a thoroughly hopeless task³.

Recent anthropological studies on magic and religion have exhibited two divergent trends. One trend, strongly influenced by EVANS-PRITCHARD, has tended to treat religio-magical phenomena only within the context of empirical studies of particular cultures thereby avoiding the temptation to formulate definitions which pretend universal validity⁴. The second trend has been the renewed consideration of the problem of the nature and function of magic and religion and

² D. F. ABERLE, *Religio-Magical Phenomena and Power, Prediction and Control*, *South-western Journal of Anthropology*, 22 (1966), 221-30.

³ E. E. EVANS-PRITCHARD, *Theories of Primitive Religion* (Oxford, 1965), p. 111.

⁴ EVANS-PRITCHARD's analyses of primitive religions exemplify the emic approach whereby definitions, distinctions and values are derived from the actors themselves rather than imposed on them by the observer; cf. E. E. EVANS-PRITCHARD, *Nuer Religion* (Oxford, 1956), p. 95; IDEM, *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande* (London, 1937), p. 21. For an excellent discussion of the terms "emic" and "etic" which have emerged from the so-called New Ethnology, see M. HARRIS, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* (New York, 1968), pp. 568-604.

their relationship to science and technology on the theoretical level⁵. Common to both trends is the emerging *communis opinio* among modern anthropologists that the older dichotomy between magic and religion is not only misleading, but that, regarded as strict categories, totally unworkable.

With few exceptions, classicists and New Testament scholars prior to World War II found it convenient to draw a distinction between magic and religion and to regard magic either as a vestige of an early stage of man's religious development⁶, or as a perverse and corrupt form of religion⁷. M. NILSSON expressed the view that the relationship to the gods in religion and magic was fundamentally different⁸. FESTUGIÈRE regarded magic as the inverse of religion⁹. PRÜMM described magic as *widerreligiös*¹⁰. In spite of the unquestioned erudition of these scholars, it is clear that the common supposition underlying these judgments is the inclination to discredit magic in contrast to religion.

A. D. NOCK, one of the more erudite historians of ancient Mediterranean religions, held a contrary opinion. "There is not, then", he claimed of the Graeco-Roman world, "as with us, a sphere of magic in contrast to the sphere of religion"¹¹. He registered strong agreement with F. PFISTER, that "there exists no fundamental distinction between incantation and prayer, just as there is none between magic and religion"¹². More recently, historians of ancient Mediterranean religions have begun to protest the rigid distinction formerly made between magic and religion¹³. Among historians of Graeco-Roman religions, as

⁵ Two articles which review the state of the question and offer new theoretical frameworks are M. and R. WAX, *The Notion of Magic*, *Current Anthropology*, 4 (1963), 495–518, and K. E. ROSENGREN, *Malinowski's Magic: The Riddle of the Empty Cell*, *Current Anthropology*, 17 (1976), 667–85.

⁶ WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF warned against mixing superstition and true religion, describing magic as *Urdummheit*, in: IDEM, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, I (Berlin, 1931), 28ff., 31. W. BOUSSET regarded magic as the lowest rung on the ladder of man's religious development (*Das Wesen der Religion* [Halle, 1903], pp. 40ff.).

⁷ The Norwegian classicist S. EITREM referred to the magical papyri as "interesting relics of degenerate religions and of the human mind gone astray" in the preface of *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. I (Oslo, 1925). More recently E. R. DODDS observed that "the magical papyri constantly operate with the debris of other people's religion" (*Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* [Cambridge, 1965], p. 73).

⁸ M. NILSSON, *Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*, in: IDEM, *Opuscula Selecta*, III (Lund, 1960), 130.

⁹ A. J. FESTUGIÈRE, *L'Idéal religieux des Grecs et L'Évangile* (Paris, 1932), p. 289.

¹⁰ K. PRÜMM, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch f. d. Raum der altchristlichen Umwelt* (Rome, 1954), p. 360.

¹¹ A. D. NOCK, *Paul and the Magus*, in: IDEM, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, I, ed. Z. STEWART (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 314.

¹² Quoted by NOCK, *Paul and the Magus*, p. 315.

¹³ J. FERGUSON, *The Religions of the Roman Empire* (Ithaca, 1970), pp. 157f.; S. G. F. BRANDON, *Magic and the Black Art*, *The Modern Churchman*, n. s., 11 (1968), 75; E. R. GOODENOUGH, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, II (New York, 1953), 155f.; M. SMITH, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), pp. 221f. Even K. PRÜMM, who regards ancient magic as *Aberglaube* from the perspective of the norms of Christian theology, realizes that it must be viewed as 'religion' from the perspective of *Religionswissenschaft* (*Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch*, p. 362).

among contemporary anthropologists, a rigid dichotomy between magic and religion has become increasingly difficult to sustain. Even among those who do propose such a theoretical distinction, inconsistencies not infrequently arise in their empirical discussions of the features of Graeco-Roman magic¹⁴.

Recognizing the difficulty of drawing a hard and fast line between magic and religion, anthropologist W. J. GOODE has formulated a number of "nondichotomous empirical differences" between magic and religion¹⁵: (1) magic tends to adopt a manipulative attitude toward "extra-ordinary" reality, while religion tends to adopt a supplicative attitude, (2) magical activities tend to be used instrumentally for specific goals, while religious activities tend to be regarded as ends in themselves, (3) magic tends to emphasize individual goals, while religion tends to focus on group goals, (4) magical activities tend to be private and individual, while religious activities tend to be carried out by groups, (5) magic tends to develop professional-client relationships, while religion tends to emphasize the "shepherd-flock" or "prophet-follower" relationship, (6) magic tends, in cases of failure, to introduce substitute techniques, while substitution is less characteristic of religion, and (7) magic tends to act impersonally with minimal emphasis on emotion, while religion tends to make greater use of emotion and to evoke attitudes of awe and worship. GOODE is exceedingly wary of formulating universally valid statements about either religion or magic unless they are carefully qualified; his discussion has not received the attention it deserves.

Perhaps the most common way in which magic has been distinguished from religion, both by behavioral scientists and historians of religion, is based on a supposed difference in attitude toward supernatural powers: magic is said to be manipulative and coercive, while religion supplicates and venerates (the hazards of such psychologizing, however, remain generally unrecognized). Historians of religion, frequently concerned with formulating universally valid generalizations, have shown themselves particularly vulnerable to this notion. The article by J. DE VRIES, *Magic and Religion, History of Religions*, 1 (1962), 214–21, sets forth just such a position; he claims that "it is generally agreed, of course, that [magic and religion] are fundamentally opposed" (p. 214), and that magic in contrast to religion adopts an audaciously coercive attitude to that which the community regards as venerable (p. 221). "The difference [between magic and religion] lies certainly not in the more or less social aspect but rather in the psychological attitude of the individual: in magic he desires to command, in religion he feels reverence" (p. 218). The basic fallacy in absolutizing this attitudinal distinction between magic and religion is the fact that it is demonstrably false:

¹⁴ FESTUGIÈRE admitted that some "magical" texts (e. g., PGM XL) are purely "religious" in nature (*L'Idéal religieux des Grecs*, p. 282); NILSSON too, in his discussion of the significance of the magical papyri remarked that "several of these invocations are quite beautiful and marked by a genuinely religious spirit" (*Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*, p. 155); DIETERICH too, who normally demarcated magic from religion, noted the great extent to which magical texts drew on material from religious texts in: *IDEM, Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 2. Aufl. (Leipzig u. Berlin, 1910), pp. 27f.

¹⁵ W. J. GOODE, *Magic and Religion: A Continuum*, *Ethnos*, 14 (1949), 172–82; *IDEM*, *Religion among the Primitives* (Glencoe, Illinois 1951), pp. 50–55.

magic not infrequently supplicates while religion not infrequently manipulates supernatural powers. In the fine study of magic in sixteenth and seventeenth century England by K. THOMAS, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (New York, 1971), the author shows how Protestant theologians attacked Catholicism by differentiating magic from religion in terms of the manipulation/supplication dichotomy (pp. 51–77 and *passim*). One suspects that this theological distinction between magic and religion which has become so influential in western religious thought has replaced an earlier implicitly sociological definition of magic which not only dominated the pre-Reformation distinction between magic and religion in Christianity, but also appears to be the central way in which the two were distinguished in the Graeco-Roman world. The attitudinal distinction between magic and religion has been emphasized by a number of historians of ancient Mediterranean religions, most notably by M. NILSSON and A. J. FESTUGIÈRE¹⁶.

Before formulating a sociological definition of the relationship of magic to religion, let us first note other ways in which magical beliefs and practices have been distinguished from those of religion, particularly by historians of Graeco-Roman religions. One of the central presuppositions of magic is said to be an understanding of the principles of cosmic sympathy and antipathy¹⁷, essential for the successful performance of magical rituals. However, the universal religious phenomenon of divination also operates on the basis of this presupposition¹⁸, making it evident that the notion of the coherence and interrelationship of the apparently discrete parts of the cosmos is hardly unique to magic. Many historians of Graeco-Roman religions have focussed on magical incantations¹⁹, or the magical ritual²⁰ as constitutive of the essence of magic. However, here too, it is difficult if not impossible to establish a phenomenological distinction between magical incantation and religious prayer or magical and religious ritual. In terms of beliefs and practices, there appears to be no thoroughly convincing way of distinguishing magic from religion. M. MAUSS emphasized this point in an attempt to formulate a general theory of magic: "... the functions of magic are not specialized. Magical life is not compartmentalized like religion. It has not led to the growth of any autonomous institutions like sacrifice and priesthood"²¹.

¹⁶ *Supra*, nn. 8 and 9.

¹⁷ J. G. FRAZER devoted a lengthy section of his *The Golden Bough*, I, 2nd ed. (New York, 1935), to the discussion of sympathetic magic (pp. 52–219), and magical sympathy and antipathy is discussed at length also in: M. MAUSS, *A General Theory of Magic* (London, 1972). For the notion in Graeco-Roman magic, see T. HOPFNER, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, I (Leipzig, 1921), paragraphs 97, 106, 378ff.; J. RÖHR, *Der okkulte Kraftbegriff im Altertum*, *Philologus*, Suppl. 17 (Leipzig, 1923).

¹⁸ R. BLOCH, *Les prodiges dans l'antiquité classique* (Paris, 1963), pp. 4ff: cf. V. TURNER's analysis of metaphor and symbol in ritual indicative of similar 'bonds of sympathy' in: *Idem*, *The Ritual Process* (Baltimore 1974).

¹⁹ K. H. E. DE JONG, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in religionsgeschichtlicher, ethnologischer und psychologischer Beleuchtung* (Leiden, 1909), p. 143.

²⁰ FESTUGIÈRE, *L'Idéal religieux des Grecs*, pp. 284ff.; PRÜMM, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch*, p. 371.

²¹ MAUSS, *A General Theory of Magic*, p. 88.

Beginning with E. DURKHEIM, the French Sociological School viewed magic as consisting of beliefs, practises and persons operating outside the religious collectivity, thereby emphasizing the individualistic, anti-social dimensions of magic²². M. MAUSS developed a more adequate view of magic and the magician on the basis of beliefs shared by the entire social unit, though magic itself was viewed as unauthorized, abnormal or at least not highly estimable²³. MAUSS saw the essence of magic in its illegality: "A magical rite is any rite which does not play a part in organized cults – it is private, secret, mysterious and approaches the limit of a prohibited rite"²⁴. More recently, a contemporary historian of ancient Mediterranean religions, J. Z. SMITH, has emphasized illegality as the one universal characteristic of magic²⁵. Between MAUSS and SMITH, of course, we have the development of the structural-functional method in anthropology and sociology in which such labels as "magic" and "magician" are viewed as playing an important role in social definition and control²⁶.

The sociological description of the nature and function of magic in relation to religion, particularly within the framework of the structural-functional method as it has been developed since World War II, appears to be the most satisfying theoretical perspective from which to analyze magic in Graeco-Roman religions. One particular branch of sociological inquiry which has risen to great prominence in America in the last decade is the study of social deviance²⁷. In spite of the enormous amount of literature on social deviance, there are only two primary theoretical approaches to the subject, symbolic interactionism and struc-

²² E. DURKHEIM, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (New York, 1965), pp. 57ff. In 'Purity and Danger: Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo' (New York, 1966), M. DOUGLAS properly criticizes DURKHEIM by claiming that he "advocated an altogether too unitary view of the social community. We should start by recognising communal life for a much more complex experience than he allowed. Then we find that DURKHEIM's idea of ritual as symbolic of social processes, can be extended to include both types of belief in contagion, religious and magical. If he could have foreseen an analysis of ritual in which none of the rules he called hygienic are without their load of social symbolism, he would presumably have been happy to discard the category of magic" (p. 22).

²³ MAUSS, *A General Theory of Magic*, pp. 24, 32.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

²⁵ J. Z. SMITH, *Good News is No News: Aretalogy and Gospel*, in: *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, ed. J. NEUSNER, I (Leiden, 1975), 23.

²⁶ DOUGLAS, *Purity and Danger*, p. 102; J. MIDDLETON and E. H. WINTER (eds.), *Witchcraft and Sorcery in East Africa* (London, 1963). However, the problems inherent in the use of the structural-functional method in this collection of essays are underlined by V. TURNER's *Witchcraft and Sorcery: Taxonomy versus Dynamics*, in: *IDEM, The Forest of Symbols* (London, 1967), pp. 112–27.

²⁷ Some significant studies of social deviance include D. C. GIBBONS and J. F. JONES, *The Study of Deviance: Perspectives and Problems* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1975); D. MATZA, *Becoming Deviant* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969); E. M. LEMERT, *Human Deviance, Social Problems & Social Control* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967); N. J. DAVIS, *Sociological Constructions of Deviance: Perspectives and Issues in the Field* (Dubuque, 1975); M. B. CLINARD, *Sociology of Deviant Behavior*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1968); K. T. ERIKSON, *On the Sociology of Deviance*, in: *The Collective Definition of Deviance*, ed. F. J. DAVIS and R. STIVERS (New York, 1975).

tural-functionalism²⁸. Labeling theory, which is frequently associated with the symbolic interactionist approach to social deviance, may equally well be adapted for use within a structural-functionalist perspective²⁹. In spite of the fact that symbolic interactionism seems to have eclipsed structural-functionalism in contemporary American sociology, the structural-functionalist approach appears better suited for dealing with the particular problems with which this article is dealing: magic in early Christianity within the context of Graeco-Roman religions³⁰.

The claim that illegality is the one universal characteristic of magic, made by J. Z. SMITH and others, is not completely satisfactory. A more adequate formulation of substantially the same point would be that magic is universally regarded as a form of deviant behavior³¹. Throughout the remainder of this study, therefore, magic is defined as that form of religious deviance whereby individual or social goals are sought by means alternate to those normally sanctioned by the dominant religious institution. Unless religious activities fit that definition, they will not be regarded as magical for the purposes of this study. Religious activities which fit this first and primary criterion must also fit a second criterion: goals sought within the context of religious deviance are magical when attained through the management of supernatural powers in such a way that results are virtually guaranteed. These two criteria incorporate many of the observations of W. J.

²⁸ The most significant scholar associated with the structural-functional approach to social deviance is R. K. MERTON, *Social Problems and Theory*, in: *Contemporary Social Problems*, ed. R. K. MERTON and R. S. NISBET, 3rd ed. (New York, 1971); R. K. MERTON, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, rev. ed. (Glencoe, Illinois, 1957). We shall rely rather heavily on MERTON's theory of anomie (pp. 131–94 in: *IDEM*, *Social Theory and Social Structure*).

²⁹ One of the more balanced discussions of labeling theory is E. M. SCHUR, *Labeling Deviant Behavior: Its Sociological Implications* (New York, 1971); two outstanding applications of labeling theory to the study of social deviance are H. S. BECKER, *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, rev. ed. (New York, 1973), and T. J. SCHEFF, *Being Mentally Ill: A Sociological Theory* (Chicago, 1966).

³⁰ S. COLE, *The Growth of Scientific Knowledge: Theories of Deviance as a Case Study*, in: *The Idea of Social Structure*, ed. L. A. COSER (New York, 1975), pp. 175–220.

³¹ R. K. MERTON defines deviant behavior as "conduct that departs significantly from the norms set for people in their social statuses" in: *IDEM*, *Social Problems and Theory*, p. 824. Similar definitions are suggested by D. C. GIBBONS and J. F. JONES, *The Study of Deviance* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1975), p. 3, and M. B. CLINARD, *Sociology of Deviant Behavior*, p. 28. N. K. DENZIN has persuasively argued that a complete theory of social deviance must account for misconduct that does not come to the attention of the agencies of social control (*Rules of Conduct and the Study of Deviant Behavior: Some Notes on the Social Relationship*, in: *Deviance and Respectability*, [ed.] JACK DOUGLAS [New York, 1970], p. 121). E. M. LEMERT has done this by differentiating between 'primary deviation' (norm-violating acts before a pejorative label is affixed), and 'secondary deviation' (norm-violating acts after the pejorative label has been affixed) in: *IDEM*, *Social Pathology* (New York, 1951), pp. 22f., 75f. In the same vein, T. J. SCHEFF formulated the concept of 'residual rule-breaking', i. e., norm-violating behavior prior to labeling (*Becoming Mentally Ill*, pp. 31–54).

GOODE within the theoretical framework of a structural-functionalist approach to social deviance.

With this definition of the role of magic in mind, let us briefly summarize the thrust of this section of our study in terms of a series of interrelated propositions: (1) Magic and religion are so closely intertwined that it is virtually impossible to regard them as discrete socio-cultural categories. (2) The structural-functional analysis of magico-religious phenomena forbids a negative attitude toward magic. (3) Magic is a phenomenon which exists only within the matrix of particular religious traditions; magic is not religion only in the sense that the species is not the genus. A particular magical system coheres within a religious structure in the sense that it shares the fundamental religious reality construction of the contextual religion. (4) Magic appears to be as universal a feature of religion as deviant behavior is of human societies.

