THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO


THE *SHEPHERD* OF HERMAS AND THE PAULINE LEGACY


A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY


DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AND

EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE


BY

JONATHAN EVERETT SOYARS


CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2017

For Johanna

"Der Hirt des Hermas ist ein eigenartiges Buch."

Hans Windisch

"Qui oserait encore étudier le *Pasteur* d'Hermas?"

Philippe Henne

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| AB | Anchor Bible |
| *Aeg* | *Aegyptus* |
| AF | Apostolic Fathers |
| AKM | Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes |
| AnGreg | Analecta Gregoriana |
| *ANRW* | *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.* Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972- |
| ANTF | Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung |
| *APF* | *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* |
| *Apoc* | *Apocrypha* |
| *AR* | *Andover Review* |
| ASP | American Studies in Papyrology |
| *ASPE* | *Acta seminarii philologici Erlangensis* |
| *AT* | *Annales theologici* |
| ATANT | Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| *Aug* | *Augustinianum* |
| AYB | Anchor Yale Bible |
| AYBRL | Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library |
| BDAG | *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Edited by W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. 3rd ed. Chicago, 1999. |
| BETL | Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium |
| BFCT | Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie |
| BHT | Beiträge zur historischen Theologie |
| *Bib* | *Biblica* |
| Bibl | Bibliologia |
| BibW | BibleWorld |
| BISSR | Bibliothèque de l'Institut supérieur des sciences religieuses |
| BNTC | Black's New Testament Commentaries |
| BÖA | Biblisch-Ökumenische Abteilung |
| *BTB* | *Biblical Theology Bulletin* |
| BWANT | Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament |
| *Byz* | *Byzantion* |
| BZNW | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche |
| CahOr | Cahiers d'Orientalisme |
| CahRB | Cahiers de la *Revue Biblique* |
| *CBQ* | *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* |
| CBQMS | *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* Monograph Series |
| *CBR* | *Currents in Biblical Research* |
| *CClCr* | *Civiltà classica e cristiana* |

| | |
|---|---|
| CCPRC | Cambridge Companions to Philosophy, Religion and Culture |
| CEJL | Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature |
| *ChrEg* | *Chronique d'Egypte* |
| CISAM | Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo |
| *CNS* | *Cristianesimo nella storia* |
| *Colloq* | *Colloquium* |
| CSCO | Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium |
| CTL | Crown Theological Library |
| DBS | Digital Biblical Studies |
| dGL | de Gruyter Lehrbuch |
| ECC | Early Church Classics |
| ECF | Early Church Fathers |
| EER | Études sur l'empire romain |
| EHPR | Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses |
| *ETL* | *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* |
| *Euph* | *Euphrosyne* |
| *ExpTim* | *Expository Times* |
| FP | Fuentes patrísticas |
| FRLANT | Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| FzB | Forschung zur Bibel |
| GA | Gesammelte Aufsätze |
| GBSNTS | Guides to Biblical Scholarship: New Testament Series |
| GCP | Græcitas christianorum primæva |
| GCS | Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller |
| *Gn* | *Gnomon* |
| GNS | Good News Studies |
| GRM | Graeco-Roman Memoirs |
| GTA | Göttinger theologische Arbeiten |
| Herm | Hermeneia |
| HFS | Haney Foundation Series |
| *HJ* | *Heythrop Journal* |
| *HJGG* | *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* |
| HNT | Handbuch zum Neuen Testament |
| *HTR* | *Harvard Theological Review* |
| HUT | Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie |
| *ICS* | *Illinois Classical Studies* |
| ISCIA | Interdisciplinary Studies on Cultural Interaction in Antiquity |
| *IKZ* | *Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift* |
| *JBL* | *Journal of Biblical Literature* |
| *JECS* | *Journal of Early Christian Studies* |
| *JHUC* | *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* |
| *JP* | *Journal of Philology* |
| JSHRZ | Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit |

| | |
|---|---|
| JSJSup | Supplements to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* |
| *JSNT* | *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* |
| JSNTSup | *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* Supplement Series |
| *JTS* | *Journal of Theological Studies* |
| KAV | Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern |
| KEKNT | Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament |
| KTVÜ | Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen |
| LAB | Living Age Books |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| LNTS | Library of New Testament Studies |
| LPS | Library of Pauline Studies |
| LSJ | *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Edited by H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996. |
| *MH* | *Museum helveticum* |
| *Mnem* | *Mnemosyne* |
| MRB | Monographische Reihe von "Benedictina" |
| MRC | Master Reference Collection |
| *Mus* | *Muséon: Revue d'études orientales* |
| *NeoT* | *Neotestamentica* |
| NGS | New Gospel Studies |
| NM | Il nuovo melograno |
| *NovT* | *Novum Testamentum* |
| NovTSup | Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* |
| *NThT* | *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* |
| NTOA | Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus |
| NTP | Novum Testamentum Patristicum |
| *NTS* | *New Testament Studies* |
| *OCP* | *Orientalia christiana periodica* |
| OECS | Oxford Early Christian Studies |
| OTM | Oxford Theological Monographs |
| PAO | Patrum apostolicorum opera |
| Papyr | Papyrologie |
| Par | Paradosis |
| *ParPass* | *La Parola del passato* |
| PBB | Publications de la Bibliotheca Bodmeriana |
| PE | Points Essais |
| PG | Patrologia Graeca |
| PHK | Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 2. Abhandlung |
| PL | Patrologia Latina |
| PointsLit | Points Littérature |
| PP | Popular Patristics |
| PPSD | Pauline and Patristic Scholars in Debate |
| PTS | Patristische Texte und Studien |
| PVTG | Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece |

| | |
|---|---|
| PWIHM | Publications of the Wellcome Institute of the History of Medicine |
| *RAC* | *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. Edited by T. Klauser et al. Stuttgart, 1950- |
| *RB* | *Revue Biblique* |
| RECM | Routledge Early Church Monographs |
| *REGC* | *Revue des études géorgiennes et caucasiennes* |
| *RevQ* | *Revue de Qumran* |
| *RevScRel* | *Recherches de sciences religieuses* |
| *RHR* | *Revue de l'histoire des religions* |
| *ROC* | *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* |
| *RQ* | *Renaissance Quarterly* |
| *RTL* | *Revue théologique de Louvain* |
| SAC | Studi di antichità cristiana |
| SAKDQ | Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften 2. Reihe |
| SC | Sources chrétiennes |
| *SCO* | *Studi Classici e Orientali* |
| ScrCopt | Scriptores Coptici |
| SCS | Septuagint Commentary Series |
| *SE* | *Studia evangelica* |
| SEÅ | Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok |
| SECA | Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha |
| *SecCent* | *Second Century* |
| SemeiaSt | Semeia Studies |
| SGKA | Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums |
| SGr | Serta Graeca |
| SHAW | Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften |
| SLBA | Schweich Lectures of the British Academy |
| Smyth | Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Rev. by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge, MA, 1984. |
| SNTSMS | Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series |
| SNTW | Studies of the New Testament and Its World |
| SPNT | Studies on Personalities of the New Testament |
| *ST* | *Studia theologica* |
| StC | Studi e commenti |
| STL | Studia Theologica Lundensia |
| STP | Studi e testi di papirologia |
| *StPatr* | *Studia patristica* |
| SUC | Schriften des Urchristentums |
| SUNT | Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments |
| SVTP | Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha |
| TBNT | Theologische Bücherei: Neues Testament |
| TDEHC | Textes et documents pour l'étude historique du Christianisme |
| TENTS | Texts and Editions for New Testament Study |

| | |
|---|---|
| Theoph | Theophaneia |
| ThHist | Théologie historique |
| *TQ* | *Theologische Quartalschrift* |
| TS | Texts and Studies |
| TTFL | Theological Translation Fund Library |
| TUGAL | Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur |
| *TynBul* | *Tyndale Bulletin* |
| UBW | Understanding the Bible and Its World |
| ULF | Unterweisung in lehrhafter Form |
| UMSHS | University of Michigan Studies; Humanistic Series |
| *VC* | *Vigiliae Christianae* |
| VCSup | Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* |
| *VetChr* | *Vetera Christianorum* |
| WGRWSup | Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement Series |
| WLAW | Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World |
| WUNT I | Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 1. Reihe |
| WUNT II | Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe |
| *ZKG* | *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* |
| *ZKT* | *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* |
| *ZNW* | *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* |
| *ZPE* | *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* |
| *ZThK* | *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* |
| *ZWT* | *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* |

# LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

served on my committee. The first reader, Professor Martinez, with whom I first floated the idea of writing a dissertation on the *Shepherd* during my visit to UChicago as an admitted doctoral student, applied his technical expertise in Greek philology, paleography, and papyrology, as well as his familiarity with the history of interpretation of the *Shepherd*, to the intricacies of my argument. The second reader, Professor Hans-Josef Klauck, shared his deep and broad knowledge of primary and secondary sources and offered substantial critical feedback, even after his retirement. I am particularly proud for mine to join the group of over sixty dissertations and *Habilitationsschriften* on whose committees he has served over his distinguished career. To these three committee members individually I offer my sincere thanks, both for their work on my behalf during the process of writing this dissertation and for their shaping influence upon me during the years of coursework and qualifying exams that preceded it. Errors, failures, or infelicities of any kind to be detected in this study are, of course, not their fault. They are entirely and solely my own.

Finally, it remains to attempt to express my gratitude to Johanna Gill Soyars. To her this meager work is affectionately dedicated in the knowledge that she has sacrificed more than any partner should in order to see it completed.

CHAPTER 1: THE POSSIBILITY OF ENCOUNTER WITH THE PAULINE LEGACY

INTRODUCTION

In modern scholarship, the *Shepherd* of Hermas is widely considered of little to no value for

assessing the actual influence, reception, or authority of the apostle or the letters written in his

name in the second century.[1] Paul and Paulinism, so it would seem, hardly mattered to Hermas

or possibly even passed by him by completely. The present project challenges this scholarly view

at length.[2] To the contrary, I shall argue that the *Shepherd* reveals significant and meaningful

contact with, influence of, and reuse of material attested in what becomes the *corpus Paulinum*.[3]

---

[1] My analysis of secondary literature in Chapter 2 will establish this claim fully, but here I need only cite two books on the early development of the Pauline legacy published in the last decade, both of which overlooked the witness of the *Shepherd* in their respective treatments of Pauline material in the writings of selected Apostolic Fathers: James W. Aageson, *Paul, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Early Church*, LPS (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008); and Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, eds., *Paul and the Second Century*, LNTS 412 (London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011). The former's treatment of "Paul and the Apostolic Fathers" in chapter five (pp. 123-56) engages the writings of the material by or attributed to Ignatius, Polycarp, and Clement, but not Hermas. Likewise, Bird and Dodson's edited volume includes contributions on Paul and the following authors/texts: Ignatius (ch. 2), the Life and Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians (ch. 3), and the Epistle to Diognetus (ch. 4). Yet nowhere is the *Shepherd* mentioned.
[2] Two recent exceptions stand apart from this scholarly position. This first is Joseph Verheyden, "The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 322-29. The second is Clayton N. Jefford, "Missing Pauline Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers? *Didache*, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Papias, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, and the *Epistle to Diognetus*," in *The Apostolic Fathers and Paul*, ed. Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite, PPSD 2 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), 41-60, esp. 49-52, 59. See the relevant discussion on pp. 106-10 in Chapter 2.
[3] The Greek and Latin text of the *Shepherd* quoted herein is that of Martin Leutzsch, *Schriften des Urchristentums* Vol. 3*: Hirt des Hermas*, SUC 3 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998). Upon its publication, Leutzsch's reconstructed text become the standard in the field, replacing the prior editions of Robert Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 2nd rev. ed., SC 53 [*bis*] (Paris: Cerf, 1968); and Molly Whittaker, *Die apostolischen Väter* Vol. 1: *Der Hirt des Hermas*, 2nd rev. ed., GCS (Berlin: Akademie, 1967). Nevertheless, Leutzsch's text does not