III. Magic in Graeco-Roman Religions

The most comprehensive study of magic in the Graeco-Roman world is the unexcelled treatise of T. HOPFNER, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1921–24), presented in condensed form by the author in an extensive article entitled 'Mageia', in: PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, XIV, 1 (1928), 301–93. A new synthesis of Graeco-Roman magic is needed in view of the many archaeological and papyrological discoveries since HOPFNER's publications, as well as in consideration of the numerous contributions to scholarly research on the subject during the last two generations. Our knowledge of ancient Mediterranean magic is based on two primary classes of sources: (1) historical evidence (consisting of magical papyri³², charms and amulets³³, *tabulae execrationum*³⁴, as well as a

³² In addition to the corpus of magical papyri originally edited by K. PREISENDANZ and now revised by A. HENRICHs, see F. L. GRIFFITH and H. THOMPSON (eds.), *The Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden* (London, 1904); A. M. KROPP, *Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte*, 3 vols. (Brussels, 1930–31); V. STEGEMANN, *Die koptischen Zaubertexte der Sammlung Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer in Wien* (Heidelberg, 1934). In addition to these collections, other magical papyri continue to be published from time to time; some of these include: D. WORTMANN, *Neue magische Texte*, *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 168 (1968), 56–111; R. DANIEL, *Two Love-Charms*, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 19 (1975), 249–64; G. M. PARASSOGLOU, *Artificial Scripts and Magical Papyri*, *Studia Papyrologica*, 13 (1974), 57–60; I. PROULX and J. O'CALLAGHAN, *Papiro magico cristiano* (P. Yale inv. 989), *Studia Papyrologica*, 13 (1974), 83–88; H. QUECKE, *Ein Fragment eines koptischen Zaubertextes*, *Studia Papyrologica*, 8 (1969), 97–100. An extremely valuable commentary on PGM XXXVI is: S. EITREM (ed.), *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. I (Oslo, 1925). Other important studies or reviews of the magical papyri include A. D. Nock, *Greek Magical Papyri*, in: *Idem*, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, I (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 176–94 (originally published in 1929); S. EITREM, *Aus 'Papyrologie und Religionsgeschichte': Die magischen Papyri*, in: *Papyri und Altertumswissenschaft*.

variety of historical and philological notices preserved in extant Graeco-Roman literature³⁵), and (2) literary-folkloristic evidence (primarily analyses of magical types and motifs in Graeco-Roman folklore indicative of the myth-image, in contrast to the historical reality, of magicians and magic in the popular imagination of citizens of the ancient Mediterranean world³⁶). Any narrative sources which describe either magical activities or miraculous events will require close examination to determine the intentionality of the description so that, if possible, actual magical activities and procedures may be separated from the imaginative embellishments of folkloristic processes.

The goals of Graeco-Roman magical activities have been classified by T. HOPFNER in four major categories³⁷: (1) protective and apotropaic magic, (2)

Vorträge des 3. internationalen Papyrologentages in München vom 4. bis 7. September 1933, hrsg. von W. OTTO und L. WENGER, Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrus-Forschung, 19 (Munich, 1934), 246–63; M. NILSSON, Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri, in: IDEM, *Opuscula Selecta*, III (Lund, 1960), 129–66; A. J. FESTUGIÈRE, Excursus E: La valeur religieuse des papyrus magiques, in: IDEM, *L'Idéal religieux des Grecs et l'Évangile* (Paris, 1932), pp. 281–328.

³³ The two most important studies of Graeco-Roman magical amulets are C. BONNER, *Studies in Magical Amulets* (Ann Arbor, 1950), and A. DELATTE and P. DERCHAIN, *Les intailles magiques Gréco-Egyptiennes*, Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris, 1964). See also C. BONNER, A Miscellany of Engraved Stones, *Hesperia*, 23 (1954), 138–57; D. WORTMANN, Neue magische Gemmen, *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 175 (1975), 63–82; G. M. PARASSO-GLOU, A Christian Amulet against Snakebite, *Studia Papyrologica*, 13 (1974), 107–10; five amulets are discussed in: WORTMANN, *Neue magische Texte*, pp. 102–6. Among secondary studies, see F. ECKSTEIN and J. H. WASZINK, *Amulett, Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, I (1950), 397–411, and GOODENOUGH, *Jewish Symbols*, II, 153–295.

³⁴ R. WÜNSCH, *Defixionum Tabellae Atticae* (Berlin, 1873); A. AUDOLLENT, *Defixionum Tabellae* . . . (Paris, 1894); R. WÜNSCH, *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom* (Leipzig, 1898); cf. F. PRADEL, *Griechische und süditalienische Gebete, Beschwörungen und Rezepte des Mittelalters* (Gießen, 1907); D. R. JORDAN, A Curse Tablet from a Well in the Athenian Agora, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 19 (1975), 245–48; JORDAN's announced edition of more than 100 lead curse tablets from the Athenian agora has not yet appeared (*American Journal of Archaeology*, 78 [1974], 169). The most recent and best general treatment of the subject is K. PREISENDANZ, *Fluchtafel (Defixion)*, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, VIII (1972), 1–29 (an extensive bibliography may be found in cols. 28f.); see also S. EITREM and H. HERTER, *Bindezauber*, *RAC*, II (1954), 380–85.

³⁵ A. ABT, *Die Apologie des Apuleius von Madaura und die antike Zauberei* (Gießen, 1908); J. E. LOWE, *Magic in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1929); J. G. GRIFFITHS (ed.), *Apuleius of Madauros, The Isis-Book, Metamorphoses, Book XI* (Leiden, 1976). O. HERZIG, *Lukian als Quelle für die antike Zauberei*, Diss. Tübingen 1933 (Tübingen, 1940); H. HUBERT, *Magia*, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, III/2 (1904), 1494–1521.

³⁶ A. KARNE, *The Types of the Folktale*, trans. and rev. S. THOMPSON (Helsinki, 1961); S. THOMPSON, *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (Copenhagen, 1955–58); though dated, A. H. KRAPPE, *The Science of Folklore* (London, 1930), devotes a chapter to magic (pp. 287–300). A recent guide to bibliographical materials on the subject of folklore is J. H. BRUNVAND, *Folklore: A Study and Research Guide* (New York, 1976).

³⁷ HOPFNER, *Magia*, PW, XIV, 1 (1928), 378; IDEM, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, II, pars. 41 ff.

aggressive and malevolent magic, (3) love magic and magic aimed at the acquisition of power and control, and (4) magical divination. Unfortunately, HOPFNER has linked these primary objectives of magic in a fairly rigid way with what he regards as the three major varieties of the magical art, *Theurgie*, *Magie* and *Goëtie*³⁸. The goals of Graeco-Roman magic then, very generally, may be characterized as providing protection, healing, success and knowledge for magical practitioners and their clients, and harm for their opponents. Formulated in this way, it can be seen at once that the goals of magic are very similar to the goals of religion. The difference lies primarily in the way in which goals are achieved. Graeco-Roman magic provided an alternate means whereby goals and benefits sanctioned by religion but not easily attainable through prescribed religious observances, could be achieved by individuals in ways which pretended to guarantee results. In other words, those who failed³⁹ to achieve the particular benefits promised by religion not infrequently turned to magic for an alternate means (and one generally regarded as socially deviant) for achieving their goals. What must have been a common situation in the Graeco-Roman world is encapsulated by Plutarch: "People with chronic diseases, when they have despaired of ordinary remedies and customary regimens turn to expiations and amulets and dreams" (*de facie* 920B).

Magical practises and practitioners were generally illegal throughout the history of the Roman empire⁴⁰, though that which the Roman authorities regarded as constitutive of "magic" varied considerably from one period to another. Opposition to magic was based primarily on social rather than religious grounds. Most of the terms for magical practitioners were always used in a pejorative sense (i. e., *magicus*, *ariolus*, γόης, ἀγύρτης)⁴¹, though the term μάγος carried with it a certain oriental mystique and so could be understood in both a positive and negative way⁴². With the lone exception of μάγος in Mt. 2:1ff., these terms

³⁸ HOPFNER, Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber, II, paragraphs 41ff., 70ff. HOPFNER, perhaps following the the Neoplatonists, regards *Theurgie* as the „höchste Stufe aller Zauberei“ (Ibid., par. 42).

³⁹ MERTON, Social Theory, pp. 131–94. MERTON uses the term anomie to describe the disjunction which occurs when segments of a society find it difficult or impossible to achieve culturally valued goals by socially approved means. He presents a typology of five modes of adaptation: (1) conformity, (2) innovation, (3) ritualism, (4) retreatism, and (5) rebellion. Innovation, the pursuance of approved goals through deviant or illegitimate means, is a mode of adaptation which translated into a framework of socially approved religious goals is analogous to magic.

⁴⁰ R. MACMULLEN, *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), pp. 125ff. The author devotes a chapter to the discussion of magicians in the Roman empire (pp. 95–127).

⁴¹ MACMULLEN, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, p. 110; cf. Plutarch's attitude in *De superstitione* 165F–166A. On γόης, see G. DELLING, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, I (1964), 737f., W. BURKERT, ΓΟΗΣ, *Rheinisches Museum*, 102 (1962), 36–55; H. D. BETZ (ed.), *Plutarch's writings and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden, 1975), pp. 1ff., 154.

⁴² Nock, Paul and the Magus, pp. 308–330; G. DELLING, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, IV (1967), 356ff.

invariably carry a pejorative connotation in the New Testament and early Christian literature.

During the first century A. D., magic was a phenomenon which pervaded the various Graeco-Roman cults, Judaism and Christianity. For various reasons, magic increased in popularity from the second through the fifth centuries of the Christian era within all cults in the Roman empire. Some scholars have supposed that magic in this era was a kind of international fifth column, independent of religion and possessing a style and ethos of its own⁴³. While it is true that the papyrological evidence for Graeco-Egyptian magic exhibits a thoroughly syncretic character⁴⁴, it would be more accurate to locate the phenomenon of syncretism as the primary level of religious cults with their accompanying ideologies. Since Graeco-Egyptian cults, as Graeco-Roman religious cults generally, are marked by strong syncretistic tendencies, it should hardly occasion surprise that magical substructures within such cults should exhibit syncretic characteristics. In H. G. GUNDEL's recent study of the world view expressed in the magical papyri, he found that the *Weltanschauung* of the papyri closely corresponded to that of Graeco-Egyptian religions⁴⁵. Graeco-Roman magical traditions flourished within the matrix of the multi-valent, syncretistic phenomenon of Graeco-Roman religions; if such magic had an international character, the basis for it was the international character of religious cults.

The matrix of early Christianity was a Palestinian Judaism which had been permeated by Hellenistic influences to such an extent that any rigid distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism must be regarded as untenable⁴⁶. As Christianity expanded into the Graeco-Roman world it continued for a time to retain such a close relationship to Judaism that it was all but indistinguishable from it. During the second half of the first century, when various Christian groups began to emerge as distinct entities, Christianity became an anomaly in the

⁴³ HULL, *Hellenistic Magic*, pp. 7, 27ff.

⁴⁴ EITREM, *Die magischen Papyri*, p. 250; NILSSON, *Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*, p. 166; GOODENOUGH, *Jewish Symbols*, 153ff.

⁴⁵ H. G. GUNDEL, *Vom Weltbild in den griechischen Zauberpapyri: Probleme und Ergebnisse*, in: *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology at Michigan* (Toronto, 1970), p. 185; this article should be read as a supplement to his earlier book, *IDEM, Weltbild und Astrologie in den griechischen Zauberpapyri* (München, 1968).

⁴⁶ M. SMITH, *Palestinian Judaism in the First Century*, in: *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*, ed. M. DAVIS (New York, 1966), 67–81; I. H. MARSHALL, *Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments*, *New Testament Studies*, 19 (1972–73), 271–87; M. HENGEL, *Judaism and Hellenism, I*, trans. J. BOWDEN (Philadelphia, 1974), 252, 311f.; D. FLUSSER, *Paganism in Palestine, The Jewish People in the First Century*, Section I of *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, I* (Philadelphia, 1976), pp. 1065–1100; this last article should be supplemented with M. SMITH's 'On the Wine God in Palestine', in: *Salo Wittmayer Baron Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem, 1975), pp. 815–29; E. P. SANDERS, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (London, 1969), pp. 190–255; B. LIFSCHITZ, *L'hellénisation des juifs de Palestine*, *Revue Biblique*, 4 (1965), 520–38; W. D. DAVIES, *Paul and Judaism*, in: *The Bible and Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. P. HYATT (Nashville, 1965), pp. 178–83.

ancient world: it became a religious tradition unrelated to nationality⁴⁷. Graeco-Roman "religion" (one must remember that the Greeks had no comprehensive term for religion as a distinct socio-cultural phenomenon)⁴⁸ consisted of three major types: (1) state cults, (2) mystery cults, and (3) philosophical sects or schools. Within this framework, Judaism constituted a state cult with a large diaspora constituency until shortly after A.D. 70.

For reasons which need not be elaborated here, Christianity was less syncretistic than most other Graeco-Roman cults, while Judaism was even less syncretistic than Christianity⁴⁹. Both Christianity and Judaism retained a sense of self-identity partially expressed in the separation of Judaism from Christianity and the distance which both cults felt from other Graeco-Roman religio-cultural traditions. If magic is a general substructure of all religions, one would assume that both Judaism and Christianity would develop magical traditions in a manner consistent with their religious systems. I think that J. TRACHTENBERG is clearly in error when he denies the existence of a distinctive form of Jewish magic until the post-Talmudic period⁵⁰. Similarly, the present study will attempt to make it clear that early Christianity rapidly developed a distinctive form of magic which cohered with its reality construction⁵¹; early Christian writers unwittingly mapped the contours of Christian magic in their apologetic program developed in rebuttal to pagan and Jewish charges that Christians practised sorcery.

Early Christianity soon stood in an ambiguous and anomalous position between Judaism on the one hand and Graeco-Roman society on the other. Since Christianity began as a religious movement within Judaism and became institutionalized within the Graeco-Roman world, one suspects that there was never a time when magical traditions did not exert strong influences upon it. During the first centuries of the Christian era, magic (despite its deviant religious character) constituted a strong undercurrent in Judaism⁵², and Jewish magic certainly be-

⁴⁷ M. NILSSON, *Universal Religion*, in: IDEM, *Opuscula Selecta*, III (Lund, 1960), 383; J. Z. SMITH, *Native Cults in the Hellenistic Period*, *History of Religions*, 11 (1971-72), 236-49.

⁴⁸ A. D. NOCK, *Conversion* (Oxford, 1933), p. 10.

⁴⁹ D. E. AUNE, *Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism*, *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 7 (1976), 1-10.

⁵⁰ J. TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion* (New York, 1939), p. 11.

⁵¹ BARB, *The Survival of Magic Arts*, p. 107.

⁵² The standard treatment of ancient Jewish magic remains that of L. BLAU, *Das altjüdische Zauberen*, 2. Aufl. (Straßburg i. E., 1914); S. LIEBERMAN supplements and corrects BLAU in: IDEM, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (Philadelphia, 1942), pp. 91-114. Other important discussion include E. SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, III, 2. Aufl. (Leipzig, 1911), 407-20; J. TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*; M. SIMON, *Verus Israel* (Paris, 1948), pp. 394-431; E. R. GOODENOUGH, *Jewish Symbols*, II, 151-295; J. NEUSNER, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (Leiden, 1965-70), II, 147-50; III, 110-26; IV, 330-62; V, 174-96, 217-43 (all excellent discussions); J. GOLDIN, *The Magic of Magic and Superstition*, in: *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. E. S. FIORENZA (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1976), pp. 115-47; M. HENGEL, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 239-41; II, 88 (n. 175); on magic at Qumran, see M. DELCOR, *Recherches sur un horoscope en langue hébraïque*

came part of the Christian heritage⁵³. As Christianity emerged from Judaism in consequence of its paganization, it continued to absorb magical traditions from the surrounding Graeco-Roman world⁵⁴.

Several particular features of magic in the Graeco-Roman world require comment prior to a more detailed discussion of magic in early Christianity.

1. One important feature of magic during this period was the irregularity of its utilization in contrast to the carefully structured recurrent observances of religious rituals. The very routine periodicity of religious observance tended to make the cult unresponsive to the irregularity and unpredictability of crises, particularly during the Hellenistic and Roman era. Magic was frequently resorted to as an alternate, though socially deviant, way of dealing with unanticipated needs and crises.

2. Magic appears to have been far more popular among the lower, uneducated classes in the Graeco-Roman world than among the upper classes⁵⁵. Those who were educated and affluent associated magical practises with the uneducated and poor in the lower strata of society (Origen contra Celsum 6.41; 7.4; Philostratus vit. sophist. 523, 590). Certainly the Greek of the magical papyri is the unpretentious common language of the people, not the cultivated, literary and atticistic language of the educated⁵⁶. Since the Graeco-Roman literature which is extant was produced and transmitted by the educated, rarely are the views of the common people adequately represented⁵⁷.

3. The popular distinction between magic and miracle has it that the latter is more "religious" than the former⁵⁸. In reality, the magic/miracle dichotomy is not only an artificial distinction which presupposes an unambiguous difference between magic and religion, it also appears to have little value in interpreting the evidence available to us from the Graeco-Roman period⁵⁹. J. M. HULL in his book 'Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition', devotes a chapter to the discussion of 'Miracle and Magic' (pp. 45–72). HULL suggests that a miracle

provenant de Qumran, *Revue de Qumran*, 5 (1966), 521–42; J. CARMIGNAC, *Les horoscopes de Qumran*, *Revue de Qumran*, 5 (1965), 199–217. For general bibliography see G. DELLING, *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1965*, TU, 1961, 2. Aufl. (Berlin, 1975), pp. 177f. („Zaubertexte“).

⁵³ R. KRAFT, *The Multiform Jewish Heritage of Early Christianity*, in: *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, III, ed. J. NEUSNER (Leiden, 1975), 196f.

⁵⁴ Effectively demonstrated by BROX, *Magie und Aberglaube*, pp. 158–61.

⁵⁵ N. BROX, *Der einfache Glaube und die Theologie: zur altkirchlichen Geschichte eines Dauerproblems*, *Kairos*, 14 (1972), 161–87.

⁵⁶ PRÜMM, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch*, p. 369.

⁵⁷ The dichotomy between the religion of the upper classes and that of the lower classes is the focus of M. NILSSON's 'Problems of the History of Greek Religion in the Hellenistic and Roman Age', *Harvard Theological Review*, 36 (1943), 251–75; on p. 254, speaking of scholars who follow one of two major approaches to the study of Greek religion, he observes that "they call attention to rites and magic, to ideas and doctrines without due regard to the social changes and stratifications of the population."

⁵⁸ PRÜMM, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch*, pp. 360f.; W. HEITMÜLLER, *Im Namen Jesu* (Göttingen, 1903), p. 159.

⁵⁹ M. NILSSON, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, II, 2. Aufl. (München, 1961), 520–34.

is partly or wholly magical if it: (1) has no cause but the will of the wonder-worker, or (2) is based on a cause-and-effect theory of sympathetic bonds, or (3) is brought about by human effort through a ritual performance (p. 54). This distinction between magic and miracle is based on HULL's substantive definition of magic as a belief that supernatural entities are linked by invisible bonds of sympathy to visible symbols of their powers in such a way that a knowledge of these powers, their sympathies, antipathies and symbols makes it possible to exert influence and control over the forces of the universe (pp. 37f.). HULL's distinction between magic and miracle is unsatisfactory because there is little in the definition which is distinctive of magic in contrast to religion, and the sympathy/antipathy theory cannot be regarded as unique to magic (*supra*, n. 18). Besides, how can an event be "partly" magical? If we define "miracle" in a commonly accepted way — R. SWINBURNE, for example, has defined miracle as "an event of an extraordinary kind, brought about by a god, and of religious significance"⁶⁰ — it becomes evident that "miracle" is a product of mankind's mythopoetic capabilities. Extraordinary events which are categorized as magic should properly consist of the perceived results of ritualistic procedures which are believed to effect desirable goals within the framework of religious deviance. The fact that popular imagination credited magicians in the Graeco-Roman world with abilities to perform many impossible feats (bringing down the moon, flying through the air, walking on water, eclipsing the sun, transformation into non-human forms)⁶¹, and magicians themselves were not infrequently taken in by their own act (PGM, XXXIV contains a number of astonishing claims)⁶², mean only that mythopoeism can structure experience as well as belief.

4. Finally, our sources reveal three relatively distinct functions of magic in the Graeco-Roman world, all of which require a setting in social deviance: (1) the pragmatic, goal-oriented utilization of deviant religious procedures and materials to achieve particular goals for individuals, (2) the imaginative literary and folkloristic portraits of magicians and magical activities which are based upon, but not limited to, the actual, historical practise of magic in the ancient Mediterranean

⁶⁰ *The Concept of Miracle* (London, 1970), p. 1.

⁶¹ HOPFNER, *Magia*, 374ff. Hippocrates *Morb. Sacr.* 4; Lucian *Philops.* 13f.

⁶² J. Z. SMITH, referring to the work of R.-L. WAGNER ("Sorcier" et "Magicien": Contribution à l'histoire du vocabulaire de la magie [Paris, 1939], pp. 26–35), suggests that the distinction between the sincere and the charlatan magician is a significant and pervasive division in the phenomenology of magical practitioners. Sociologically, this psychological approach appears beset by many pitfalls. In the performance of social roles, to use I. GOFFMAN's dramaturgical metaphor, the performer may be taken in by his own act or not (*The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life* [New York, 1955], p. 17). For sociological issues it is generally unnecessary to decide which is the more real, the fostered impression or the one the performer attempts to conceal from the audience (*Ibid.*, pp. 65f.). One can profitably study false performances to learn about honest ones (*Ibid.*, p. 66). The problem is further complicated by the fact that sincerity and fraud can be found in the same individual claiming to possess magical powers. Shamans apparently add fraud to their performances, yet still retain a belief in their own supernatural powers; cf. A. L. KROEBER, *The Nature of Culture* (Chicago, 1952), p. 311, and C. LÉVI-STRAUSS, *Structural Anthropology* (Garden City, New York, 1967), pp. 161–80.

world, and (3) the use of accusations of the practise of magic as a means of social control and definition. Religious propaganda of the Graeco-Roman era was replete with accusations that various individuals or groups practised magic, together with the defense of those charges⁶³. In view of the general illegality of magic in the Roman empire, the accusation of magic is, among other things a form of social control used by those within the dominant social structure to label and exert control on those in the ambiguous and unstructured areas of society⁶⁴. In view of the fact that the charge of sorcery or magic is part of a constellation of accusations of antisocial behavior levelled at marginal or interstitial individuals and groups⁶⁵, from a sociological perspective the validity or invalidity of the charge itself becomes relatively unimportant, though from a historical perspective, however, it becomes crucial.

IV. Jesus and Magic

The complex nature of the primary sources for our knowledge of the historical Jesus, the canonical gospels, is such that the authentic historical features of the life and activities of Jesus of Nazareth can only be extricated with great difficulty from the folkloristic embellishments, idealizations and editorial tendencies found in the gospels and the traditions of which they are constituted. Many of these traditions are directly relevant for a consideration of the nature and function of magic in the life and activities of Jesus. In this study we shall focus on the miracle tradition contained in the gospels, in spite of the fact that a full treatment of the subject of "Jesus and Magic" would include many other topics⁶⁶, though perhaps of less central significance. The miracle tradition of the gospels contains accounts of six exorcisms⁶⁷, seventeen healings⁶⁸, and eight so-called nature mir-

⁶³ A. B. KOLENKOW, *A Problem of Power: How Miracle Doers Counter Charges of Magic in the Hellenistic World*, Society of Biblical Literature, 1976, Seminar Papers (Missoula, 1976), pp. 105–10; P. BROWN, *Sorcery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity*, in: *Witchcraft: Confessions & Accusations*, ed. M. DOUGLAS (London, 1970); S. ISSER, *Dositheus, Jesus, and a Moses Aretalogy*, in: *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, IV, ed. J. NEUSNER (Leiden, 1975), 167–89.

⁶⁴ DOUGLAS, *Purity and Danger*, p. 102; on this aspect of Ms. DOUGLAS' work, see S. R. ISENBERG and D. E. OWEN, *Bodies Natural and Contrived: The Work of Mary Douglas*, *Religious Studies Review*, 3 (1977), 1–17.

⁶⁵ M. ELIADE, *Some Observations on European Witchcraft*, *History of Religions*, 14 (1975), 149–72. In 'Jewish Magic and Superstition', pp. 1–10, J. TRACHTENBERG summarizes medieval legends of Jewish sorcery.

⁶⁶ A fuller approach to this subject is sketched out by M. SMITH, *Clement of Alexandria*, pp. 220–37.

⁶⁷ (1) the Demoniac in the Synagogue (Mk. 1:23–27; Lk. 4:33–36); (2) the Gerasene Demoniac (Mk. 5:1–20; Mt. 8:28–34; Lk. 8:26–39); (3) the Daughter of the Syrophenician Woman (Mk. 7:24–30; Mt. 15:21–28); (4) the "Epileptic" Boy (Mk. 9:14–29; Mt. 17:14–21; Lk. 9:27–43); (5) the Dumb Demoniac (Mt. 9:32–34); (6) the Blind and Dumb Demoniac (Mt. 12:22–23; Lk. 11:15).

⁶⁸ (1) Peter's Mother-in-law (Mk. 1:29–31; Mt. 8:14–15; Lk. 4:38–39); (2) the Leper (Mk.

acles⁶⁹. Next in importance are the generalizing descriptions of Jesus' program of wonderworking⁷⁰, allusions to miracles performed by his disciples⁷¹, references to specific miracles which are alluded to but not narrated⁷², and various feats of Jesus wherein he appears to exercise supernatural powers⁷³. Finally we have what appear to be the remnants of accusations levelled at the historical Jesus to the effect that he practised magic⁷⁴.

Did the historical Jesus actually perform miracles? Predictably, conservative New Testament scholars argue for the complete historicity of the miracle tradition, but their arguments are theologically and apologetically motivated⁷⁵. However, there is also general consensus among critical New Testament scholars that there is overwhelming evidence that Jesus did in fact perform exorcisms and healings⁷⁶. The nature miracles, however, are generally regarded as legendary embellishments of the Jesus tradition. The historicity of the exorcisms is particularly emphasized by a number of prominent critical scholars⁷⁷.

1:40-45; Mt. 8:1-4; Lk. 5:12-16); (3) the Paralytic (Mk. 2:1-12; Mt. 9:1-8; Lk. 5:17-26); (4) the Man with the Withered Hand (Mk. 3:1-6; Mt. 12:9-14; Lk. 6:6-11); (5) the Daughter of Jairus (Mk. 5:21-43; Mt. 9:18-26; Lk. 8:40-56); (6) the Woman with the Hemorrhage (Mk. 5:25-34; Mt. 9:20-22; Lk. 8:43-48); (7) the Deaf Mute (Mk. 7:31-36); (8) the Blind Man near Bethsaida (Mk. 8:22-26); (9) Blind Bartimaeus (Mk. 10:46-52; Mt. 9:27-34; Lk. 18:35-43); (10) the Young Man at Nain (Lk. 7:11-17); (11) the Bent Woman (Lk. 13:10-17); (12) the Ten Lepers (Lk. 17:11-19); (13) the Man with Dropsy (Lk. 14:1-6); (14) the Paralytic (Jn. 5:1-9); (15) the Raising of Lazarus (Jn. 11); (16) the Man Born Blind (Jn. 9:1-41); (17) the Centurion's Servant (Mt. 8:5-13; Jn. 4:46-54).

⁶⁹ (1) the Stilling of the Storm (Mk. 4:35-41; Mt. 8:23-27; Lk. 8:22-25); (2) the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mk. 6:30-44; Mt. 14:13-21; Lk. 9:10-17; Jn. 6:1-15); (3) the Feeding of the Four Thousand (Mk. 8:1-10; Mt. 15:32-39); (4) Walking on Water (Mk. 6:45-52; Mt. 14:22-33; Jn. 6:16-21); (5) the Cursing of the Fig Tree (Mk. 11:12-14, 20-26; Mt. 21:18-22); (6) the Coin in the Fish's Mouth (Mt. 17:24-27); (7) the Miraculous Catch of Fish (Lk. 5:1-11; cf. Jn. 21:1-11); (8) the Transformation of Water to Wine (Jn. 2:1-11).

⁷⁰ (1) Mk. 1:32-34; Mt. 8:16; Lk. 4:40-41; (2) Mk. 1:39; Mt. 4:24; (3) Mk. 3:10-11; Lk. 6:17-18; (4) Mk. 6:56; Mt. 14:36.

⁷¹ (1) Mk. 3:14-15; (2) Mk. 6:7; Mt. 10:1; Lk. 9:1; (3) Mk. 9:18, 28; Mt. 17:16, 19; Lk. 9:40; (4) Mk. 16:17-18; (5) Lk. 10:17-20.

⁷² Mary Magdalene is said to have been relieved of seven demons (Lk. 8:2; cf. Mk. 16:9).

⁷³ Jesus possesses supernatural knowledge (Jn. 1:47-51; 2:25; 6:70-71), he escapes miraculously from enemies (Lk. 4:29-30; cf. Jn. 8:59 [var. lec.]), and he has prophetic foreknowledge; many other such characteristics could be listed.

⁷⁴ These will be discussed below in some detail.

⁷⁵ The most comprehensive recent attempt to demonstrate the historicity of Jesus' miracles is: H. VAN DER LOOS, *The Miracles of Jesus*, Nov.Test. Suppl. 9 (Leiden, 1965).

⁷⁶ F. C. CONYBEARE *Myth, Magic and Morals: A Study of Christian Origins* (London, 1910), pp. 142f.; R. M. GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought* (Amsterdam, 1952), p. 168; A. FRIDRICHSEN, *The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity* (Minneapolis, 1972), p. 26; R. FULLER, *Interpreting the Miracles* (Philadelphia, 1963), pp. 18-29; R. BULTMANN, *Jesus and the Word* (New York, 1958), p. 173.

⁷⁷ R. BULTMANN, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, I (Tübingen, 1948), p. 28; R. BULTMANN, *The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus*, in: *The Historical Jesus*

While there is no infallible way of confirming or disconfirming the historicity of particular exorcisms or healings once the legendary embellishments have been stripped away, there are several general arguments which are used to affirm the essential historicity of the wonderworking activities of Jesus: (1) The fact that Jewish⁷⁸ and pagan⁷⁹ sources label Jesus as a magician can be regarded as independent evidence reflecting the fact that the historical Jesus was a wonder-worker⁸⁰. However, since much of this corroborative evidence does not antedate the second century, it may simply reflect attitudes toward the image of Jesus which had crystalized in Christian literature and teaching⁸¹. (2) The fact that the miracles of Jesus are found in every stratum of gospel tradition is indicative that the tradition has a historical core⁸². (3) Since the Jesuanic miracle tradition possesses some distinctive features unparalleled in Judaism, the Graeco-Roman world or early Christianity, those features necessarily derive from Jesus himself⁸³. (4) Since most of the healings and exorcisms found in the tradition can be construed as psychosomatic cures, their occurrence is not an a priori historical impossibility⁸⁴. (5) The title 'Son of David', which is embedded in two exorcism

and the Kerygmatic Christ, ed. C. BRAATEN and R. HARRISVILLE (New York, 1964), p. 22; N. PERRIN, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York, 1967), p. 65; S. V. McCASLAND, *By the Finger of God: Demon Possession and Exorcism in Early Christianity in the Light of Modern Views of Mental Illness* (New York, 1951), 54–82.

⁷⁸ Jewish traditions of Jesus as a sorcerer and magician have been collected by H. L. STRACK, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben* (Leipzig, 1910); H. L. STRACK and P. BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, I (München, 1926), 38ff., 84ff., 631. For discussion, see BLAU, *Das alt-jüdische Zauberesen*, pp. 29, 57, n. 4; R. TRAVERS HERFORD, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London, 1903), pp. 35–41, 54–56; SAMUEL KRAUSS, *Jesus*, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, VII (1904), 170–73 (an excellent discussion); T. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth* (Boston, 1964), pp. 18–47; H. VAN DER LOOS, *The Miracles of Jesus*, pp. 156–75. Christian sources reflecting Jewish charges that Jesus practised magic include Justin Dial. 69.5; 1 Apol. 30; Origen contra Celsum 1. 28; Arnobius adv. nat. 1. 43; Lactantius div. inst. 4. 15. 1.

⁷⁹ Origen contra Celsum 1. 6, 28, 38, 68; 2. 9, 14, 16, 48, 49; 6. 77. Celsus refers to Jesus' miracles as "inventions and myths" (πλάσματα καὶ μῦθοι) in 3. 27; 5. 51, 57; 7. 77.

⁸⁰ FULLER, *Interpreting the Miracles*, p. 23; PERRIN, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, p. 65.

⁸¹ *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, VII, 170ff.; P. WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus* (Berlin, 1961), p. 144. WINTER briefly discusses one of the more important Jewish texts in the Babylonian Talmud on this subject, Sanhedrin 43a, and claims that it is based on Christian (literary) sources. E. STAUFFER, on the other hand, regards Sanhedrin 43a as evidence that Jesus was charged with sorcery (among other things) at his trial (*Jesus, Gestalt und Geschichte* [Bern, 1957], p. 19).

⁸² PERRIN, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, p. 65 (congruent with PERRIN's "criterion of multiple attestation" discussed on pp. 45ff.); R. BULTMANN, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York, 1963), p. 239.

⁸³ For example, "faith" in many of the miracle stories is used in an absolute sense and is not faith 'in' or 'on' any one or any thing; this is claimed to be unique, cf. PERRIN, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 130–42; J. ROLOFF, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus* (Göttingen, 1970), pp. 152–73.

⁸⁴ J. D. G. DUNN, *Jesus and the Spirit* (Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 74ff.; McCASLAND, *By the Finger of God*.

stories (Mt. 12:23; 15:22) and one healing story (Mk. 10:47–48; Mt. 9:27; 20:30f.; Lk. 18:38f.) can now be understood as a possible reference to “Solomon” and to the very considerable tradition of magic and healing which was associated with that name⁸⁵; since this connotation of the title was understood as little by New Testament authors as by modern New Testament scholars⁸⁶, it has a strong claim to historicity. On these bases, we regard it as entirely plausible that Jesus performed deeds which both he and those about him regarded as miraculous feats of exorcism and healing.

Before considering the relationship of the miracle tradition to magic in greater detail, it is first necessary to discuss the context of the thaumaturgical activities of Jesus. Several scholars have noted that, when compared with Jewish or Graeco-Roman miracle stories, those in the gospels are similar in content, but differ in context⁸⁷. The supposed unique context of Jesus’ miracles is their eschatological setting within the framework of Jewish apocalypticism. Jesus’ miracles are unique in that, while non-Christian miracle stories exalt the person of the performer and are done as ends in themselves, those effected by Jesus have an eschatological significance in that they are subordinate to the proclamation of the nearness of the Kingdom of God⁸⁸. While these arguments are not basically incorrect, they have been erroneously used to claim that Jesus’ thaumaturgical activities cannot be considered magical.

⁸⁵ L. R. FISHER, ‘Can This Be the Son of David?’ in: *Jesus and the Historian*, ed. F. T. TROTTER (Philadelphia, 1968), pp. 82–97; K. BERGER, *Die königlichen Messias-traditionen des Neuen Testaments*, *New Testament Studies*, 20 (1973), pp. 3–9; BERGER argues that “son of David” designates the Messiah as an exorcist and miracle worker, arguing against those that contend that Jewish messianic expectation was not tied to miracle working. See also E. LÖVESTAM, *Dauids-son-kristologin hos synoptikerna*, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*, 15 (1972), 198–210. FISHER, BERGER and LÖVESTAM are criticized by D. C. DULING, *Solomon, Exorcism, and the son of David*, *Harvard Theological Review*, 68 (1975), 235–52. On the connection between the figure of Solomon and magic, see C. C. McCOWN, *The Testament of Solomon* (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 48f., and STRACK–BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, IV, 510ff., 533f. (Solomon as the patron of exorcists).

⁸⁶ Cf. H. C. KEE, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark’s Gospel* (Philadelphia, 1977), p. 171: “the appropriateness of Bartimaeus’ calling Jesus ‘Son of David’ is not at all clear”. Further, the major handbooks on New Testament Christology do not even mention the Solomonic tradition under the rubric of “Son of David”; cf. R. H. FULLER, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York, 1965); O. CULLMANN, *The Christology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia, 1963); F. HAHN, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (New York and Cleveland, 1969).

⁸⁷ GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 172; G. K. BARRETT, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London, 1966), p. 57.

⁸⁸ H. C. KEE, *The Terminology of Mark’s Exorcism Stories*, *New Testament Studies*, 14 (1967–68), pp. 239, 245f. P. ACHTEMEIER, *Gospel Miracle Tradition and the Divine Man*, *Interpretation*, 26 (1972), 185; E. SCHWEIZER, *Jesus* (Richmond, 1972), p. 43; H. C. KEE, *Community of the New Age*, p. 23; H. VAN DER LOOS, *The Miracles of Jesus*, p. 150; R. PESCH, *Jesu ureigene Taten?* (Freiburg, 1970), pp. 24f.

Both historically and sociologically, the most appropriate designation for the role which Jesus assumed is that of messianic prophet⁸⁹; the particular type of collective behavior which he sparked must correspondingly be labeled as a millennial movement⁹⁰. Just as the comparative study of millennial movements has shown that magic functions in such a way that the leaders of such movements are supernaturally legitimated, so the thaumaturgical activities of Jesus appear to have functioned as a form of supernatural legitimation supporting his role as messianic prophet. Sociologically, millennial movements are a collective form of deviant behavior. Consequently, in line with the definition of magic which we have formulated above, we are disposed to regard wonderworking within the context of a millennial movement as essentially magical. Further, in B. WILSON's comprehensive study of millennial movements in Third World countries, those who join such movements are generally conscious of being afflicted with evils which the contextual social system has been impotent to solve. According to WILSON, "The living god, the man who claims to be a messiah, must of necessity be a thaumaturge. He may not practise much and he may rely largely on legendary feats, but usually he will be obliged to appear and to manifest power Casting out demons and countering such evils, healing the sick, and purging or curing wizards are his specialty"⁹¹. The subordinate function of

⁸⁹ The question of whether or not Jesus self-consciously played the role of a messiah is still hotly debated; I continue to maintain the position that he did in fact conceptualize his own role in a manner similar to other charismatic or prophetic-messianic leaders of millennial movements during the first century; cf. D. E. AUNE, *The Problem of the Messianic Secret*, *Novum Testament*, 11 (1969), 1-31; *idem*, *A Note on Jesus' Messianic Consciousness and 11Q Melchisedek*, *Evangelical Quarterly*, 45 (1973), 161-65. It is of course a matter of historical record that no Jew explicitly claimed to be the messiah prior to Bar Cochba. However, the title "messiah" does not appear to have functioned as an exclusive label for this role prior to the late first century A.D.; cf. M. DE JONGE, *The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus*, *Novum Testamentum*, 7 (1966), 133f. Completely unacceptable is the thesis propagated by some New Testament scholars that Jesus cannot be categorized in terms of psychology, comparative religion or general history; this position has been maintained by M. HENGEL, *Nachfolge und Charisma* (Berlin, 1968), pp. 97f., and E. KÄSEMANN, *The Problem of the Historical Jesus*, in: *idem*, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London, 1964), p. 46.