By this I mean that in crafting his composite text over a period of years Hermas preserved, expanded, and sometimes contested certain Pauline traditions, thereby implicitly contributing to the ongoing development of the apostle's legacy. Consequently, the composition of Hermas's tripartite text during the first few decades of the second century C.E. should be read as an episode in the apostle's history of effects If my thesis is convincing, it opens a new avenue for investigating the history of Paulinism in the second century.

In exploring Pauline intertexts in the *Shepherd*, I seek to demonstrate where, how, and to what ends Hermas employs and engages material attested in what becomes the *corpus Paulinum*. For the purposes of this study, I define his potential *corpus* to include Paul's seven undisputed letters (Rom, 1-2 Cor, Gal, Phil, 1 Thess, Phlm), the three deutero-Paulines (Eph, Col, 2 Thess), the Pastoral Epistles (1-2 Tim, Tit), and Hebrews. The former decision has both historical and theoretical warrant. The list mirrors the presumed contents of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ (P.Beatty 2 + P.Mich. inv. 6238).[4] That manuscript is the earliest extant collection of Paul's letters and may be only a few

---

incorporate some finds published directly before it, and numerous others have appeared since 1998; for a description of those in Greek and Ethiopic, see Gianfrancesco Lusini, "Nouvelles recherches sur le texte du Pasteur d'Hermas," *Apoc* 12 (2001): 79-97. The quoted Greek text of the New Testament is that of Barbara Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012). Unless otherwise noted, all English translations of ancient sources are my own.

[4] Ten leaves of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ in the Chester Beatty collection were published by Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* Fasc. III: *Pauline Epistles and Revelation: Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1934). An additional thirty leaves at Michigan were published by Henry A. Sanders, ed., *A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul*, UMSHS 38 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935). Sanders' 1935 edition of the Michigan leaves was republished together with an edition of the remaining leaves of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ by Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* Fasc. III Supplement: *Pauline Epistles: Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1936); and Supplement: *Pauline Epistles: Plates* (London: Emery Walker, 1937). Although the surviving leaves of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ do not include the text of 2 Thess or Phlm, the original manuscript "almost certainly" included

decades younger than the final edition of the *Shepherd*.[5] Following the example of Emily J.

Hunt, whose comparative analysis of Tatian "include[d] all of the Pauline Epistles that second

century Christians… may have considered authentic," I too include all texts considered

potentially Pauline in my comparative *corpus* in order not to exclude *a priori* the possibility that

Hermas might have known them either in whole or in part.[6] Such openness signals my suspicion

that there are connections between the *Shepherd* and the *corpus Paulinum* that have long been

underestimated.

---

these two letters (so Richard I. Pervo, *The Making of Paul: Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010], 291 n. 29). $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ has frequently been thought to have omitted the Pastorals, but Jeremy Duff has argued that the "scribe who produced $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ assum[ed] that the Pastorals were a constituent part of the Pauline corpus" ("$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and the Pastorals: A Misleading Consensus?," *NTS* 44 [1998]: 578-90; the quote is from p. 589).

[5] Paleographical dating of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ranges widely from the late first to third centuries C.E. Among the many proposals, compare Young Kyu Kim, "Palaeographical Dating of P$^{46}$ to the Later First Century," *Bib* 69 (1988): 248-57 (late first cent.); Ulrich Wilcken, "The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri," *APF* 11 (1935): 113 (ca. 200, perhaps slightly earlier); Hans Lietzmann, "Zur Würdigung des Chester-Beatty-Papyrus der Paulusbriefe," in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1934), 780 (ca. 200); Eric G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex*, HFS 18 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 148 (third cent.); Kenyon, *Pauline Epistles and Revelation: Text*, ix (first half of third cent.); cf. Kenyon's original, broader proposal of the third cent. in *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* Fasc. I: *General Introduction* (London: Emery Walker, 1933), 7; Sanders, *Third-Century Papyrus Codex*, 13 (second half of third cent.); Stuart Pickering, "The Dating of the Chester Beatty-Michigan Codex of the Pauline Epistles (P46)," in *Ancient History in a Modern University: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Macquarie University, 8-13 July, 1993*, ed. T. W. Hillard and E. A. Judge, vol. 2 (N.S.W., Australia: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 216-27, esp. 223 (third/fourth cent.).

[6] Emily J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian*, RECM (London: Routledge, 2003), 191 n. 124. Hunt added, "Thus, I include Ephesians and other Epistles which, although now considered to be spurious, were uncontested in our period. I have also included Hebrews within Tatian's Pauline corpus, despite concern often displayed until the fourth century about its authenticity."

In this chapter, I lay the foundation upon which my extended argument in support of my thesis is constructed. I shall establish the historical possibility of Hermas's knowing multiple Pauline letters, by which I mean a *corpus Paulinum*, in some manner. My investigation of scholarly views on the *Shepherd*'s dating and compositional history shall show that there is chronological contemporaneity with the dating of the various Pauline letter collections in circulation in the late first and early second centuries C.E. Finally, in the chapter's second main section, I shall present the *Shepherd*'s imagined portrait of Hermas as a literate medium of divine communication in order then to describe how Hermas possibly encountered a *corpus Paulinum* in two different ways, namely by reading it himself or hearing it read or discussed. Although both are possible, I shall argue that the latter mode is more likely.