⁹⁰ J. G. GAGER, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1975), pp. 20-37; S. R. ISENBERG, *Millenarianism in Greco-Roman Palestine*, *Religion*, 4 (1974), 24-46. In B. R. WILSON's recent comparative study of millennial movements, *'Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third World Peoples'* (New York, 1973), the author suggests a schema of eight types of millennial movements, each of which constitutes a distinctive "supernaturalistic response to the world". The two ideal types proposed by WILSON which appear to be the most useful for analyzing the movement centering in Jesus are the thaumaturgical movement and the conversionist movement. The former centers on a religious practitioner or charismatic leader who, through his wonderworking, lays claim to supernatural forms of legitimation (pp. 133f.). The leader must incorporate such magical activities as healing and exorcism into his role because those who join such movements characteristically believe in and demand supernatural communications and manifestations of power that have immediate personal significance (p. 70).

⁹¹ WILSON, *Magic and the Millennium*, p. 134.

magic within such movements gives it a dynamic role in contrast with the more mechanistic overtones which magical activities appear to have in other social settings. Nevertheless, magic is magic regardless of whether the context is individual or collective social deviance.

The millennial movement initiated by Jesus, though more successful ultimately than other such movements in Graeco-Roman Palestine, was nevertheless just one among a number of such movements⁹². Demonstrations of magical power appear to have been a central feature of those movements of which we have any knowledge. The revolt of Theudas (ca. A.D. 44–46) is reported in Josephus Ant. 20. 97–98 and Acts 5:36; he attempted to lead a band of 400 dryshod over the Jordan in an apparent attempt to replicate the feat of Joshua. He was slain and his followers scattered by the Romans. Josephus refers to Theudas as a γόης, though he seems to have designated himself as a προφήτης. The revolt of Judas the Galilean is also reported by Josephus Ant. 18. 1–10; 20. 102; Wars 2. 117f. and Acts 5:37; he also appears to have presupposed the assistance of God. An unnamed Samaritan led a revolt reported in Josephus Ant. 18. 85–87, and led a group of followers to Mt. Gerizim in Samaria expecting to recover miraculously the ancient Temple vessels; he too must be regarded as having conceived of himself as an eschatological prophet⁹³. Again, in Josephus Ant. 20. 196–72; Wars 2. 261–63 and Acts 21:31, we read of an unnamed Egyptian who designated himself as a προφήτης; Josephus, however, labels him a ψευδοπροφήτης and a γόης. This revolutionary figure intended to lead a band of 30,000 followers to the Mount of Olives, from which vantage point he intended to cause the walls of Jerusalem to fall down.

Twice Josephus summarizes the activities of first century Palestinian millennial movements. In Ant. 20. 167f., he makes this descriptive generalization:

“Moreover, imposters and deceivers [γόητες καὶ ἀπατεῶνες ἄνθρωποι] called upon the mob to follow them into the desert. For they said that they would show them un mistakeable marvels and signs [τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα] that would be wrought in harmony with God’s design.”

A similar summary is found in Wars 2. 259:

“Deceivers and impostors [πλάνοι γὰρ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἀπατεῶνες] under the pretense of divine inspiration fostering revolutionary changes, they persuaded the multitude to act like madmen, and led them out into the desert under the belief that God would there give them tokens of deliverance [σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας].”

⁹² E. MEYER, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, II (Berlin, 1925), 402–12; HENGEL, *Nachfolge und Charisma*, pp. 23–27; D. M. RHOADS, *Israel in Revolution: 6–74 C.E., A Political History Based on the Writings of Josephus* (Philadelphia, 1976); ISENBERG, *Millenarianism in Greco-Roman Palestine*.

⁹³ M. F. COLLINS, *Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions*, *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 3 (1972), 97–116.

The frequency and spontaneity of these several instances of collective deviant behavior in first century Palestine reveal the presence of deep-seated tensions and strains in that society. The mundane goals of the Jewish religion (peace, prosperity, long life, fruitfulness of the womb and field, health, etc.) were frustrated by both economic conditions⁹⁴ and the religious establishment⁹⁵. Both Jesus' teaching and his wonderworking activities constituted alternate, though socially deviant, means of achieving acceptable goals; widespread experience of dissatisfaction and frustration virtually ensured his success.

At this point let us summarize the major features of Jesus' techniques of exorcism and healing as they appear in the gospel tradition. Exorcisms are generally distinguished from healings in the tradition⁹⁶: exorcism relieves sufferers from the adverse effects of being possessed by malevolent supernatural beings (demons), while healing with a few major exceptions does not appear to presuppose that disease or physical malfunctions have a demonic cause⁹⁷. A closer analysis of the healing narratives, however, reveals that they stand in a more fluid relationship to exorcism stories than first appears⁹⁸. While Jesus' exorcistic and healing technique does not follow a rigid or invariable pattern, at least two generalizations can be made about it: (1) Jesus never touched demon-possessed individuals; on the other hand, the technique of touching was the characteristic way in which he healed the sick and infirm. (2) Jesus' own use of the authoritative word of command was perhaps the most characteristic technique which he used to effect both exorcisms and healings.

While the synoptic tradition (the Fourth Gospel is completely silent at this point) preserves only six accounts of Jesus' exorcisms, three sayings which deal specifically with exorcisms (Lk. 11:19–20 [Mt. 12:27–28]; 13:32; Mk. 3:19–27 [Mt. 12:25–26, 29; Lk. 11:17–18a, 21–22]), and a few editorial summaries which mention his ministry of exorcism⁹⁹, they have a strong basic claim to

⁹⁴ S. APPLEBAUM, *Economic Life in Palestine, The Jewish People in the First Century*, Section I of *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, II (Philadelphia, 1976), 631–700.

⁹⁵ S. R. ISENBERG, *Power through Temple and Torah in Greco-Roman Palestine*, in: *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, II, ed. J. NEUSNER (Leiden, 1975) 24–52.

⁹⁶ S. EITREM, *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Oslo, 1966), pp. 34f. Healings and exorcisms are differentiated in the following passages: Mk. 1:32–34 (Mt. 8:16; Lk. 4:40f.); 1:39 (Mt. 4:24); 3:10–11 (Lk. 6:17–18); Lk. 13:32.

⁹⁷ In the story of the healing of the woman with a "spirit of infirmity" (Lk. 13:10–17), the cause of the woman's distress is specifically described as a "binding" (δεῖν) effected by Satan. For the magical use of δεῖν καὶ λύειν, see F. BÜCHSEL, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, II (1964), 60, n. 3. Since Jesus heals her by touch, some have argued that this is not an exorcism; however, the texts should not be interpreted that rigidly.

⁹⁸ Several miracle stories contain traces of exorcistic language; J. M. ROBINSON, *The Problem of History in Mark* (London, 1957), p. 40; O. BÖCHER, *Christus Exorcista: Dämonismus und Taufe im Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart, 1972), pp. 70–76.

⁹⁹ For the six exorcisms, cf. *supra*, n. 67; for the editorial statements which mention exorcism: Mk. 1:32ff. (Mt. 8:16; Lk. 4:40f.); 1:39 (Mt. 4:24); 3:10f. (Lk. 6:17f.); Lk. 7:21; 8:2.

historicity¹⁰⁰. In an important article on the technique of exorcism, C. BONNER demonstrated that an ancient exorcist's work was most effectively carried out if the afflicting demon, before leaving the oppressed individual, was compelled to do one or more of the following: (1) reply to the practitioner's conjurations (demons effect "dumbness" in those they possess, presumably to frustrate the exorcist); cf. Mt. 9:32; Mt. 12:22 (Lk. 11:14); Mk. 9:17, 25; (2) tell his name or his nature; Mk. 5:9 (Lk. 8:30), or (3) provide visible proof that the possessing force was a demon and that he has actually left the afflicted individual; in Mk. 1:26 (Lk. 4:35) and 9:26, the exorcisms are accompanied by convulsions, while in Mk. 5:13 (Mt. 8:32; Lk. 8:33) the demons leave the demoniac for a herd of swine which destroys itself in the sea¹⁰¹. BONNER does not draw any conclusions regarding the significance of these parallels, nor does he venture an opinion whether these techniques are traditional embellishments or characteristics of the exorcistic techniques of the historical Jesus¹⁰².

Yet another characteristic of the exorcistic technique of Jesus is the use of the verb ἐπιτιμᾶν in two exorcism stories, Mk. 1:25 (Lk. 4:35, 41) and 9:25 (Mt. 17:18; Lk. 9:42)¹⁰³. In the 'Genesis Apocryphon' (1QSA), a first century B.C. Aramaic document from Palestine, Abraham is described as performing an exorcism on the king of Egypt by rebuking the evil spirit (20. 28f.), after praying and laying hands on the monarch. The Aramaic verb g'ṛ, which in all probability lies behind ἐπιτιμᾶν in those passages cited above, is interpreted by J. FITZMYER to mean "'to be exorcised' (i.e., driven out by a rebuke)"¹⁰⁴. Although ἐπιτιμᾶν or its synonyms does not occur in exorcistic contexts in Graeco-Roman accounts or in other Jewish accounts¹⁰⁵, we have here a term of Palestinian provenance which may reflect the usage of the historical Jesus. It would appear that H. C.

¹⁰⁰ *Supra*, n. 77.

¹⁰¹ C. BONNER, *The Technique of Exorcism*, *Harvard Theological Review*, 36 (1943), 39–49; HULL, *Hellenistic Magic*, pp. 68ff. amplifies some of BONNER's points with additional data.

¹⁰² In an earlier article, 'Traces of Thaumaturgic Technique in the Miracles', *Harvard Theological Review*, 20 (1927), 171–81, BONNER suggests that the magical techniques which he discusses entered into the miracle tradition in the process of their transmission. This suggests to me that, in some Christian circles at least, the portrayal of Jesus as a magician was not something that had to be avoided at all costs.

¹⁰³ Elsewhere the term ἐπιτιμᾶν has entered into a legendary nature miracle, Jesus' rebuke of the wind in Mk. 4:39. Also, in the Lukan version of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law (Lk. 38f.), Jesus "rebukes" the woman's fever. If this were a Lukan embellishment, it would be noteworthy as an instance in which magical technique (in contrast to legendary magical motifs) has entered into synoptic tradition. Based on what we know of Luke's not infrequent use of non-Markan variants of his Markan exemplar (cf. T. SCHRAMM, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas* [Cambridge, 1971]), I would argue that the Lukan version of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law is in fact more original than the version preserved in Mk 1:29 ff.

¹⁰⁴ J. A. FITZMYER, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* (Rome, 1966), p. 123; cf. IDEM, *Some Observations on the Genesis Apocryphon*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 22 (1960), 284.

¹⁰⁵ KEE, *The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories*, p. 241.

KEE's attempt to demonstrate that ἐπιτιμᾶν is a terminus technicus for "the word of command that brings hostile powers under control" is unsuccessful¹⁰⁶.

Another term with magical connotations which occurs in a gospel exorcism story is φιμοῦν (Mk. 1:25; Lk. 4:35), where it is really a formula for exorcism¹⁰⁷.

Of the six exorcisms of Jesus preserved in gospel tradition, two describe absolutely no exorcistic technique whatsoever (Mt. 9:32 ff. and 12:22 ff.). In three exorcism stories, Jesus expells demons with short succinct commands: "Jesus rebuked [ἐπετίμησεν] him, saying 'Be silent [φιμώθητι] and come out [ἔξελθε] of him!'" (Mk. 1:25; Lk. 4:35); "Come out [ἔξελθε] of the man, you unclean spirit!" (Mk. 5:8; Lk. 8:29); "He rebuked [ἐπετίμησεν] the unclean spirit and said to it, 'I command you, come out [ἔξελθε] of him and never enter him again!'"¹⁰⁸ (Mk. 9:25; Mt. 17:18; Lk. 9:42). The brevity of these exorcistic formulae has led some scholars to contrast them with the long adjurations of the magical papyri (cf. the famous 'Recipe of Pibeches' in PGM IV, 3007–3086). Aside from the not unimportant observation that such a contrast is quantitative, not qualitative, it should be noted that most of the magical papyri come from the third through the fifth centuries A.D. during the great *Blütezeit* of Graeco-Roman magic; it appears that the older the magical forms, the shorter and more precise are the formulas¹⁰⁹. HULL has claimed that the expression "come out" [ἔξελθε] is the usual form of address in exorcisms in the magical papyri¹¹⁰. However, since this verb in the imperative mode in exorcisms is only found four times (PGM IV, 1243, 1245, 3013; V, 158), that claim is hardly valid. Rather, the usual form of addressing a demon is an expression of adjuration followed by the naming of those supernatural powers being invoked, frequently accompanied by *voces magicae* (e.g., "I adjure you by" [ὁρκίζω σε κατά], cf. PGM III, 36; IV, 289; VII, 242 and passim). The purpose of the adjuration, of course, is to harness supernatural powers in order to effect the exorcism. In instances in which [ἔξ]ορκίζω is followed by an objective accusative and an infinitive (e.g., PGM IV, 3037f.: ὁρκίζω σε . . . λαλῆσαι), once the adjuration has been completed the practitioner may then switch to the imperative mood (e.g. PGM IV, 3041, 3044: λάλησον). When the practitioner has achieved control of

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 232–46. KEE's apparent purpose in this article is to provide a firm base within the synoptic miracle tradition itself for arguing the eschatological significance of Jesus' exorcisms. As they stand the exorcism stories themselves contain no clear connection with Jesus' eschatological program; neither the Spirit of God nor Satan are ever mentioned within the framework of such stories.

¹⁰⁷ FRIDRICHSEN, *The Problem of Miracle*, p. 112; EITREM, *Some Notes on Demonology*, p. 38; IDEM, *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. I, pp. 76f. EITREM refers to E. ROHDE's correlation of φιμοῦν with καταδεῖν in exorcisms involving the dead in his 'Psyche', II (New York, 1966), 603 ff.

¹⁰⁸ Provision that demons never return is a constituent element of many ancient exorcisms (Josephus Ant. 8. 25; Philostratus vit. Apoll. 4. 20), and can be one of the many functions of amulets (PGM, IV, 1254).

¹⁰⁹ NILSSON, *Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*, p. 132; FESTUGIÈRE, *L'Idéal religieux des Grecs*, p. 283; W. R. HALLIDAY, *Greek Divination* (Chicago, 1967 [1913]), p. 27.

¹¹⁰ HULL, *Hellenistic Magic*, p. 68.

the demon, he may exercise that control by commanding the demon to do any number of things: ἀπάλλαξον (PGM IV, 86; V, 125, 130, 133; WORTMANN, *Neue magische Texte*, p. 107); ὑπάγε . . . ἐγείρε . . . ἀπελθε (WORTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 83); ἀπόστηθι (PGM IV, 1244); ἀκολούθησον (PGM V, 158); ὑπόταξον (PGM, V, 164), and many others. In fact the term [ἐξ]ορκίζω in exorcistic contexts can mean anything from “implore” to “command,” dependent on the relative power which the practitioner sees in the supernatural powers upon whom he calls. Therefore, Jesus’ use of the imperative mood in exorcisms is in fact a widely known and used form of adjuration in the ancient world¹¹¹. The fact that Jesus can confidently command demons and expect instant obedience indicates that he already thought himself in possession of the necessary supernatural powers requisite for accomplishing such feats. The great gulf which some New Testament scholars would place between “the powerful word of the Son” and “magical incantations” is simply nonexistent¹¹². The short authoritative commands of Jesus to demons in the gospel narratives are formulas of magical adjuration¹¹³.

Of the three sayings of Jesus in which exorcisms are mentioned, Lk. 13:32 (though probably genuine) contributes little to our knowledge. The Beelzebul controversy (Mk. 3:19b–27; Mt. 12:22–26, 29; Lk. 11:14–18a, 21–22), which has a strong claim to historicity¹¹⁴, contains the charge by Jesus’ adversaries that he was casting out demons through the agency of a more powerful demon¹¹⁵. Jesus is represented as refuting the charge by pointing out its contradictory presuppositions. Finally a third pericope (Lk. 11:19–20; Mt. 12:27) is widely recognized as authentic even though it has been inserted into an alien context¹¹⁶:

¹¹¹ EITREM, *Some Notes on Demonology*, p. 40 (however, EITREM contrasts the magical force of imperatives which are repeated many times with the simple imperatives of Jesus, p. 32, n. 3). Apollonius of Tyana is represented as using a command to exorcise a demon in Philostratus *vit. Apoll.* 4. 20, as are Hanina ben Dosa and Shimon ben Jochae (STRACK–BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, IV, 514, 534–35). In Acts 16:18, the only narrated exorcism of Paul, the verb παραγγέλλω is a synonym of ορκίζω.

¹¹² This artificial distinction is made by, among others, E. STAUFFER, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, II (1964), 626.

¹¹³ In: *Das Neue Testament und die dämonischen Mächte* (Stuttgart, 1972), O. BÖCHER appropriately describes Jesus’ commands to demons as *Wortzauber* (pp. 33 ff.). In a recent article by W. KIRCHSCHLÄGER, *Exorcismus in Qumran?*, *Kairos*, 18 (1976), 135–53, the author correctly affirms the use of exorcism at Qumran, but erroneously concludes that both the Qumran writings and the gospels rejected magical ideas.

¹¹⁴ S. E. JOHNSON, *Jesus and First Century Galilee*, in: *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, ed. W. SCHMAUCH (Stuttgart, 1951), p. 80; FRIDRICHSEN, *The Problem of Miracle*, pp. 102–10 (an excellent discussion); FULLER, *Interpreting the Miracles*, pp. 25 ff.; J. JEREMIAS, *New Testament Theology*, I (New York, 1971), p. 91; BARRETT, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 59–63.

¹¹⁵ The presuppositions behind this charge are briefly discussed in: BONNER, *Amulets*, p. 106.

¹¹⁶ H. WINDISCH, *Jesus und der Geist nach synoptischer Überlieferung*, in: *Studies in Early Christianity*, ed. S. J. CASE (New York, 1928), pp. 216 ff.; PERRIN, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 63–68; FULLER, *Foundations of New Testament Christology*, p. 105. However, the saying is regarded as inauthentic by FRIDRICHSEN, *The Problem of Miracle*, pp. 74 f.

"If it is by the finger of God [Mt.: Spirit of God] then the kingdom of God has come upon you." Jesus apparently regarded his exorcisms as signs of the coming kingdom of God; as such they were subordinate to a framework of apocalyptic eschatology. Jewish eschatology expected the removal of the evil spirit from the world at the end of days¹¹⁷. It was precisely this diffuse, distant and general religious goal which Jesus, within the framework of a socially deviant millennial movement, made a concrete and present reality by controlling spiritual power through magical techniques.

Turning now to the gospel healing stories, we have already noticed the central function of the rite of laying on of hands in the ministry of Jesus¹¹⁸. The use of touch was unquestionably an authentic feature of Jesus' healing technique. In Hellenistic traditions, touch as a healing rite is used by the gods in legends and stories, but only very rarely by human miracle workers¹¹⁹. There is no association of the rite of laying on of hands with healing in Old Testament or rabbinic tradition¹²⁰. However, the 'Genesis Apocryphon' contains a brief reference to Abraham's exorcism of the king of Egypt through prayer, laying on of hands and rebuking the evil spirit (1 QSA 20:28–29); this is the only instance of the laying on of hands as a healing rite in an ancient Jewish source¹²¹. In contrast to Jesus' technique, however, prayer plays a central role, just as it does in rabbinic miracle stories¹²². While prayer was apparently used in early Christian healing rituals (Jas. 5:14–16), it is only rarely referred to in connection with Jesus' healings; those few references, however, are not insignificant. Jesus' reference in Mk. 9:29

¹¹⁷ 1 Enoch 54:4–6; 69:27–28; Test. Levi 18:12; Test. Juda 25:3; Jub. 23:29; Ass. Moses 10:1; 1 QS 4:19–21; 1 QM 14:10; 1 QH 3:18; Zech. 13:2; cf. AUNE, *The Problem of the Messianic Secret*, p. 29; O. BETZ, *Was Wissen Wir von Jesus?* (Stuttgart, 1965), pp. 42–47; O. BETZ, *Jesus heiliger Krieg*, *Novum testamentum*, 2 (1957), 116–37.

¹¹⁸ In healing stories, the laying on of hands is referred to in Mk. 1:31 (Mt. 8:15); 1:41 (Mt. 8:3; Lk. 5:13); 5:41 (Mt. 9:25; Lk. 8:54); 7:33–34; 8:23, 25; 9:27; Lk. 13:13 (cf. Lk. 7:14). General references to the laying on of hands as a healing rite are found in Mk. 5:23 (Mt. 9:18); 6:5; 7:32; 8:22; 16:18; Lk. 4:40 (cf. Mk. 6:2). On the general subject see J. BEHM, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum* (Leipzig, 1911); J. COPPENS, *L'imposition des mains et les rites connexes dans le Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1925); S. MORENZ, *Handauflegung, Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, III, 3. Aufl. (Tübingen, 1959), 52f.; EITREM, *Some Notes on Demonology*, pp. 41–46. PERELS, I think erroneously, sees Hellenistic influences in the tradition of Jesus' healing by touch: *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker in ihrem Verhältnis zur Wortüberlieferung* (Stuttgart, 1934), p. 91. A recent bibliography is found in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, IX (1974), 424.

¹¹⁹ O. WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder: Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer* (Gießen, 1909), pp. 45–48. The few examples which WEINREICH cites are not earlier than the third century A. D. In Roman literature, Tacitus preserves the story of Vespasian's healings at Alexandria in which one man's crippled hand is cured by a touch of the emperor's foot (Hist. 4.81; cf. Suetonius Vesp. 7). In European folklore traditions, note the tradition of the "king's touch"; cf. K. THOMAS, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, pp. 192–204.

¹²⁰ E. LOHSE, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, IX (1974), 428.

¹²¹ D. FLUSSER, *Healing through Laying On of Hands in a Dead Sea Scroll*, *Israel Exploration Journal*, 7 (1957), 107f.

¹²² W. SCHMITHALS, *Wunder und Glaube* (Neukirchen–Vluyn, 1970), p. 20.

to the necessity of prayer for difficult exorcisms appears to derive from the early church rather than Jesus himself. In Mk. 7:34, it is said of Jesus that "after looking up to heaven, he sighed [ἐστέναξεν]", and then proceeded to heal a deaf and dumb man. "Looking up to heaven" is a gesture of prayer (cf. Lk. 18:13; STRACK-BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, II, 246f.), and the groaning appears to be a form of "silent prayer", which is a conventional feature of the behavior of a wonderworker¹²³. In Jn. 11:41b-42 Jesus is described as addressing a prayer to God prior to a miracle (cf. Jn. 9:31)¹²⁴. Jesus' prayer prior to the multiplication of the loaves (Mk. 6:41; Mt. 14:19; Lk. 9:16; Jn. 6:11) is a stereotypical feature of Jewish piety. Jesus does place the performance of nature miracles in close connection with faith and prayer in Mk. 11:23-24 (Mt. 17:20; Lk. 17:6). All that can be said is that prayer played a role in Jesus' wonderworking, but hardly a major one.

As in the case of the exorcisms, many of Jesus' healings were effected by a succinct command directed toward the afflicted individuals: "Be clean!" (Mk. 1:41); "I say to you, rise up, take your pallet and go home!" (Mk. 2:11); "*Talitha cumi*!" which Mark interprets as "Little girl, I say to you, arise!" (Mk. 5:41); "Your faith has made you well; be healed of your disease!" (Mk. 5:34); "*Ephphatha*!" which Mark renders as "Be opened!" (addressed, interestingly enough, to the deaf man's ear in Mk. 7:34); "Go and show yourselves to the priests!" (Lk. 17:14); "Young man, I say to you, arise!" (Lk. 7:14); "Rise, take up your pallet and walk!" (Jn. 5:8); "Lazarus, come out!" (Jn. 11:43); "Go; be it done to you as you have believed!" (Mt. 8:13). As in the case of the exorcisms, so here too the healing commands of Jesus must be regarded as magical formulas of adjuration. Only four healing stories lack a pronouncement by Jesus; in two (Mk. 1:29-31; Lk. 14:1-6), the stories are narrated so briefly that the pronouncement may have dropped out of the tradition. In Mk. 5:25-34 the healing is effected (vv. 27-29) and only later is a pronouncement of healing made by Jesus (v. 34). Mk. 8:22-26, therefore, is the only miracle story clearly lacking a pronouncement by Jesus in the tradition; here, however, an elaborate ritual involving sputum and touch effects the healing.

Two healing pronouncements of Jesus in particular have drawn a great deal of attention: the Aramaic commands "*Talitha cumi*," (Mk. 5:41), and "*Ephphatha*" (Mk. 7:34), neither of which are reproduced by Matthew or Luke. The fact that Aramaic was in all probability the mother tongue of Jesus means that these phrases, if indeed they are *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, could not have been used by him as *voces magicae*. Why then are these Aramaic healing formulas preserved in the tradition used by Mark? In view of the importance attributed to preserving

¹²³ EITREM, *Some Notes on Demonology*, pp. 54f.; cf. C. BONNER, *Traces of Thaumaturgic Technique in the Miracles*, *Harvard Theological Review*, 20 (1927), 171-74; BONNER does not sufficiently stress the prayer-like nature of the inarticulate groans.

¹²⁴ R. BULTMANN, *The Gospel of John* (Philadelphia, 1971), p. 408, interprets this prayer as a demonstration that Jesus is no magician or divine man who works by his own power; the same view is expressed by C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London, 1958), p. 336. However, the apologetic motif which is clearly present in this prayer is in all probability a redactional overlay obscuring the original intent of the prayer.

adjurations and incantations in their original languages¹²⁵, these formulas were probably preserved for the purpose of guiding Christian thaumaturges in exorcistic and healing activities¹²⁶. In early Christianity, therefore, these Aramaic phrases may have functioned as magic formulas¹²⁷.

Another feature of the gospel healing stories which demands some attention is the element of "faith" in such narratives; we have already noted that the distinctive meaning of faith in the miracle stories has led some scholars to affirm the essential historicity of Jesus' healing ministry¹²⁸. Faith is an element in only two exorcism stories, where it is exercised by parents of afflicted individuals (Mk. 9:23f.; Mt. 15:28). In healing stories, faith plays a significant role in four such narratives: Mk. 5:34 (Mt. 9:22; Lk. 8:48); 10:52 (Lk. 18:42); Lk. 17:19; Mt. 8:10, 13 (Lk. 7:9); cf. Jn. 11:26–27. Unfortunately a great deal of theological flummery has been occasioned by the retroactive importation of later Christian notions of faith into the use of the notion by Jesus¹²⁹. Equally erroneous is the notion that faith played no part in Jewish or Graeco-Roman miracles¹³⁰. The Greek word commonly rendered as "faith" in the synoptic healing and exorcism narratives could better be translated "trust". It simply refers to the naive and elemental confidence that Jesus possessed the requisite power to heal and cast out demons¹³¹. Since Jesus, according to tradition, only healed or exorcized those

¹²⁵ Iamblichus de myst. 7.4f.; Lucian philops. 9; Lucian Alex. 13; Origen contra Cels. 1.24f.; 5.45; cf. A. DEISSMANN, *Bible Studies* (Edinburgh, 1901), p. 355; DIETRICH, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, pp. 39f.; above all, see T. HOPFNER, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, I, 706–68.

¹²⁶ M. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 6. Aufl. (Tübingen, 1971), pp. 80–84; EITREM, *Some Notes on Demonology*; D. TIEDE, *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker* (Missoula, 1970), pp. 267f.

¹²⁷ O. BÖCHER, *Dämonenfurcht und Dämonenabwehr* (Stuttgart, 1970), p. 76; BÖCHER, *Das Neue Testament und die dämonischen Mächte*, p. 35; D. STRAUSS, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined* (Philadelphia, 1972), pp. 448f., and W. WREDE, *The Messianic Secret* (Cambridge and London, 1971), p. 147, n. 40 (both referred to in German editions by DIETRICH, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, p. 40). H. J. CADBURY, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (New York, 1937), p. 81; BULTMANN, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 213f., refers to both Aramaic expressions as "magic words" (as does BÖCHER, in both references above). It is somewhat surprising that the Aramaic term *abba* (occurring once in the gospels, Mk. 14:36; twice in the Pauline corpus, Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6) does not recur in magical contexts particularly since in form it is a palindrome (the term is not listed in the indices to BONNER, *Amulets* or PREISENDANZ, *PGM*, vol. 3). The cry from the cross, *eloi eloi lama sabachthani* (Mk. 15:34; a curious mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic, is "corrected" in Mt. 27:46) appears in a corrupted form in a Coptic charm published by A. M. KROPP, *Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte*, III, 59, 128, translated by E. GOODE-NOUGH and described by him as the work of a Christian magician; IDEM, *Jewish Symbols*, II, 180.

¹²⁸ *Supra*, n. 83.

¹²⁹ Cf. A. OEPKE, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III (1965), 210f.

¹³⁰ This view is expressed by DUNN, *Jesus and the Spirit*, p. 75; examples to the contrary from the cult of Aesklepios are cited by A. OEPKE, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, 210.

¹³¹ FRIDRICHSEN, *The Problem of Miracle*, p. 78; NOCK, *Paul and the Magus*, p. 185; F. PREISIGKE, *Die Gotteskraft der frühchristlichen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 4–6.

who came to him, the very fact of their coming indicated a hope that Jesus would effect a cure of their condition. The single indication that Jesus was not always successful is found in Mk. 6:5–6 (Mt. 13:58); here the view of FRIDRICHSEN appears to be the most satisfactory: Jesus' help was not sought after in Nazareth, therefore he was not able to perform any exorcisms and only a few cures¹³². The necessity of a magician's credibility in the eyes of his clients is such a widespread phenomenon that the emphasis on "faith" in the gospel healing narratives cannot be considered a distinctive feature of the wonderworking activity of Jesus¹³³.

Four particular healing stories deserve special consideration: (1) the Woman with the Hemorrhage (Mk. 5:25–34 and parallels), (2) the Deaf Mute (Mk. 7:31–36), (3) the Blind Man near Bethsaida (Mk. 8:22–26), and (4) the Man Born Blind (Jn. 9:1–41). In the first story the healing is reported as accomplished, without the knowledge of Jesus, when the woman touched the border of his garment. Jesus is said to have perceived that "power had gone forth from him". This story has been intensively analyzed by the papyrologist F. PREISIGKE from the perspective of the materialistic view of divine "power" (δύναμις) on which the story focuses¹³⁴. W. GRUNDMANN, who was so preoccupied with denying that there was any connection between New Testament miracles and magic, found it unnecessary to refer to or discuss the notion of *dynamis* found in this story¹³⁵.

One of the more recent commentators on Mark, W. L. LANE, shows just how difficult it is to avoid the magical interpretation of this passage:

"Jesus possesses the power of God as the representative of the Father. Nevertheless, the Father remains in control of his own power. The healing of the woman occurred through God's free and gracious decision to bestow upon her the power which was active in Jesus. By an act of sovereign will God determined to honor the woman's faith *in spite of the fact that it was tinged with ideas which bordered on magic*"¹³⁶.

The ideas expressed in the story of the woman's healing do not border on magic, they are of the essence of Graeco-Roman magical notions. PREISIGKE's discussion of this story, though he unfortunately focuses on the Lukan rather than the Markan version, is excellent, in spite of an overemphasis on the Egyptian origin of the concept of materialistic power presupposed in this miracle story. Consequently, PREISIGKE focuses on the term "fluid" which is a less than satisfactory

¹³² FRIDRICHSEN, *The Problem of Miracle*, p. 80; T. KLAUSNER's view that the miracles of Jesus were not always successful and that he was afraid to attempt them often is unsubstantiated speculation, though not inherently improbable; IDEM, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 272.

¹³³ V. TURNER, *An Ndembu Doctor in Practice*, in: *Magic, Faith, and Healing*, ed. A. KIEV (New York, 1964), p. 263; K. THOMAS, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, p. 210.

¹³⁴ *Die Gotteskraft der frühchristlichen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1922).

¹³⁵ W. GRUNDMANN, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, II (1964), 284–317; IDEM, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestamentlichen Gedankenwelt* (Stuttgart, 1932).

¹³⁶ W. L. LANE, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Grand Rapids, 1974), pp. 192f.

conception for elucidating the idea of power found in the text¹³⁷; δύναμις or πνεῦμα would perhaps have been more appropriate terms. One year after the appearance of PREISIGKE's small monograph, the more general treatment of the subject was published by J. RÖHR, *Der okkulte Kraftbegriff im Altertum* (Leipzig, 1923). The focal terms for RÖHR's study are δύναμις (the most frequently used Greek word for "power"), and ἐνέργεια; to a lesser extent συμπάθεια and ἀντιπάθεια, which (among other uses, scientific, philosophical and religious) are important for the ancient conception of magical power (pp. 77–95)¹³⁸. Among Hellenistic miracle stories of healing discussed by WEINREICH, those which are brought about by "*Heilende Statuen und Bilder*,"¹³⁹ in many ways form a close parallel to the Markan story. The fact that divine power resides in objects and persons and can be magically transferred or appropriated by those in need is found elsewhere in the New Testament¹⁴⁰.

The story of the healings of the Deaf Mute (Mk. 7:31–37) and the Blind Man near Bethsaida (Mk. 8:22–26)¹⁴¹, appear to be closely related and have proven enigmatical to many commentators. Since these two pericopes have no synoptic parallels, some have assumed that they were absent from that edition of Mark used by Matthew and Luke. More probably, it has been conjectured that the first and third evangelists wished to delete the apparent references to magic¹⁴². The two stories have several common elements: (1) the afflicted individuals are healed in private, (2) saliva is used to effect the healing, (3) the affected organ is touched by Jesus, and (4) there is an emphasis on confidentiality. Attention should also be called to the use of the magic formula "*Ephphatha*" (Mk. 7:34), the fact that Jesus is described as "looking up into heaven" and groaning (Mk. 7:34), with the result that "his tongue was released" [ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμός τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ]¹⁴³. Mk. 8:22–26 has another unusual feature: the healing is accomplished in two stages, first saliva is applied to the man's eyes and Jesus lays his hands upon him with the result that he is only able to see indistinctly. In the second stage, Jesus touches the man's eyes directly and the complete healing is accomplished. The story of the Man Born Blind (Jn. 9:11–41) also emphasizes the use of saliva mixed with clay to effect the restoration of sight (vv. 6–7). All of these techniques are well-known to both Jewish and Graeco-Roman magical practitioners. The fact that they are magical techniques is indicated not only by the deviant context in

¹³⁷ PREISIGKE briefly notes these equivalencies on p. 39. The term "fluid" was picked up by E. LOHMEYER, even though it adds little to the discussion; E. LOHMEYER, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen, 1959), p. 102, n. 6.

¹³⁸ In the two publications by GRUNDMANN (*supra*, n. 135), no account is taken of the work of RÖHR.

¹³⁹ WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, pp. 137–74.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Acts 19:12, where cloths touched by Paul were used to heal the sick and cast out demons, and Acts 5:15 where Peter's shadow heals the sick.

¹⁴¹ An excellent discussion of these passages is found in: ROLOFF, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus*, pp. 127–31.

¹⁴² F. W. BEARE, *The Earliest Records of Jesus* (Nashville, 1962), pp. 133 ff.

¹⁴³ A. DEISSMAN, *Light from the Ancient East*, pp. 306 ff. calls this the clearest example of technical expressions taken from magic in the New Testament.

which they were performed, but also by the fact that Jesus made the general Jewish religious goal of health and longevity (Deut. 6:2; Josh. 1:8) individually and concretely available to particular persons by means which were thought guaranteed of success.

One of the more difficult aspects of our subject is the problem of determining to what extent the more obviously magical elements preserved in the gospel tradition can be traced back to the historical Jesus. R. BULTMANN's judgment that the "Hellenistic origin of the miracle stories is overwhelmingly the more probable"¹⁴⁴ has been widely influential in modern discussions of the historicity of the miracle tradition. On the other hand, it has become increasingly evident that the neat form critical bifurcation between Hellenistic and Palestinian Jewish influences on the synoptic tradition is beset with difficulties, a product of the Teutonic compulsion for orderliness. The gospel miracle tradition has certainly been subject to folkloristic development and embellishment. However, whether these additions were made in a Hellenistic or Palestinian linguistic and cultural arena is extremely difficult to determine. H. C. KEE, who claims that the oldest layers of the tradition are uninterested in thaumaturgical details¹⁴⁵, in our opinion appears to have unwittingly demonstrated precisely the opposite. EITREM's judgment that the miracle stories do not seem to have been embellished with more thaumaturgical details than were originally present in the tradition appears to me to be generally convincing¹⁴⁶, though careful research in this area is an urgent necessity. While there is some tendency to increase the magical techniques found in the gospel miracle stories¹⁴⁷, in most instances the exact opposite tendency appears to be at work. Here, of course, I am distinguishing between magical techniques and magical folkloristic motifs. The latter are clearly found in the nature miracles, most of which are creations out of whole cloth by the early communities. In the healing and exorcism stories, such motifs as healing from a distance, stopping the bier in a funeral procession, the impotence of rational medicine, are some of the more common folkloristic motifs¹⁴⁸.

The focal issue in this phase of our study has been to determine whether or not Jesus made use of magical techniques in his ministry of exorcism and healing, and if so, whether he should be labeled a magician. The thrust of our discussion to this point should make it abundantly clear that, in our opinion, Jesus did in fact make use of magical techniques which must be regarded as magical because they were effected within the socially deviant context of a millennial movement and because he was able to harness supernatural power in such a way that he and his followers believed that success was virtually guaranteed.

¹⁴⁴ BULTMANN, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, p. 240.

¹⁴⁵ KEE, *The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories*, p. 245.

¹⁴⁶ EITREM, *Some Notes on Demonology*, p. 63.

¹⁴⁷ M. SMITH, *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 223; cf. *supra*, n. 103.