DATING THE COMPOSITION OF THE *SHEPHERD* AND THE FORMATION OF A *CORPUS PAULINUM*

In order to prove the *Shepherd*'s contacts with letters attributed to Paul, first I must establish the historical possibility that Hermas could have known them. This possibility will be accomplished if I can demonstrate, first, that a *corpus Paulinum* was in circulation at Rome prior to, or during the period of, the *Shepherd*'s composition and, second, that an author like Hermas could have had access to it in some way. This requires dating the *Shepherd* itself, which is no simple task. Indeed, as I shall show, the compositional history of the *Shepherd* remains one of its enduring puzzles. And yet, I think a strong case can be made for the possibility that Hermas's process of composition began after Paul's letters began to arrive and be engaged by others in the imperial city.

Dating the Composition of the *Shepherd*

In order plausibly to date the *Shepherd*'s composition, I must examine both external and internal evidence. The former includes the paleography of papyrus remains, the Muratorian canon, and quotations in subsequent authors. The latter includes references to known Christian figures and persecutions experienced by Christ-followers under various Roman emperors. I begin by searching for the earliest extant external evidence.

*Manuscript Witnesses*

The *Shepherd* enjoys the best manuscript attestation of all early Christian texts that were not ultimately included in the canon.[7] The vast majority of these manuscripts date to the third century or later. The Athos codex from the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries is the most extensive surviving Greek one; it contains nearly the entirety of the work, with the exception of the end of *Sim.* 9 and 10.[8] The fourth-century codex Sinaiticus preserves *Vis.* 1-5 and *Mand.* 1-2.5 [1.1-27.6] in full, but after that point the text's remains are fragmentary.[9] P.Mich. 129, which Bonner

---

[7] Malcolm Choat and Rachel Yuen-Collingridge, "The Egyptian Hermas: The Shepherd in Egypt Before Constantine," in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, TENTS 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 191.

[8] The three leaves brought to Leipzig by the forger Constantine Simonides were published in the edition of Rudolf Anger, *Hermae Pastor* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1856). A collation of the six leaves remaining on Mt. Athos was published by Spyridon P. Lampros, *A Collation of the Athos Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas*, trans. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge: Clay and Sons, 1888), 11-23. Plates of the Athos leaves are published in Kirsopp Lake, *Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of the Shepherd of Hermas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907).

[9] Subsequent surviving folios preserve 27.7-28.2, 5; 29.1-30.3; 31.4-6; 65.5-66.6; 67.1-11, 14-18; 68.1-5; 91.4-95.5.

assigned to period 250-300 C.E., attests parts of *Sim*. 2-9.[10] *Vis*. 1-3 are included in P.Bodm. 38,

the fourth or fifth century papyrus published by Carlini.[11] Numerous other Greek papyri or

parchments also preserve at least a portion of the *Shepherd*.[12] A thirteenth-century *florilegium*

also preserves five extended Greek quotations, including one where the text only survives

otherwise in Latin and Ethiopic.[13]

Of these Greek manuscript witnesses to the text of the *Shepherd*, only four papyri have

been dated plausibly to the second century, and scholars continue to debate these assignments.

The first and most substantial is P.Mich. 130. Bonner initially dated this small fragment

containing portions of *Mand*. 2-3 [27.6-28.2] to ca. 200 C.E.[14] But in his republication of this

fragment together with the famous Michigan Codex (P.Mich. 129), he slightly amended his

dating to "the last years of the second century," observing that "it was written scarcely more than

---

[10] Campbell Bonner, "A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas," *HTR* 18 (1925): 115-27; idem, *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas: Similitudes 2-9 with a Fragment of the Mandates*, UMSHS 22 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1934), 3-126. Bonner's dating appears on p. 16.

[11] Antonio Carlini, *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII. Erma: Il Pastore (Ia-IIIa visione)*, PBB (Cologne; Geneva: Foundation Martin Bodmer, 1991).

[12] For a list of surviving Greek fragments of the *Shepherd*, see Joseph van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, Papyr 1 (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976), 234-37; Kurt Aland and Hans-Udo Rosenbaum, eds., *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri* Vol. 2: *Kirchenväter - Papyri* Part 1: Beschreibungen, PTS 42 (Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 1995), XXIII-XXIV. The following fragments have been published subsequently: P.Berl. 21259: Panagiota Sarischouli, ed., *Berliner griechische Papyri: Christliche literarische Texte und Urkunden aus dem 3. bis 8. Jh. n.Chr.*, SGr 3 (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1995), 83-86, Plate V; P.Oxy. 4705, 4706, and 4707, which were edited by Nikolaos Gonis in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 69, GRM 89 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2005); and P.Weill I 96, which is the bottom portion of Frg. B of P.Prag. I 1 and was edited recently by Daniel Batovici, "A New Hermas Papyrus Fragment in Paris," *APF* 62 (2016): 20-36.

[13] Paris gr. 1143, published by Eurydice Lappa-Zizicas, "Cinq fragments du *Pasteur* d'Hermas dans un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris," *RevScRel* 53 (1965): 251-56.

[14] Campbell Bonner, "A New Fragment of the Shepherd of Hermas (Michigan Papyrus 44-H)," *HTR* 20 (1927): 107.

two generations after the commonly accepted date of Hermas;"[15] by this "commonly accepted

date" Bonner presumably meant ca. 150 C.E. Bonner's dating of P.Mich. 130 to the late second

century has been widely accepted.[16]

Two papyrus texts of the *Shepherd* were among the finds from the trash dump at the

Egyptian city of Oxyrhynchus. These are: P.Oxy. 3528 (a fragment of *Sim.* 9.20-22) and P.Oxy.

4706 (numerous fragments of *Vis.* 3-4 and *Mand.* 2, 4-10).[17] Both were dated to the late

second/early third centuries by their original editors, Colin Roberts and Nikolaos Gonis,

respectively.[18] As in the case of P.Mich. 130, these dates were assigned on the basis of

paleography alone, so they must remain broad. But a number of other scholars consider a late

second-century date for both P.Oxy. 3528 and P.Oxy. 4706 if not likely then at least possible.[19]

The final copy of the *Shepherd* possibly from the second century is P.Iand. 1.4. Unlike

that of P.Mich. 130, this fragment's dating is widely contested. E. Schäfer initially labeled

---

[15] Bonner, *Papyrus Codex*, 129, 131. In his earlier article, he added, "…it is apparently the oldest extant part of any writing that was ever held to belong to the canon of sacred scripture" ("New Fragment," 116).

[16] For example, Bonner's dating was affirmed by Antonio Carlini, "P. Michigan 130 (inv. 44-H) e il problema dell'unicità di redazione del Pastore di Erma," *ParPass* 38 (1983): 31. However, the fragment is assigned to the third century without explanation in Choat and Yuen-Collingridge, "Egyptian Hermas," 195.

[17] E.g., Choat and Yuen-Collingridge, "Egyptian Hermas," 194, 205-06.

[18] Colin H. Roberts, "P.Oxy. 3528: Hermas, Similitudes 9.20-22," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 50, GRM 70 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983), 21; Nikolaos Gonis, "P.Oxy. 4706: Hermas, Visiones III 4.3, 6.6, 9.6-7, 13.3-IV 1.1, 7-9; Mandata II 4-5, IV 1.1, 3.6, 4.3-4, V 1.6-7, VI 1.3-5, VII 5, VIII 6, IX 7-8, X 1.1-2," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 69, GRM 89 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2005), 3.

[19] E.g., Harry Gamble, who is among those convinced these four papyri belong to the second century: "Some papyrus fragments of Hermas are 2nd cent. (P.Oxy. 4706 and 3528, P.Mich. 130, P.Iand. 1.4)" ("The Book Trade in the Roman Empire," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012], 34 n. 35).

P.Iand. 1.4 a *fragmentum argumenti incerti*, but he suggested it might be medical in origin.[20]

Amazingly, given its fragmentary state, J. Lenaerts and M. Gronewald independently determined

in 1979 and 1980, respectively, that this small fragment contains portions of *Mand*. 11-12

(43.19-21; 44.2-3). Schäfer initially dated the hand of P.Iand. 1.4 to the fourth century, as did

Gronewald.[21] Lenaerts preferred a slightly earlier date "on the borders of the third and fourth

centuries."[22]

However, at a 1984 conference in Dublin, in a still unpublished paper Peter Parsons

sparked a conversation among paleographers regarding the date of P.Iand. 1.4. Parsons suggested

that the fragment be backdated from the third/fourth century to the second. Bruce M. Metzger

preserved Parsons' summary of the conversation at Dublin, drawing exclusively on Parsons'

recounting of it in a 1985 letter to him. According to Metzger, Parsons wrote, "[P.Iand. 1.4]

should be dated earlier (with all the usual reservations about palaeographic dating): I thought ii

A.D., and other palaeographers present agreed on earlier ii rather than late ii."[23] Although Carlini

was not in attendance at the Dublin conference, Parsons gave him a copy of his paper, which

Carlini engaged in an article eight years later.[24]

---

[20] Ernst Schäfer, "P. Iand. 1.4," in *Voluminum codicumque fragmenta Graeca cum amuleto Christiano* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912), 13.

[21] Ibid., 12; Michael Gronewald, "Ein verkannter Hermas-Papyrus (P. Iand. I 4 = Hermae Pastor, Mand. XI 19-21; XII 1,2-3)," *ZPE* 40 (1980): 53.

[22] Jean Lenaerts, "Un papyrus du *Pasteur* d'Hermas: *P. Iand*. 1,4," *ChrEg* 54 (1979): 356.

[23] Quoted in *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, repr. of 1987 ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 63 n. 36. I am indebted to Prof. David Martinez for informing me of Metzger's discussion of Parsons' paper. The dating that Parsons proposed apparently was not even the earliest discussed at the Dublin conference. But, to my knowledge, the views arguing for an early second-century date have never appeared in print.

[24] Antonio Carlini, "Testimone e testo: il problema della datazione di PIand I 4 del *Pastore* di Erma," *SCO* 42 (1992): 17-30 and Tables I-II. Carlini documents his access to Parsons' paper on p. 23 n. 19.

Carlini challenged Parsons' reassignment of P.Iand. 1.4 to the second century. He did this partly on the basis of Parsons' own initial hesitancy in dealing with the paleography of the fragment. As Carlini noted, in his Dublin presentation Parsons conceded that this early dating suffers from three weaknesses: "(a) the dating is based on a photo, not on autopsy; (b) the surviving sample of writing is very small; (c) one must always reckon with archaism or scribal incompetence (as e.g. in P.Oxy. L 3529)."[25] More recently, as further evidence against Parsons' position, Carlini has appealed to efforts by Joseph van Haelst, Eric Turner, and Roger Bagnall to reassign Christian papyri initially given early dates to later, often significantly later, periods.[26]

In the end, no scholarly consensus currently exists on the dating of P.Iand. 1.4. Roger Bagnall astutely observes that "the foundations of the disagreement are located for the most part in the extent to which the scholars are willing to invoke one of the possible exit routes proposed

---

[25] Ibid., 23.