¹⁴⁸ The finest discussion of the constituent motifs in the synoptic miracle stories remains that of R. BULTMANN, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 209–244. For a more recent discussion and analysis of the motifs in the miracle stories see G. THEISSEN, *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten: Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien* (Gütersloh, 1974), pp. 57–128.

In a recent book entitled 'Jesus the Jew' (New York, 1973), G. VERMES deals at some length with the historical significance of Jesus' exorcisms and healings. One type of exorcist in Palestinian Judaism, according to VERMES, flirted with magical techniques and was thought successful precisely because the appropriate rituals and incantations were flawlessly repeated (p. 64). Jesus' exorcisms as depicted in the gospels, VERMES goes on to point out, are noticeably free from such magical or quasi-magical techniques (p. 65). Even in Jesus' healings he rarely approximates the Noachic, Solomonic or Essene types of cures. VERMES concludes that

"the representation of Jesus in the Gospels as a man whose supernatural abilities derive, not from secret powers, but from immediate contact with God, proves him to be a genuine charismatic, the true heir of an age-old prophetic religious line [p. 69]."

Jesus, then, represents the Jewish "holy man" tradition, other illustrious examples of which were Honi (1st cent. B.C.)^{148a} and Hanina ben Dosa (1st cent. A.D.). Jesus was a Galilean Hasid. Unfortunately, VERMES' discussion is flawed by an inadequate conception of magic: magical wonders are thought to be based on secret powers, while miracles of healing are the result of exceptional piety (i.e., an "immediate relationship to God"). The apocalyptic framework within which Jesus' activities and teachings took place has unaccountably receded into the background. Further, it should be observed that magical techniques vary with the particular conception of the divinity or supernatural powers held by the magical practitioner. In a Graeco-Roman polytheistic context, where many deities are noticeably lacking in such qualities as omnipotence, a different protocol is required than in a Jewish context in which Yahweh and his subordinates must be manipulated in a more covert manner.

The wonderworking activities of Jesus cannot be considered magical simply because his healing and exorcistic techniques have parallels in Graeco-Roman magic (though they in fact do), neither can they be considered non-magical because such traits are relatively infrequent. The wonders performed by Jesus are magical because they occur within a context of social deviance in which widely accepted but generally unattainable goals highly valued in Judaism are thought to be accomplished for particular individuals through the application of generally successful management techniques. However, it does not seem appropriate to regard Jesus as a magician. While magical activities may constitute important aspects of the role of such figures as the shaman, the sage (both Graeco-Roman and rabbinic), the prophet and the messiah, each of these socio-religious roles involves different collections of specializations. Sociologically (and we shall have to remain with the vantage point with which we began), it would be problematic to categorize Jesus as a magician, since those magical activities which he used can be more appropriately subsumed under the role of messianic prophet.

^{148a} Cf. W. S. GREEN, *Palestinian Holy Men: Charismatic Leadership and Rabbinic Tradition*, ANRW II 19,2, ed. by W. HAASE (Berlin-New York, 1979), pp. 619-647.

V. Gospel and Aretalogy

In our discussion of the healings and exorcisms of Jesus as magical activities within the framework of the socially deviant millennial movement initiated by Jesus, we found compelling reasons to suppose that a solid core of authentic tradition lay behind the gospel accounts. The form critical analysis of the gospels has made it clear that, in some respects at least, Jesus' reputation as a thaumaturge was augmented and embellished through the creation of new stories as well as the amplification of older ones. In this section we shall consider three related issues: (1) the apologetic nature of the gospel genre, (2) the role of magic in the redactional activities of the evangelists, and (3) the influence of Graeco-Roman aretalogical traditions on the way in which the life of Jesus is depicted in the gospels.

A significant contribution to the question of the relationship of magic to the gospel tradition has been made indirectly by J. Z. SMITH in an article to which we have had occasion to refer above: 'Good News is No News: Aretalogy and Gospel'. SMITH proposes that the primary characteristic of every major religious biography of the Greco-Roman period is that of a double defense against (1) outsiders' charges that the subjects of these biographies were magicians, and (2) the sincere misunderstanding of insiders that these religious figures were wonderworkers or, in their terms, "divine men". SMITH analyzes the 'Vita Apollonii' of Philostratus and the 'Vita Pythagorica' of Iamblichos from this perspective, demonstrating the important function of these two complementary motifs in the biographies and by implication their relevance for understanding the canonical gospels, particularly Mark. While SMITH has little to say directly about the canonical gospels themselves, he assumes the relevance of his analysis for understanding Mark and John which he characterizes as reverse aretalogies in the sense that they appear to be combatting the image of Jesus as magician-divine man.

A number of scholars, particularly P. SAMAIN in his article 'L'Accusation de magie contre le Christ dans les Évangiles', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 15 (1938), 449–90, have contributed to our knowledge of the anti-magic apologetic found in the gospels. According to SAMAIN, Jesus is never expressly charged with being a magician or practising magic (p. 454). Within a Jewish context, prophets and other divine emissaries were thought to accredit their missions by performing miracles; however, enemies of God in league with Satan could also perform wonders. To charge someone with having a pact with Satan, then, is to charge him with practising magic (pp. 455f.). SAMAIN contends that the charge that Jesus was an imposter is equivalent to the more direct charge of practising magic (p. 456). The charge of imposture is found in Mt. 27:63 (cf. Jn. 7:12, 47) and many other passages; referring as well to parallels in Josephus and early Christian literature, SAMAIN presents an iron-clad case for understanding the charge of imposture as an accusation that Jesus performed miracles by trickery or magical techniques (pp. 456–64). Turning to the Beelzebul pericope in Mk.

3:22–30 and parallels, SAMAIN correctly understands the phrase “by Beelzebul” as an elipsis for the expression “in the name of Beelzebul” (p. 466). At this point he refers to the statement of Origen, *Magi sunt, qui invocant Beelzebul* (in Num., Hom. 13. 5). After citing a number of passages from the magical papyri which demonstrate that a divinity can be described as entering and inhabiting the magician (e.g., PGM III, 415f., 470ff.; IV, 710f.), SAMAIN then interprets the accusation that Jesus cast out demons by Beelzebul in this way:

“The Christ would be a magician: united to the leader of demons, he would compel him, since he possessed his name, to perform the prodigies which he desired and particularly exorcisms; no spirit or demonic power could resist him [pp. 469f.].”

In commenting on Lk. 11:20; Mt. 12:28, SAMAIN observes that

“the distinction between an authentic miraculous deed and a magical act is less to be found in the procedure or result of the operation itself than in the supernatural powers which intervene there [p. 471].”

By exorcizing demons, Jesus has taken the part of God in making war against Satan; this is the opposite of the role of a magician (p. 472). Turning to three passages in John (7:20; 8:48–53; 10:20f.), all of which contain the phrase “you have a demon”, SAMAIN discusses them in detail (pp. 473–84), providing an amplified paraphrase of that charge: “You are only a pseudo-prophet charlatan, and your exaltation and your power are only products of the devil” (p. 482). Finally, SAMAIN turns to the pericopes in Matthew and Luke which deal with the temptation of Jesus (Mt. 4:1–11; Lk. 4:1–13), since such feats as changing stones to bread and flying through the air are not uncommon magical folklore motifs (pp. 484–90). Noting that the temptation story is commonly interpreted as relating to the question of religious vs. political messianism, and less commonly as the refusal of Jesus to use magical powers to accomplish his goals, SAMAIN believes, probably correctly, that both views are correct (p. 489)¹⁴⁹. He concludes by observing that the accusation that Jesus practised magic is a motif which permeates the gospel tradition (p. 490).

To the data provided by J. SMITH and SAMAIN, we may add the contribution of C. H. KRAELING, Was Jesus accused of Necromancy?, *Journal of Biblical*

¹⁴⁹ Only the third temptation in Matthew (4:8ff.) and the second in Luke (4:5–8) have any connection with Jewish messianic expectations; the others relate to typical feats possible for a Hellenistic divine man or son of God, according to G. P. WETTER, *Der Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannes-Evangeliums* (Göttingen, 1916), pp. 139f. FRIDRICHSEN, *The Problem of Miracle*, pp. 121–28, sees the temptation story as reflecting two groups in the church, one which emphasizes the role of miracles, the other which, while not denying the reality and role of miracles, wishes to protect Christianity from declining into mere thaumaturgy. EITREM, *Die Versuchung Christi* (Oslo, 1924), quite properly emphasized the magical motifs in two of the three temptations and saw in the story an apologetic against the charge that Jesus was a magician. It would appear that FRIDRICHSEN’s and EITREM’s views are mutually exclusive. All of this has been ignored by C. K. BARRETT, *The Holy Spirit*, pp. 46–53.

Literature, 59 (1940), 147–57, who defines necromancy as not only a means of divination in which the spirits of the dead play a central role but also as the use of such spirits for the accomplishment of magical feats (p. 147, following T. HOPFNER). Focusing on Mk. 6:14–16, KRAELING is convinced that the evangelist thinks that both the common people and Herod believed that Jesus was John the Baptist *redivivus* in the Markan presentation (p. 150). However, it is unclear how a resurrected John could be thought to perform miracles when he had not done so previous to his execution. Like Jesus (Mk. 3:22; Jn. 7:20; 8:48, 49, 52; 10:20), John the Baptist was accused of having a demon (Mt. 11:18; Lk. 7:33), that is, both were thought of as magicians “who had demonic spirits under their control, through whom they did unusual things” (p. 154). The original notion reflected in Mk. 6:14–16, and one which was not understood by Mark, according to KRAELING, is that “Jesus was using the spirit of John brought back from the dead to perform his miracles for him” (p. 155).

A. FRIDRICHSEN too made an important contribution to our knowledge of the anti-magic apologetic of the gospel tradition, not only in his 1925 book ‘The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity’, but also in a later article entitled ‘The Conflict of Jesus with the Unclean Spirits’, *Theology*, 22 (1931), 122–35. In ‘The Problem of Miracle’, FRIDRICHSEN devoted a significant part of his treatment of miracles in early Christianity to a discussion of the hostile criticism which Jesus’ miracles evoked (pp. 85–118). He isolated four major themes in an apologetic found in the gospels themselves and which live on in various Christian writers from the second through the third centuries. The four themes, shorn of the evidence which FRIDRICHSEN adduces in their support, are: (1) The miracles of Jesus were not due to chance or magic, but were predicted by the Old Testament prophets. (2) Jesus’ healings, in contrast with those of pagan wonderworkers, had a lasting effect. (3) Jesus used no devices in effecting healings and exorcisms in contrast with pagan magical practise. (4) Jesus sought no personal profit or advantage from miracles, but rather acted solely for man’s salvation. In the very interesting and important dissertation of O. BAUERNFEIND, *Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium* (Stuttgart, 1927), the author carefully examined the three sayings of demons preserved in Mk. 1:24, 3:11 and 5:7 against the background provided by the magical papyri. He found that the words spoken by the demons have many parallels in magical incantations and that, in effect, the demons are presented as attempting to protect themselves, in vain, against Jesus by using magical formulas. By some quirk, BAUERNFEIND tries to show that this is not a folkloristic development in the gospel tradition, but that such demonic utterances actually correspond to actual occurrences in Jesus’ ministry of exorcism (p. 94). In ‘The Conflict of Jesus with the Unclean Spirits’, FRIDRICHSEN sets forth the much more probable view that the demonic exclamations were intended to defend Jesus from the accusation of being a magician in alliance with the prince of demons (p. 125).

While it is clear that an anti-magic apologetic permeates the gospels, it is less clear whether and to what degree such accusations and their defense can be traced back to the historical Jesus. Here is another important area of research that requires scholarly attention.

In considering the role of magic in the redactions of the gospels, we must turn to the recent study of J. M. HULL, to which we have already referred. HULL's rather brief treatment of Mark (pp. 73–86) is marred by three factors: (1) He does not attempt to separate tradition from redaction in Mark; thus, while he does focus on many magical features of the Markan gospel, we are not presented with a careful delineation of the evangelist's perspective. (2) The anti-magical apologetic which is present in Mark (side-by-side with magical traditions!) is neither discussed nor evaluated by HULL¹⁵⁰. (3) Recent work on the gospel as aretology, particularly relevant for the study of Mark, is not considered by HULL. Not only has the author not advanced our knowledge of the relationship between the Second Evangelist and Christian magical traditions, he has not even summarized many of the important contributions of studies already made.

HULL's treatment of the Gospel of Luke is more satisfactory, but still problematic. The chapter is entitled 'Luke: The Tradition Penetrated by Magic', indicative of HULL's contention that the Lukan *Weltanschauung* is that of the "magical universe" (p. 87). In contrast to McCASLAND, who asserts that Luke made no attempt to heighten the phenomena of exorcism¹⁵¹, HULL attempts to show that Luke has in fact emphasized the phenomena of exorcism in various ways. HULL's views on Luke have received a telling critique by P. ACHTEMEIER, 'The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 94 (1975), 556–58, with which I find myself in complete agreement. HULL summarizes PREISIGKE's findings in the monograph to which we have already referred, 'Die Gotteskraft der frühchristlichen Zeit' (Leipzig, 1922), particularly as it relates to the story of the healing of the Woman with the Hemorrhage (pp. 109–114). Since the story occurred in Luke's Markan exemplar (Mk. 5:25–34), the more appropriate place for discussing PREISIGKE's work would have been in HULL's chapter on Mark (Luke makes no substantial alteration in this pericope). Again, HULL ignores most of the recent redaction critical work on the Gospel of Luke, not to mention Lukan aretological elements.

HULL's discussion of Matthew, in which he sees the tradition as purified of magic, is more satisfactory. The author is able to demonstrate convincingly the Matthaean suspicion of magical exorcism and healing. Again, however, recent redaction critical work on Matthew has been largely ignored. In sum, then, the central purpose of HULL's book, the analysis of the synoptic tradition from the perspective of ancient magic, is a task that the author has carried out in a very incomplete and unsatisfactory way. Redaction critical studies of the stance of each evangelist in relation to early Christian and Graeco-Roman magical traditions remain to be done.

The last decade has witnessed a dramatic increase in interest in the relationship between the gospel as a literary genre and Graeco-Roman aretological

¹⁵⁰ The two glaring omissions are the lack of any adequate discussion of the Beelzebul pericope (Mk. 3:19b–30) and the failure to consider BAUERNFEIND's study 'Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium'.

¹⁵¹ McCASLAND, *By the Finger of God*, pp. 49–51.

traditions¹⁵². A recent survey by P. ACHTEMEIER, *Gospel Miracle Tradition and the Divine Man*, Interpretation, 26 (1972), 174–97, concludes that in New Testament scholarship there appears to be an emerging inclination to see the gospels as attempts to combat the divine man image which had been superimposed on the figure of Jesus at earlier stages in the tradition (p. 197). The original function of aretalogies was to praise various miracle-working divinities; by extension an aretalogy could recount the miracle-working activities of a charismatic figure, thereby demonstrating his status as a divine man. In a recent dissertation by D. L. TIEDE, *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker* (Missoula, 1972), the author has attempted to demonstrate the existence of two discrete kinds of traditions, the aretalogies of the divine wise man and the aretalogies of the miracle-worker (p. 5). TIEDE's thesis has been rigorously challenged by M. SMITH, both in a critical review of the dissertation in Interpretation, 28 (1974), 238–40, and in a paper presented on October 31, 1976 at the Society of Biblical Literature entitled 'On the History of the 'Divine Man': A Critique of Tiede's Thesis', at which time Professor TIEDE presented an oral response. The debate continues, and both New Testament scholars, students of Graeco-Roman religions and classicists alike will profit from an increasing focus on the nature and function of such charismatic figures in late antiquity. It is clear that particular individuals, such as Apollonius of Tyana and Jesus could be labeled a "divine man" by those who approved of them, or as a "magician" by those who did not¹⁵³. SMITH is certainly correct when he notes that "the difference between these figures is one of social status and success"¹⁵⁴. The process of labeling in such cases is entirely relative. As BECKER has observed, "deviance is not a quality that lies in behavior itself, but in the interaction between the person who commits an act and those who respond to it"¹⁵⁵. Both the gospels and Graeco-Roman biographies of such figures as Apollonius of Tyana and Pythagoras tend to "normalize" the deviant tendencies of such debated figures by showing them involved in fairly mundane and ordinary conduct as well as underlining their divine authentication in terms of unrepachable, if miraculous activities.

¹⁵² Perhaps the best discussion of the general subject is M. SMITH, Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 90 (1971), 174–99. See also H. D. BETZ, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament*, TU, 76 (Berlin, 1961), pp. 100–146; D. GEORGI, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief*, WMANT, 11 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964); M. HADAS and M. SMITH, *Heroes and Gods: Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity* (New York, 1963); H. KOESTER, *One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels*, in: *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, ed. H. KOESTER and J. M. ROBINSON (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 187–93. H. D. BETZ, *Jesus as Divine Man*, in: *Jesus and the Historian*, ed. T. TROTTER (Philadelphia, 1968), pp. 114–33 (a German translation will appear in: A. SUHL, ed., *Der Wunderbegriff im Neuen Testament* [Darmstadt, im Druck]), and an extensive article (ca. 300 columns) on 'Gottmensch', by H. D. Betz will appear in a forthcoming fascicle of RAC.

¹⁵³ G. PETZKE, *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana und das Neue Testament* (Leiden, 1970), p. 47; cf. WETTER, *Der Sohn Gottes*, pp. 73–82.

¹⁵⁴ M. SMITH, *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 228.

¹⁵⁵ BECKER, *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, p. 14.

VI. *The Magical Use of the Name of Jesus*

While there is no evidence to suggest that Jesus himself invoked the name of God or any other powerful names in the rituals which he used to effect exorcisms and healings¹⁵⁶, the gospels do contain traditions which indicate that the name of Jesus was used to perform exorcisms during his lifetime by disciples (Mt. 7:22; Lk. 10:17; cf. Mk. 16:17), as well as by freelance Jewish exorcists not formally associated with Jesus (Mk. 9:38f.; Lk. 9:49). These notices are generally regarded as historically reliable¹⁵⁷. 'Acts' contains several examples of the magical use of the name of Jesus in the performance of healings and exorcisms (3:6, 16; 4:7, 10, 30; 16:18; cf. 9:34 19:13)¹⁵⁸, and Jas. 5:14 describes a healing ritual in which the invocation of the "name of the Lord" is a central feature. The name of Jesus was so efficacious that it was incorporated into pagan exorcistic formulas¹⁵⁹; Origen observes that the name of Jesus is so powerful that it is even effective when used by bad men (contra Cels. 1.6). Paul appears to use amulet imagery when he speaks of bearing on his body "the marks of Jesus" (Gal. 6:17)¹⁶⁰, and the name of Jesus functions as a charm or amulet in Rev. 14:1¹⁶¹. In early Christianity, the name of Jesus was used not only in the performance of exorcisms and healings and for apotropaic purposes, but also in prayers, prophecy and baptismal rituals. The present discussion will focus on the use of Jesus' name in exorcisms and healings.