[26] Antonio Carlini and M. Bandini, "Il *Pastore* di Erma: nuove testimonianze e vecchi problemi," in *I papiri letterari cristiani: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi in memoria di Mario Naldini, Firenze, 10-11 giugno 2010*, ed. Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova, STP n. s. 13 (Firenze: Istituto papirologico "G. Vitelli," 2011), 91-97, esp. 96. As support for his position, Carlini drew upon Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex*; J. van Haelst, "Les origines du codex," in *Les débuts du codex: actes de la journée d'étude*, ed. Alain Blanchard, Bibl 9 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989), 13-35; Roger S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 21-24. In a manner directly relevant to dating the *Shepherd*'s composition in light of the paleography of P.Iand. 1.4, Brent Nongbri has challenged those who assign overly narrow chronological periods for the composition of papyrus remains attesting portions of the Fourth Gospel (i.e., 𝔓52): "The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel," *HTR* 98 (2005): 3-48. More recently, Nongbri has argued for a reconsideration of the traditional dating of 𝔓66 and 𝔓75, contending that both manuscripts are more plausibly assigned to a later period, namely the fourth century: "The Limits of Palaeographic Dating of Literary Papyri: Some Observations on the Date and Provenance of P. Bodmer II (P66)," *MH* 71 (2014): 1-35; and "Reconsidering the Place of Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV (P75) in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," *JBL* 135 (2016): 405-37. For a thorough, data-driven criticism of what they deem the theologically motivated assignment of NT papyri to dates that mainstream paleographers and papyrologists consider too early, see Pasquale Orsini and Willy Clarysse, "Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography," *ETL* 88 (2012): 443-74.

by Parsons—that is, archaism or incompetence."[27] Nevertheless, even if P.Iand. 1.4 cannot be dated with certainty to some part of the second century, there still is at least one manuscript securely dated to that period, namely P.Mich. 130. This fragment suggests the late second century C.E. as an initial *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the *Shepherd*, which coheres with the dating of the Old Latin or Vulgate translation of it. However, there are other good reasons to date the *Shepherd*'s composition even earlier in the second century.

*Ancient Translations*

The *Shepherd* of Hermas was translated widely, beginning in antiquity and continuing for centuries. Among translations that survive, the most substantial is that into Latin, which is comprised of two streams, each represented by various manuscripts.[28] The first of the two Latin traditions is the earlier Old Latin or Vulgate translation ($L^1$).[29] The earliest manuscript evidence for $L^1$ dates to the ninth century,[30] but the initial Latin translation itself is typically assigned to

---

[27] Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 48-49.
[28] Eligius Dekkers, "Les traductions latines du Pasteur d'Hermas," *Euph* N.S. 22 (1994): 13-26.
[29] The *editio princeps* of the *Shepherd* was published by Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples, *Liber trium virorum et trium spiritualium virginum* (Paris: Stephanus, 1513), which included Hermas's text as the first of the lives of three men. Based on additional Greek manuscripts available to him, J. Cotelier published the first critical edition as *SS. patrum, qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabæ, Clementis, Hermæ, Ignatii, Polycarpi opera, vera, et suppositicia* (Luteciæ Parisiorum: Typis Petri Le Petit, 1672). This was eventually followed by Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Hermae Pastor: Veterem latinam interpretationem e codicibus* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1873). More recently, an updated critical edition of the Vulgate translation was published by Christian Tornau and Paolo Cecconi, eds., *The Shepherd of Hermas in Latin: Critical Edition of the Oldest Translation Vulgata*, TUGAL 173 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014).
[30] For a concise list of the three major manuscripts of $L^1$ and their dates, see Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols., LCL 24-25 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 2:171.

the late second.[31] The other Latin tradition is the so-called Palatine translation (L$^2$).[32] It appeared

later, perhaps in the fourth or fifth centuries.[33]

Translations of the *Shepherd* were also made into other languages besides Latin,

indicating its broad popularity. A few Coptic fragments survive, as well more substantial

translations into the Akhmimic and Sahidic dialects (C$^1$ and C$^2$, respectively).[34] Portions of at

least three Ethiopic translations have survived.[35] Much less extensive is the now fragmentary

---

[31] Carlini, among many others, dates L$^1$ to the late second century: "La tradizione testuale del Pastore di Erma e i nuovi papiri," in *Le Strade del testo*, ed. Guglielmo Cavallo, StC 5 (Bari: Adriatica, 1987), 23, 24.

[32] L$^2$ is represented by two manuscripts in the Vatican Library (Vat.Pal.lat. 150 and Vat.Urb.lat. 486). An eighth-century fragment held in Düsseldorf is cited in ibid., 25, 37 n. 16; cf. Dekkers, "Les traductions latines," 20. L$^2$ was first published together with L$^1$ by Albert Rudolf Maximilian Dressel, *Hermae Pastor* in *Patrum apostolicorum opera* (Lipsiae: J. C. Hinrichs, 1857). L$^2$ was then published with the extant Greek text by Oscar von Gebhardt and Adolf von Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e codice palatino*, PAO 3 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877). See also Antonio Carlini, "Due estratti del Pastore di Erma nella versione Palatina in *Par. Lat.* 3182," *SCO* 35 (1985): 311-12; Anna Vezzoni, "Un testimone testuale inedito della versione Palatina del 'Pastore' di Erma," *SCO* 37 (1987): 241-65. The most recent edition L$^2$ is that of idem, ed., *Il pastore di Erma: Versione Palatina*, NM 13 (Firenze: Casa editrice Le lettere, 1994).

[33] Dekkers, "Les traductions latines," 14.

[34] Johannes Leipoldt, "Der Hirt des Hermas in saïdischer Übersetzung," in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1903), 261-68; Louis Delaporte, "Le Pasteur d'Hermas: Fragments de la version copte-sahidique," *ROC* 10 (1905): 424-33; idem, "Le Pasteur d'Hermas: Nouveaux fragments sahidiques," *ROC* n.s. 1 (1906): 301-11; L. Théophile Lefort, ed., *Les Pères apostoliques en copte*, CSCO 135; ScrCopt 17 (Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1952), 1-31.