In considering the early use of the name of Jesus in the performance of healings and exorcisms in 'Acts', it must surely have appeared to Jewish and pagan observers that early Christian wonderworkers were practising necromancy. As we have already indicated in connection with our discussion of KRAELING's article, necromancy is not only a form of divination, but also a means of accomplishing magical goals through the instrumentality of spirits of the dead (PGM IV, 333, 1914, 1950; LVII, 6). Thus, in Acts 9:34 when Peter exclaims "Aeneas, Jesus Christ heals you!" we have a phenomenon which could be regarded as nothing other than necromancy by non-Christian observers. Like John the Baptist, Jesus was a βίαιοθάνατος, i.e., a person who had died a premature, violent death; in popular belief such spirits were readily available to become subject to the control of magicians (Tertullian Apol. 23.1). In Lucian philops. 29, those who are decapitated (cf. John the Baptist) and those who are crucified (cf. Jesus) are so classified.

¹⁵⁶ EITREM, Some Notes on Demonology, pp. 10f.

¹⁵⁷ EITREM, Some Notes on Demonology, pp. 4-8; HEITMÜLLER, Im Namen Jesu, p. 241.

¹⁵⁸ In Acts 9:40 Peter's short statement, "Tabitha, rise!" is expanded by the phrase *in nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi* in several versions (it, sy^h, sa, Cypr).

¹⁵⁹ Many of these have been collected by EITREM, Some Notes on Demonology, p. 8, n. 1.

¹⁶⁰ DEISSMANN, Bible Studies, p. 358.

¹⁶¹ HEITMÜLLER, Im Namen Jesu, p. 249, n. 3; W. BOUSSET, Die Offenbarung Johannes, 6. Aufl. (Göttingen, 1906), p. 368.

The Great Church drew a hard and fast line between Christian exorcists and pagan magicians¹⁶². In 2 Apol. 6, Justin contrasts successful Christian exorcists who use the name of Jesus Christ, with others who use incantations and drugs. In referring to Jewish exorcists, Justin claims that exorcisms attempted in the names of Israelite kings (Solomon?), righteous men, prophets or patriarchs will not be successful, while those done in the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob have a better chance of success (Dial. 85); in the same section he speaks against the use of fumigations and incantations by Jewish and gentile exorcists. Origen too, himself a firm believer in magic¹⁶³, attributed success to the use by both Jews and pagans of the various names for the God of the Jews in exorcisms (contra Cels. 4.33f.). Christians too use the name of the supreme God as well as that of Jesus to perform exorcisms and healings which others found impossible to effect (contra Cels. 3.24).

The fundamental significance of the magical use of the names of divinities, supernatural beings or great men of the past is the supposition that such names share the being and participate in the power of their bearers; to possess a name is to possess power over the one who bears the name¹⁶⁴. The most comprehensive study of the magical use of the name of Jesus, within the general context of the magical use of names in both Judaism and Graeco-Roman paganism, is the still valuable study of W. HEITMÜLLER, *Im Namen Jesu: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe* (Göttingen, 1903). HEITMÜLLER makes a number of important points, two of which are particularly important for our present study: (1) The early Christian use of the name of Jesus shares the same magical presuppositions as the analogous use of powerful names in Judaism and Graeco-Roman paganism (pp. 253f., cf. pp. 148, 221). (2) Throughout the entire period encompassed by the first references to the use of the name of Jesus in the synoptic gospels until the time of Origen, essentially the same belief in the magical power of the name of Jesus is found in Christianity (p. 236).

Jewish exorcists used the name of God in exorcisms (Josephus Ant. 2.12.4; 8.2.5.; Irenaeus adv. haer. 2.4.6), sometimes in the formula "the God of Abraham, (the God of) Isaac, and (the God of) Jacob (Justin Dial. 85; 135;

¹⁶² A. HARNACK, *Medicinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte* (Leipzig, 1892), p. 111 (the entire chapter on exorcisms pp. 104–124, is excellent). Several revisions later, an expanded chapter on exorcisms appeared in HARNACK's *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, I, 4. Aufl. (Leipzig, 1924), 151–70.

¹⁶³ G. BARDY, *Origène et la Magie*, *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 18 (1928), 126–42.

¹⁶⁴ DEISSMANN, *Bible Studies*, p. 288 (he refers to Jac. 2:19). On the general subject of the magical use of names, see B. JACOB, *Im Namen Gottes* (Berlin, 1903), pp. 72, 75ff.; J. G. FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, I, 3rd ed. (London, 1911), 403–47; F. C. CONYBEARE, *Myth, Magic and Morals*, pp. 235–50; A. DIETERICH, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, pp. 109–116; TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, pp. 78–103; H. BIETENHARD, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, V (1967), 242–83 (excellent bibliography on p. 242); BIETENHARD claims that "there is in the NT no belief in magically potent names" (p. 278). Black is also white.

Origen contra Cels. 4.33f.; 5.45; 1.22; cf. Acts 3:13–16)¹⁶⁵. Alternate names for God, preserved in Hebrew transliterations, are frequently used in formulas in the magical papyri and on amulets (PGM IV, 1230ff.; XII, 287f.; XIII, 815f., 975f.); Origen mentions Sabaoth and Adonai as two such magical names used by Jews (contra Cels. 1.24), as well as “the God of the Hebrews” and “the God who drowned the King of Egypt and the Egyptians in the Red Sea” as exorcistic formulas (contra Cels. 4.34). In this last formula we have essentially a mini-aretalogy. In Graeco-Egyptian magical formulas the deeds of various gods are sometimes recounted in varying degrees of detail as an essential feature of the invocation¹⁶⁶. Jewish exorcists also used angelic names¹⁶⁷, and in the Talmudic period, the name of a famous first century B. C. rabbi, Joshua ben Peraḥiah was used in incantations inscribed on magical bowls¹⁶⁸. It would appear that J. TRACHTENBERG’s judgment that the invocation of names, especially angelic names, came to the fore only in the post-Talmudic period is in need of revision¹⁶⁹. The lists of angelic names in the ‘Sepher-ha-Razim’ and in the so-called ‘Angelic Liturgy’ (4Q Serek) from Qumran, together with some of the other references we have cited should be sufficient to seriously qualify TRACHTENBERG’s view.

In response to Celsus’ charge that Christians get the power they possess by pronouncing the names of certain demons and incantations, Origen counters that they do this by the name of Jesus and the recital of narratives about him (contra Cels. 1.6). We have already mentioned the quasi-aretalogical Jewish incantation in the name of “the God who drowned the king of Egypt and the Egyptians in the Red Sea” (contra Cels. 4.34). One of the more elaborate examples of such magical *Heilsgeschichte* is found in the so-called ‘Recipe of Pibeches’ (PGM IV, 3008ff.); EITREM refers to several other examples of the same phenomenon¹⁷⁰. A closer inspection of the use of the name of Jesus in the performance of wonders from the New Testament era through to the time of Origen reveals that the name of Jesus was increasingly supplemented with other elements, in accordance with the general principle that magical formulas tend to expand in transmission. In ‘Acts’, the expressions “Jesus Christ” or “Jesus Christ of Nazareth” appear to suffice; in the Old Latin and Cyprianic variant of Acts 9:40, we find the expanded expression *in nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi*. By the time of Justin, the phrase “crucified under Pontius Pilate” is used to supplement the name of Jesus in formulas of exorcism (2 Apol. 6.6; Dial. 30.3; 76.6; 85.2)¹⁷¹. The notion

¹⁶⁵ M. RIST, The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: A Liturgical and Magical Formula, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 57 (1938), 289–303; cf. HEITMÜLLER, *Im Namen Jesu*, pp. 180–82.

¹⁶⁶ HOPFNER, *Mageia*, PW, XIV, 1 (1928), 343; cf. T. SCHERMANN, *Griechische Zauberpapyri und das Gemeinde- und Dankgebet*, TU, 34 (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 4–17.

¹⁶⁷ HEITMÜLLER, *Im Namen Jesu*, pp. 176–80.

¹⁶⁸ J. NEUSNER and J. Z. SMITH, *Archaeology and Babylonian Jewry*, in: *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century*, ed. J. A. SANDERS, (Garden City, New York, 1970), pp. 331–47, esp. p. 337.

¹⁶⁹ TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, p. 88.

¹⁷⁰ EITREM, *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. I, p. 109.

¹⁷¹ E. F. OSBORN, *Justin Martyr* (Tübingen, 1973), p. 63; HEITMÜLLER, *Im Namen Jesu*, pp. 250, 334ff.; Origène, *Contre Celse*, ed. M. BOURRET, I (Paris, 1967), note on 1.6.

that the crucifixion of Jesus spelled the destruction of demonic powers seems to underlie this expanded usage. The same formula occurs in Irenaeus *adv. haer.* 2.49.3: *in nomine Christi Jesu crucifixi sub Pontio Pilato* (cf. Irenaeus *Epideixis* 97). The same formula entered into baptismal liturgies (Justin 1 *Apol.* 61), which originally functioned as magical rituals which expelled demons from baptismal candidates¹⁷².

At this point a few remarks should be directed toward the eccentric article by E. G. WELTIN, *The Concept of Ex-Opere-Operato Efficacy in the Fathers as an Evidence of Magic in Early Christianity*, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, 3 (1960), 74–100. After correctly observing that several early Christian rites acted independently of the persons who performed them in an *ex opere operato* manner (pp. 88–94), WELTIN claims that “diverse magical formulae preclude an ascription of self-virtuous powers to any magical set of words” (p. 76). Because early Christian exorcistic formulas exhibit variety in formulation, therefore, they do not possess *ex opere operato* power (p. 85). Rather than argue that the demons copied the Christian mysteries, Justin should have argued (suggests WELTIN) that since Christianity is a truly historical revelation with a legal contract enacted by the deity, the power to perform miracles is a permanent provision of this contractual relationship. “Magic”, suggests WELTIN, “is occult and knows no divine contract; it is unilateral and arises from man’s ingenuity” (p. 98). On pp. 99f. he expresses this view clearly:

“It is clearly not magical hocus-pocus or even presumptuous effrontery to draw payment on a permanent blank check at the express command of your Father. No classical god, as far as we have seen, or mystery deity that we know of, has been so lavish in his concern and so legal-minded as to have his contracts put into writing.”

While the gospels and ‘Acts’ contain a great many narratives of healings and exorcisms, the epistolary literature of the New Testament refers to signs, wonders and mighty deeds only in very general terms (Rom. 15:19; Gal. 3:5; 1 Cor. 12:10; 2 Cor. 12:12; Heb. 2:4). Only in Jac. 5:14–16 do we find a specific healing ritual which is to be followed in cases of illness (1 Cor. 12:9 refers to “gifts of healing” without further specification or elaboration). References to exorcisms occur only in the synoptic gospels and ‘Acts’ and then are not referred to again until the middle of the second century in the writings of Justin Martyr. In a recent study of the relationship between rational medicine and miraculous or magical healing in early Christianity, M. SMITH has pointed out the paradoxical nature of the evidence regarding the early Christian attitude toward health and

¹⁷² On the magical-exorcistic understanding of “*Onoma-Taufe*” in Justin, see C. ANDRESEN, *Die Kirchen der alten Christenheit* (Stuttgart, 1971), p. 77; on baptism “in the name of Jesus” generally in the second century see HEITMÜLLER, *Im Namen Jesu*, pp. 266–336; BÖCHER, *Christus Exorcista*, pp. 166–80; F. J. DÖLGER, *Der Exorzismus im altchristlichen Taufritual* (Paderborn, 1909),

illness¹⁷³. While the gospels and 'Acts' contain many stories of miraculous cures, and Paul and others claimed that sickness could be miraculously healed, yet Paul himself was a sick man (1 Cor. 12:7-10)¹⁷⁴. Sickness was not uncommon in Christian communities, yet neither rational medicine (which was not unknown) nor miraculous or magical healing was resorted to. It would therefore appear that magical healing (in contrast to exorcism) was more firmly fixed in the ideology of Christian mission propaganda than in the experience of everyday life. The second century Neo-Platonist Celsus apparently charged that Christians avoided physicians (Origen contra Cels. 3.75), and Origen himself recommended in the third century that Christians ought to seek medical attention for physical ailments (contra Cels. 8.60). Origen recognized the effectiveness of names, demons and charms in combating illness, but emphasized at the same time that the truly pious man will avoid their use (contra Cels. 8.61).

VII. Glossolalia and Voces Magicae

One of the more peculiar characteristics of the magical papyri and amulets from the Graeco-Roman period is the frequent occurrence of incomprehensible sequences of vowels and consonants, generally designated as *voces magicae*. Many of these *voces magicae* recur in precisely the same form in many magical texts, a fact which reveals their formulaic rather than extemporaneous nature. On the other hand such *voces magicae* frequently introduce or frame extemporaneous series of nonsensical sequences of vowels and consonants which are related to, yet different from the *voces magicae* themselves. Some of the more common sequences include the widely used 'Ephesia grammata' and various palindromes (e.g., αβλαναθαβαλβα, ιαωαι, αβερραμενθω, ουλερθεξαναξ, εθρελυωθμε, μαρεβα, etc.)¹⁷⁵. This phenomenon, in combination with the interest which magical texts betray in foreign words and phrases and in the names of foreign divinities, has quite naturally led some scholars to suspect a close relationship between glossolalia and *voces magicae*¹⁷⁶. Some deny any relationship¹⁷⁷, others affirm that the two

¹⁷³ M. SMITH, Plutarch's de tuenda sanitate praecepta (Moralia 122B-137E), in: Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature, ed. H. D. BETZ (Leiden, 1978), pp. 34-41.

¹⁷⁴ HARNACK, Medicinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte, pp. 93f.

¹⁷⁵ See PREISENDANZ, PGM, vol. 3, pp. 243-78 (index to magical words), and pp. 279-80 (index to palindromes); on the last palindrome listed in our examples, see EITREM, Papyri Osloenses, Fasc. I, pp. 7f.

¹⁷⁶ J. BEHM, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, I (1964), 723; S. EITREM, Orakel und Mysterien am Ausgang der Antike (Zürich, 1947), p. 41; E. R. DODDS, Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety (Cambridge, 1965), p. 55, n. 1; F. DORNSEIFF, Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 45, 54f. H. WEINEL, Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus (Freiburg, 1899), p. 77.

¹⁷⁷ A. DIETZEL, Beten im Geist, Theologische Zeitung, 13 (1957), 12ff.

are very closely related¹⁷⁸, while still others claim that the precise relationship, if any, cannot be determined¹⁷⁹. HARNACK, while he thought he recognized actual glossolalia behind the *voces magicae* in the 'Pistis Sophia', nevertheless concluded that "we certainly no longer have genuine glossolalia in the Pistis Sophia"¹⁸⁰.

BONNER contends that while the two might have sounded similar, glossolalia was "spontaneous, unmediated utterance", while the *voces magicae* consisted of carefully transmitted, stereotypical formulas¹⁸¹. However, those who have heard the phenomenon of speaking in tongues in our day will notice that certain sequences of sound recur in this 'spontaneous' utterance, leading one to suspect that the difference between spontaneous and formulaic ecstatic speech can easily be overdrawn.

Unfortunately, while we are told that glossolalia was practised in various places through brief (and late) narratives (Acts 2: 1–13, in Jerusalem; 10: 44–46, in Caesarea; 19: 6, in Ephesus), and we receive some brief descriptive and theoretical statements on the subject by Paul (1 Cor. 12–14), we apparently have no transcription of such utterances. I say apparently, because there is a possible exception in the term *abba* referred to by Paul in Rom. 8: 15 and Gal. 4: 6 together with an interpretation: *Abba!* "Father!" While many scholars interpret the στεναγμοὶ ἀλάλητοι in Rom. 8: 26 as glossolalia¹⁸², they usually object to extending this interpretation to Rom. 8: 15. In form, *abba* is a palindrome of a foreign (Aramaic) word which would have been incomprehensible to gentile Roman Christians (or Galatian Christians) were it not for the fact that the utterance is interpreted. Paul, of course, insists that glossolalia be accompanied by an interpretation (1 Cor. 14: 13–19). In principle this use of *abba* functions no differently than the ecstatic cry εὐὸν by devotees of Dionysos (Theophilos ad Autolyc. 2. 28). I myself have heard the term *abba* used in the context of modern glossolalia several times; the fact that it is a *Lallwort* makes it easily adaptable to such contexts.

Furthermore, inarticulate speech, the speech of animals or other secret or incomprehensible languages can be part of the repertoire of the shaman¹⁸³. Such speech also appears to be one possible characteristic of the prophet or diviner; Isa. 8: 19 speaks of wizards that squeak and gibber, and Celsus mentions the incoherent utterances of Syrian prophets (Origen contra Cels. 7. 9ff.; cf. Lucian Alex. 13)¹⁸⁴. One major similarity between glossolalia and *voces magicae* is the

¹⁷⁸ M. SMITH, Clement of Alexandria, p. 233: "The spirit which spoke through the Christians and the spirits which spoke through pagan magicians spoke the same characteristic language."

¹⁷⁹ W. KEILBACH, Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3. Aufl., VI (1962), 1941.

¹⁸⁰ A. HARNACK, Über die Pistis Sophia, TU, 7, 2 (Leipzig, 1891), pp. 88f.

¹⁸¹ BONNER, Amulets, pp. 189f.

¹⁸² E. KÄSEMANN, The Cry for Liberty in the Worship of the Church, Perspectives on Paul (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 127–34; IDEM, An die Römer, 3. Aufl. (Tübingen, 1974), pp. 231f.; H. LIETZMANN, An die Römer, 5. Aufl. (Tübingen, 1933), p. 86; P. ALTHAUS, Der Brief an die Römer, 6. Aufl. (Göttingen, 1966), p. 94; G. B. CUTTEN, Speaking with Tongues (New Haven, 1927), pp. 170ff.

¹⁸³ M. ELIADE, Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy (New York, 1964), pp. 96–99.

¹⁸⁴ S. D. CURRIE, Speaking in Tongues, Interpretation, 19 (1965), 274–94.

fact that both are directed to a divinity; magicians in their incantations are calling upon supernatural powers just as Paul claims that those who speak in tongues are speaking to God (1 Cor. 14:2, 28) in the "language of angels" (1 Cor. 13:1)¹⁸⁵. Iamblichus observes that unintelligible language used in holy rites reproduces the language of the gods (de myst. 7.4f.; cf. HOPFNER, Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber, I, 757). Similarly, the context of most transcriptions of *voces magicae* is that of an ἐπίκλησις directed to gods or other supernatural powers¹⁸⁶.

In sum, the available evidence in our judgment does not support the contention that glossolalia was a form of magical prayer closely related, if not identical to, the *voces magicae* of the magical papyri. The use of *voces magicae* in magical rituals appears always to have been directed toward the accomplishment of particular religious objectives. In contrast to this pragmatic, and hence thoroughly magical, function of the *voces magicae*, there is no evidence to suggest that glossolalia functioned similarly. Even that which some scholars regard as the clearest parallel to the phenomenon of glossolalia at Corinth, the incomprehensible speech of the Pythia which supposedly required prophetic interpretation to render Apollo's utterances comprehensible, turns out, on closer examination, to be a product of modern scholarly imagination¹⁸⁷. There is no evidence that the Pythia's speech was incomprehensible.