[35] Antonius d'Abbadie, ed., *Hermae Pastor: Aethiopice primum edidit et aethiopica latine vertit*, AKM II, 1 (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1860); Arnold van. Lantshoot, "Un second témoin éthiopien du 'Pasteur' d'Hermas," *Byz* 32 (1962): 93-96; Robert Beylot, "Hermas: Le Pasteur: Quelques variantes inédites de la version éthiopienne," in *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont: Contributions à l'étude des Christianismes orientaux*, ed. René-Georges Coquin, CahOr 20 (Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1988), 155-62; O. Raineri, "Il Pastore di Erma nel secondo testimone etiopico," *OCP* 59 (1993): 427-64; T. Erho, "A Third Ethiopic Witness to the Shepherd of Hermas," *ParPass* 67 (2012): 363-70; Massimo Villa, "La versione etiopica del Pastore di Erma: Riedizione critica del testo (*Visioni* e *Precetti*)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Naples "L'Orientale," 2016).

middle Persian translation.[36] An Arabic translation is presumed, from which Outtier suggested the sole extant Georgian translation was made, but the Arabic has not survived.[37] Likewise, no Syriac translation has survived, if one existed at all, and the *Shepherd* seems to have been unengaged by if not unknown to the authors of extant Syriac literature.[38] Of all these translations, the Old Latin or Vulgate is the earliest. Its existence confirms that the *Shepherd* was composed prior to the end of the second century C.E. and perhaps points to a Western provenance.

*Compositional History*

The preceding discussion has treated the text of the *Shepherd* as a single literary unit, presented as it is in modern critical editions and translations. However, as Leutzsch has recognized, "The literary unity of [the *Shepherd*'s] text has been questioned time and time again."[39] Indeed, various scholars have contended that the *Shepherd*, comprised as it is of three main sections, was composed over a period of years, in multiple stages, maybe even by multiple authors. The rough dating of major moments in this potentially complex course of composition is crucially important to my argument, if I am to sustain the claim that the *Shepherd* was — either in whole or in part — written after the composition, collection, and circulation of Pauline letters.

---

[36] F. W. K. Müller, "Eine Hermas-Stelle in manichäischer Version," in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. 51 (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1905), 1077-83.

[37] Bernard Outtier, "La version géorgienne du *Pasteur* d'Hermas," *REGC* 6-7 (1990): 212-13. Similarly, d'Abbadie originally suggested that the Ethiopic translation he edited was made from the Arabic, but he later retracted the claim (*Hermae Pastor*, VII).

[38] Henry Chadwick, "The New Edition of Hermas," *JTS* 8 (1957): 275-76.

[39] Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 130.

Early Independent Circulation of the *Shepherd*'s Sections

Manuscript evidence reveals that parts of the *Shepherd* circulated independently, indeed from an

early date. Certain ancient manuscript witnesses to its text never contained all three of its

sections. P.Mich. 129 originally contained *Vis.* 5 as the introduction to the *Mandates* that

followed, as well as the *Similitudes*.[40] This confirms that the *Mandates* and *Similitudes*

sometimes circulated together as a bipartite literary unit, apart from the full *Visions* section.

Likewise, according to Carlini, the "reasonable hypothesis" is that P.Bodm. 38 contained *Vis.* 1-

4, even though only the first three have survived.[41] Therefore, in the mid-third century (ca. 250

C.E.) and well into the fourth or fifth, when the Michigan codex and Bodmer papyrus were

constructed, respectively, discrete sections of the *Shepherd* were still being copied and circulated

apart from the rest of Hermas's work.[42] Indeed, as Choat and Yuen-Collingridge have noted, "As

most of our papyrus witnesses attest to only a single part of the *Shepherd*,… it is also not

unlikely that in many cases the parts circulated as separate works."[43] Whether independent

circulation of parts or publication of a full edition came first is contested in the scholarly

literature.[44] But even if the latter followed the former, independent circulation of parts likely

continued afterward.[45]

---

[40] Bonner, "Papyrus Codex," 118; cf. idem, *Papyrus Codex*, 7-14, esp. 13.

[41] Carlini, *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII. Erma*, 12. Bonner imagined the possibility that P.Mich. 130 might have been a copy of only the *Mandates*, but given the fragment's small size and condition this suggestion is impossible to substantiate ("New Fragment," 108).

[42] Bonner, "Papyrus Codex," 121; idem, *Papyrus Codex*, 16. Carlini, *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII. Erma*, 11-15. For a skeptical assessment of the evidence suggesting independent circulation of the *Shepherd*'s various parts, see Aland and Rosenbaum, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri* Vol. 2: *Kirchenväter - Papyri* Part 1: Beschreibungen, esp. XCIV.

[43] Choat and Yuen-Collingridge, "Egyptian Hermas," 196; italics added.

[44] For example, according to Osiek, "The best historical evidence based on early use of the [*Shepherd*'s] text indicates an initial unity that was later broken by circulation of separate

13

Even before most of the manuscript evidence suggesting independent circulation of

sections of the *Shepherd* came to light, scholars had long denied that the work was product of a

single author writing at one time.[46] An exhaustive examination of their proposals is beyond the

scope of this project, but I now briefly turn to a summary of the most important among them and

a consideration of their arguments.