VIII. Magical Prayer¹⁸⁸

"In prayer", observed M. WEBER, "the boundary between magical formula and supplication remains fluid"¹⁸⁹. One of the most characteristic forms of magical prayer is the blessing and the curse. Blessing and cursing may be regarded as magical if, within the context of religious deviance, the act of invoking formulas of benison and malediction is regarded as tantamount to achieving the desired effect. In Graeco-Roman magic, formulas of cursing are the central

¹⁸⁵ EITREM, Orakel und Mysterien, p. 41.

¹⁸⁶ The structure of the magical ceremony may be divided into two major parts, the [*epi*]-*klēsis* or invocation and the *praxis* or magical operation (FESTUGIÈRE, l'Idéal religieux des Grecs, pp. 284–89). This morphology is more satisfactory than the more elaborate one of T. HOPFNER, Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber, I, 869–81, followed by PRÜMM, Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch, pp. 371–75. HULL, Hellenistic Magic, pp. 42 ff. appears to be summarizing FESTUGIÈRE but nowhere indicates that.

¹⁸⁷ The traditional view is represented by EITREM, Orakel und Mysterien, p. 42; H. GUNKEL, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, 2. Aufl. (Göttingen, 1899), pp. 18f. The view expressed here is argued by J. FONTENROSE, The Delphic Oracle (Berkeley, 1978), pp. 212–24.

¹⁸⁸ J. LEIPOLDT, Gebet und Zauber im Urchristentum, in: IDEM, Von den Mysterien zur Kirche: Gesammelte Aufsätze (Leipzig, 1961), pp. 104–115.

¹⁸⁹ M. WEBER, The Sociology of Religion, trans. E. FISCHOFF (Boston, 1963), p. 26.

feature of the so-called *tabulae execrationum*¹⁹⁰. A curse has been defined by F. BÜCHSEL as "a directly expressed or indicated utterance which in virtue of a supernatural nexus of operation brings harm by its very expression to the one against whom it is directed"¹⁹¹. The phenomenon of blessing and cursing permeates early Christianity¹⁹², where it is certainly a magical phenomenon.

Just as magical prayers are characterized by the use of imperatives (particularly toward their conclusion)¹⁹³, and by the lavish use of threats¹⁹⁴, so formulas of cursing also bear these two characteristic features. Curses are also closely related to "punitive miracles" in which harm is inflicted on persons or things; such *Strafwunder* are the inverse of *Heilungswunder*¹⁹⁵.

The gospels preserve no narratives of punitive miracles performed by Jesus, with the single exception of the episode of the Cursing of the Fig Tree (Mk. 11:12–14, 20–25; Mt. 21:18–22). BRUN notes that this narrative is not just a fortuitous exception, particularly in light of Lk. 9:51–56 and Mt. 26:53¹⁹⁶. Further, the connection of this *Strafwunder* with Jesus' saying on faith (Mk. 11:22–25; Mt. 21:21–22) is probably not original¹⁹⁷, and appears to function in such a way as to diminish the magical character of the entire episode, which has a strong claim to historicity precisely because of its strange character. Jesus' pronouncement of woes upon various groups and individuals must also be considered under the rubric of cursing¹⁹⁸. In the one instance in which Jesus pronounces a woe upon an individual (his future betrayer) in Mk. 14:21 (Mt. 26:24; Lk. 22:22), the curse is fulfilled by the pitiful death of Judas (Mt. 27:3–10; Acts 1:16–19). However, in this instance the contradictory accounts of Judas' demise indicate either a curse pronounced *ex eventu* by the Christian community or a story invented to report the fulfillment of the predicted woe.

In contrast to the gospels, *Strafwunder* occupy a very prominent position in the 'Acts of the Apostles' where they are performed by both Peter and Paul¹⁹⁹. In the story of Ananias and Sapphira, Peter presides over the death of Ananias (Acts 5:5), who dies without the invocation of a curse, while the death of his wife Sapphira (5:10) is preceded by a curse (5:9) which becomes immediately effective. In Acts 13:6–12, Elymas the magician is struck blind in consequence of an imprecation pronounced by Paul. These two punitive miracles, of course, are

¹⁹⁰ Supra, n. 34.

¹⁹¹ Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, I (1964), 449.

¹⁹² The most detailed investigation of this subject is L. BRUN, *Segen und Fluch im Urchristentum* (Oslo, 1933), who does not deal with the magical complexion of blessing and cursing. BRUN emphasizes the Jewish origin of these concepts in the New Testament and does not take seriously the form of the imprecations used, for example, by Paul. However, he does show the constellation of ideas which are involved in the "blessing/curse" topic.

¹⁹³ EITREM, *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. I, p. 46.

¹⁹⁴ HOPFNER, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, I, 792; EITREM, *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. I, p. 36.

¹⁹⁵ WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, pp. 57–62, 138, 147–55.

¹⁹⁶ BRUN, *Segen und Fluch*, pp. 75f.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 84–87.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 78ff.

overshadowed by the numerically more frequent healings performed both by Peter (Acts 2:43; 3:1ff.; 4:30; 5:12ff.; 9:32ff., 39ff.) and by Paul (Acts 14:8ff.; 16:16ff.; 19:11f.; 20:9f.; 28:8f.). The early Christian apologetic argument that Jesus' miracles (unlike those of Graeco-Roman magicians or divine men) were performed unselfishly and for the salvation of man, while apparently true of Jesus, could not as easily be applied to the Lukan portrait of apostolic activity. In early Christian apocryphal literature, the incidence of *Strafwunder* attributed to both Jesus and the apostles exhibits a marked increase in frequency²⁰⁰, a feature which seems to indicate that the apologetic perspective of the more educated Christian authors was not fully shared or even understood by popular Christianity.

The Paul depicted in Acts 13:6–12 is fully consonant with the author of the Pauline letters. In an excellent recent study of the prayers of Paul, G. WILES devotes a substantial section to considering blessings and curses in Paul's prayers²⁰¹. The passages of central importance are the introductory curse (1:8f.) and concluding blessing (6:16) of the letter to the Galatians, and the two curse passages in 1 Cor. 5:3–5 (cf. Tim. 1:20), and 16:22; in all of these passages imperative verbs are used. Many years ago DEISSMANN suggested that 1 Cor. 5:3–5 be understood against the background of Graeco-Roman magic²⁰². DEISSMANN demonstrated the presence of two technical terms from the magical ritual of execration; the chief difference between this early Christian curse formula and that of pagan magic being the Pauline substitution of "Satan" for pagan divinities. We must also reckon with the probability that this ritual execration was pronounced "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 5:4)²⁰³. The difficulty of interpreting this passage in a non-magical way is perhaps indicated by WILES' lengthy discussion of it in its broader context²⁰⁴. For though the author recognizes that Paul's imprecations resemble Old Testament, Jewish and pagan usage, he opines that "it does not in itself necessarily imply a magical concept or a departure from his usual understanding of the limits of his own power and authority under God" (p. 121). WILES' difficulty in arguing against the magical interpretation of 1 Cor. 5:3–5 becomes clear in his concluding statement: "Confident that no other protective course could be taken, he [Paul] acted as

²⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 81ff.; cf. W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen, 1909), pp. 360–68.

²⁰¹ G. WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers: The Significance of the Intercessory Prayer Passages in the Letters of St. Paul*, in: SNTS Monographs, 24 (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 108–55.

²⁰² DEISSMANN, *Light from the Ancient East*, pp. 303ff.; IDEM, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, trans. W. E. WILSON (New York, 1912), p. 70; BRUN, *Segen und Fluch*, p. 109.

²⁰³ The grammatical problems are summarized by H. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, trans. J. W. LEITCH (Philadelphia, 1975), p. 97; in interpreting the passage as we have, we are following HEITMÜLLER, *Im Namen Jesu*, pp. 73f. and W. BOUSSET, *Kyrios Christos*, 5. Aufl. (Göttingen, 1965), p. 87. R. REITZENSTEIN correctly describes the rite found in 1 Cor. 5:3–5 as a "*Zauberhandlung*" in: IDEM, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen*, 3. Aufl. (Stuttgart, 1927, repr. Darmstadt, 1956), p. 364.

²⁰⁴ WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, pp. 135–50.

apostolic intercessor with a certainty that went far beyond his usual intercessory practice" (p. 150, spacing added).

The three other passages, Gal. 1:8f.; 6:16 and 1 Cor. 16:22, differ from the one just discussed in that while 1 Cor. 5:3–5 describes a ceremony of ritual execration, these passages imply that the letters to which blessings and curses are attached are thereby constituted as 'magical letters'²⁰⁵, a category of letters in antiquity. DEISSMANN demonstrated that the cognates ἀναθεματίζω and ἀνάθεμα in Gal. 1:8f. and 1 Cor. 16:22 were technical terms of magical execration in Graeco-Roman curse tablets²⁰⁶. The use of the imperative mood in the verbs of all of these formulas of execration makes it clear that we are dealing with the curse as a variety of magical prayer²⁰⁷.

In J. LEIPOLDT's study 'Gebet und Zauber im Urchristentum', the author proposed that, while prayer and magic cannot be clearly differentiated in Judaism or Graeco-Roman paganism, Jesus uniquely separated prayer from magic (pp. 109ff.). Paul's prayers too, are non-magical (pp. 113–14). While LEIPOLDT's views on the relationship between prayer and magic in Graeco-Roman religions and Judaism are correct, we do not know enough about the prayers of Jesus to make an accurate judgment. LEIPOLDT's characterization of Paul's prayers as non-magical requires careful qualification in the light of the foregoing discussion.

One significant characteristic which dominates many magical prayers is the abundance of divine attributes, a feature not uncommon in Jewish and pagan prayers of the Graeco-Roman era²⁰⁸. Presumably influenced by DEISSMANN, T. SCHERMANN produced a study entitled 'Griechische Zauberpapyri und das Gemeinde- und Dankgebet im I. Klemensbriefe', TU, 34 (Leipzig, 1909). SCHERMANN's objective was to illuminate the formulation of the communal prayers of thanksgiving found in 1 Clement 9–12; 20:1–12 34:5–7; 59–61. After a consideration of various names and epithets of the gods in the prayers of the magical papyri (pp. 4–16), he provided a detailed analysis of the names and epithets of God in the thanksgiving prayers of 1 Clement (pp. 22–50). SCHERMANN concludes that while the content and form of the prayers in Clement are neither new nor original, neither are they dependent on pagan or Egyptian sources; the emphasis on the omnipotence of God in the creation and preservation of the world, the determination of the fate of mankind and governance over all

²⁰⁵ H. D. BETZ, In Defense of the Spirit: Paul's Letter to the Galatians as a Document of Early Christian Apologetics, in: Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity, ed. E. S. FIORENZA (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1976), p. 112. See also H. D. BETZ, The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians, New Testament Studies, 21 (1974/75), pp. 378f., and H. D. BETZ, Galatians (Philadelphia, 1979), p. 25; there BETZ refers to J. SCHNEIDER, Brief, RAC, 2 (1954) 572f.; R. STÜBE, Der Himmelsbrief (Tübingen, 1918), and J. SYKUTRIS, Epistolographie, PW. Suppl. V (1931), col. 207. The concluding curse in Rev. 22:18–19 would appear to place that document in the category of a magical letter, since it has some formal features of ancient epistolary literature.

²⁰⁶ DEISSMANN, Light from the Ancient East, pp. 92f.; cf. BRUN, Segen und Fluch, p. 105.

²⁰⁷ EITREM, Papyri Osloenses, Fasc. I, p. 46.

²⁰⁸ But, see the excellent article by H. D. BETZ, On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism, Journal for Theology and the Church, 6 (1969), 134–56.

beings forms a type of prayer which has close parallels in the Old Testament, Jewish apocryphal literature, Philo and the Greek magical papyri, not to mention 1 Clement (p. 51). Thus, while SCHERMANN's study does little to illuminate the features of magical prayer, it does underscore the proximity of 'religious' prayer and 'magical' incantation.

IX. Magical Motifs in Early Christian Literature

The analysis of the various magical patterns and motifs which underlie some of the writings emanating from early Christianity is a task which has yet to be undertaken. In the New Testament, the 'Revelation of John' has yet to be fully investigated from the vantage point of the history of religions²⁰⁸, and it is precisely that document which shows the greatest impact of magical patterns and motifs in the New Testament. In the group of writings called Apostolic Fathers, it is the 'Shepherd of Hermas' which appears to show the greatest number of such magical patterns and motifs. We shall first indicate a number of features in the 'Revelation of John' which have magical parallels, and then turn to the important work of E. PETERSON on the 'Shepherd of Hermas'.

J. M. HULL has observed that magic has been "baptized" in the 'Apocalypse of John', and that "the relationship between Christianity and magic becomes creative, and magical images and customs are taken over wholesale without compromise to the essentially eschatological nature of the church's faith"²⁰⁹. In spite of the fact that the present study might question HULL's supposition of the alien nature of magic in early Christianity, his basic view of the 'Apocalypse of John' is certainly correct. I would like to make a number of random observations regarding parallels between the 'Apocalypse' and Graeco-Roman magic: (1) The use of the adverb 'quickly' found not infrequently in the 'Apocalypse' (1:1; 2:16; 3:11; 11:14; 22:6, 7, 12, 20) occurs regularly at the conclusion of magical incantations in the papyri. (2) The imagery of the plagues of the Jewish exodus used in the 'Apocalypse' are strongly emphasized in PGM IV, 3008-86. (3) It has been noted by some scholars that certain passages of the 'Apocalypse' (1:4, 8, 17; 21:6; 22:13) read like magical formulas²¹⁰. (4) The creature with many eyes (Rev. 4:6; 4:8) has striking parallels with the iconography of magical papyri and depictions on amulets²¹¹. (5) The verb *vikōv* found seventeen times in the 'Apocalypse', is a popular expression in magical literature used of the success of the magician²¹². (6) The rhetorical features of doxological prayers (cf. Rev. 5:12) resembles those used by magicians²¹³. (7) The name of God is a protective or apotropaic device

²⁰⁹ HULL, *Hellenistic Magic*, p. 144.

²¹⁰ EITREM, *Some Notes on Demonology*, p. 22; the author refers to the judgments of J. WEISS with approval.

²¹¹ HOFFNER, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, I, 213ff.

²¹² EITREM, *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. I, p. 83.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

against evil powers (Rev. 7:2, 3; 9:4; 14:1; 22:4), (8) similarly, the names of blasphemy are said to have been written on the head of an animal from the sea (Rev. 13:1; 17:3), both notions which presuppose name-magic. (9) In Rev. 20:1f. (cf. 1:18; 9:1) an angel descends from heaven with the key of the Abyss and a chain to restrain Satan; here there are exact parallels in magical texts²¹⁴. (10) The magical use of alpha and omega (Rev. 1:8; 21:6; 22:3) has been commented upon by DORNSEIFF²¹⁵. (11) The frequent use of the numbers three and seven in the 'Apocalypse' has many magical parallels. (12) The "stone with the new name" (Rev. 2:17) is a magical amulet²¹⁶. Perhaps these random examples will serve as an indication of the extent to which the 'Apocalypse of John' uses magical patterns and motifs.

In two important articles devoted to the 'Shepherd of Hermas', E. PETERSON has convincingly demonstrated that the revelatory visions ostensibly received by Hermas are tricked out by terms and concepts from ancient magic and magical techniques, particularly as they relate to divination²¹⁷. However, PETERSON emphasizes that Hermas has produced a „*Buchprophetie*“, and therefore „*weil sie Buchprophetie sind, können sie in ihrer Einkleidung Elemente aus der hellenistischen Offenbarungsliteratur übernehmen, ohne doch der magischen Handlung, die der hellenistischen Offenbarungsliteratur zugrunde liegt, Erwähnung zu tun*“²¹⁸. In effect, the world of Hellenistic magic is indispensable for understanding some of the otherwise puzzling details of the visions, yet such borrowing must be considered primarily formal, since the two central revelatory figures found in the visions of Hermas are not compelled to appear through the use of magical formulas and rites²¹⁹. R. JOLY, referring to PETERSON's work on Hermas, agrees on the formal nature of the Hellenistic magical influences²²⁰, as does L. PERNVEDEN²²¹. J. REILING, however, in his recent study on 'Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate', *Nov. Test. Supplements*, 37 (Leiden, 1973), thinks that such magical influences on Hermas are more than just formal, and he regarded his own study as "an attempt to do for the 11th Mandate what Peterson did for the Visions" (p. 21). At the conclusion of his study, REILING states the following:

"If the conclusions drawn above are correct, there is reason to revise Peterson's judgment on the hellenistic elements in the Visions. They are not just

²¹⁴ PGM IV, 3024ff.; WORTMANN, *Neue magische Texte*, p. 69; EITREM, *Some Notes on Demonology*, pp. 11f.

²¹⁵ DORNSEIFF, *Das Alphabet*, pp. 122–25.

²¹⁶ EITREM, *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. I, p. 41; BOUSSET *Offenbarung Johannes*, p. 249; cf. *supra*, n. 161.

²¹⁷ E. PETERSON, *Beiträge zur Interpretation der Visionem im Pastor Hermas*, in: IDEM, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rom, Freiburg u. Wien, 1959), pp. 254–70. A second article, 'Kritische Analyse der fünften Vision des Hermas', is found in the same volume.

²¹⁸ PETERSON, *Kritische Analyse*, p. 284.

²¹⁹ PETERSON, *Beiträge zur Interpretation*, p. 268.

²²⁰ R. JOLY (ed.), *Hermas le Pasteur*, SC, 53 (Paris, 1958), p. 54.

²²¹ L. PERNVEDEN, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas* (Lund, 1966), pp. 26, 34, 291.

“Einkleidung”, wording, which can, as it were, be detached without altering the portrait of the author’s work and message, but there is good reason to see them as part of Hermas’s work [p. 174].”

REILING’s own use of magical papyri to illuminate the 11th Mandate centers on the expression τὸ κενὸν πνεῦμα (pp. 41–48), which, he concludes, was a phrase associated with pagan divination used by Hermas to brand one who possessed such a spirit as utterly pagan (p. 43), an explanation which assumes Hermas to be quite familiar with both the milieu and language of magical divination. REILING places Hermas within the context of a Christianity within which there was an undercurrent of divinatory practices which had more in common with the religious ideas outside the church than with the theological positions of teachers within the church (p. 81). In work currently in progress by the Swedish scholar DAVID HELLHOLM at Uppsala, one hopes that the research of PETERSON and REILING will be supplemented so that a more accurate picture of the relationship between that enigmatical document and the world of Graeco-Roman magic will emerge²²².

X. Conclusions

The foregoing study, as incomplete as it necessarily is, has nevertheless attempted to summarize a great deal of the work which has been done during the last two generations on the relationship between magic and early Christianity. If we have found that magic was a characteristic feature of early Christianity from its very inception, that is because we have regarded magic as a constant if subordinate feature of all religious traditions. Unfortunately, the term ‘magic’ itself has been a red herring in a great deal of the scholarly discussion. We have used the term without any pejorative connotations, referring only to the pragmatic and religiously deviant features of magic as a necessary and universally present substructure of religious systems. The study has also attempted to point to some of the critical areas where intensive research is required if the phenomenon of early Christianity is to be understood adequately.

²²² In discussing this matter with Mr. DAVID HELLHOLM at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in Claremont, California in April, 1976, he gave me the distinct impression that he would deal with this matter at some length in his Uppsala dissertation.