Proposals for Multi-Author Composition

Perhaps the first to posit the periodical composition, or at least collection and revision, of the

*Shepherd* was Heinrich Thiersch in 1852. He assigned an initial early (albeit non-specific) date

to the recording of Hermas's visions, by which Thiersch presumably meant the entirety of the

work in its three constituent parts, suggesting these visions that Hermas experienced at Rome

were recorded at the end of the so-called apostolic period, sometime between the sporadic

"persecutions" under Trajan and Domitian, and were later gathered and perhaps also revised

---

sections independently" (*Shepherd of Hermas*, Herm [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999],
8). Vezzoni reverses this order, postulating the independent composition and circulation of *Vis.*
1-4, on the one hand, and the *Mandates* and the *Similitudes*, on the other; she attributes the
"fortunate welding" ("felice saldatura") of the two sections to Roman Christians and dates it to
the mid-second century (*Il pastore di Erma*, 14).

[45] Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 48.

[46] For surveys of the various hypotheses with respect to the *Shepherd*'s compositional history,
together with supporting bibliography, see William Jerome Wilson, "The Career of the Prophet
Hermas," *HTR* 20 (1927): 33 n. 7; Stanislas Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs: Les trois auteurs du
Pasteur d'Hermas* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1963), 64-70; J. C. Wilson, *Toward a
Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen
Biblical Press, 1993), 14-23; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 9-10; and, more recently, Mark Grundeken,
*Community Building in the* Shepherd of Hermas*: A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects*, VCSup
131 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 11-16.

under Pius.[47] I shall engage the witness of the Muratorian Canon at greater length later in this chapter, but for now I note that Thiersch's translation of it reveals that his hypothesis accepted the veracity of its statement regarding the *Shepherd*, albeit with specific caveats:

> den Hirten (eben jene Sammlung von Visionen) hat erst neuerdings, zu unseren Zeiten, Hermas zu Rom geschrieben (*oder: zusammengeschrieben*), während sein Bruder, der Bischof Pius, den Stuhl der Stadt Rom inne hatte.[48]

> Hermas wrote (*better yet, compiled*) the *Shepherd* (precisely, that collection of Visions) only recently in our times at Rome, while his brother, bishop Pius, held the see of the city of Rome.

Thiersch focused on the meaning of a crucially important verb — *conscripsit* — in the Canon's reference to the *Shepherd*. He translated this verb using a form of *schreiben* ("to write"), but he noted in parentheses that it really should be rendered with a form of *zusammenschreiben* ("to compile"). In doing so, Thiersch limited the Canon's reference to the *Shepherd* to the final collection and possible revision of its visionary traditions, which he believed had long been written down. This substitution reveals his view that the Canon refers not to the initial recording of Hermas's visions but to their collection and possible revision decades later. Crucially, though, Thiersch did not explicitly state whether Hermas himself was either the initial recorder of the visions or their later reviser/collector.

Roughly a decade after Thiersch, Franz de Champagny similarly determined that two authors composed the *Shepherd*: one wrote the *Visions* section (i.e., the Hermas of Rom 16:14), and the other the *Mandates* and *Similitudes* (i.e., the brother of Pius mentioned in the Muratorian

---

[47] "Unsere Ansicht ist deshalb, dass Visionen in der römischen Gemeinde wirklich schon am Ende des apostolischen Zeitalters vorgekommen und aufgezeichnet, dann eine Zeitlan wenig beachtet, später, unter Pius dem Ersten, wieder hervorgezogen, zusammengestellt und vielleicht überarbeitet worden sind" (*Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter und die Entstehung der neutestamentlichen Schriften* [Frankfurt am Main: Heyder und Zimmer, 1852], 352, 354).
[48] Ibid., 351; emphasis added.

Canon).[49] Three years later, de Champagny's proposal was largely accepted by Prosper Guéranger, albeit with the caveat that the author of the *Visions* was "perhaps the same" Hermas greeted in Romans.[50] But the idea was rejected by Gebhardt and Harnack in their 1877 commentary, in which they defended sole authorship by Hermas, brother of Pius, and claimed, *pace* de Champagny, "The Visions, Mandates [and] Similitudes cling together closely… Concerning the unity and integrity of the *Shepherd*, no doubt remains."[51] Johannes Haussleiter, writing seven years after Gebhardt and Harnack, suggested a two-step compositional process similar to those proposed previously by Thiersch, de Champagny, and Guéranger. He contended that the anonymous author whom the Muratorian Canon names Hermas, the brother of Pius, composed *Vis.* 5, the *Mandates*, and the *Similitudes* "slightly before the year 150," and another wrote the first four *Visions* "prior to the end of the second century."[52]

Compositional theories became even more complex in the work of Adolf Hilgenfeld. He rejected Harnack's dismissal of de Champagny's two-part proposal, which he himself expanded.[53] Hilgenfeld proposed the first tripartite compositional history of what is now known to be the complete *Shepherd*. According to him, three authors composed it: (1) *Hermas*

---

[49] "Je n'hésite donc pas à penser que la première partie (*Visiones*), à laquelle un passage remarquable (*Visio* II, 4) donne la date du pape Clément, est l'œuvre du premier Hermas, contemporain de saint Paul; que les deux autres, au contraire (*Mandata* et *Similitudines*), sont l'œuvre du second Hermas, surnommé Pasteur, frère du pape Pie I<sup>er</sup>, lequel a repris et imité avec des formes et des détails nouveaux l'œuvre de son devancier" (*Les Antonins, ans de J.-C. 69-180* Vol. 1: *Suite de Césars et de Rome et la Judée*, 3rd rev. ed., EER 7 [Paris: Bray et Retaux, 1874], 144 n. 1).

[50] *Sainte Cécile et la société romaine aux deux premiers siècles* (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1877), 132-33, 197; the quote is from p. 132.

[51] *Visiones, mandata, similitudines arte inter se cohaerent…De unitate et integritate Pastoris nulla relicta est dubitatio* (*Hermae Pastor graece*, LXXII-LXIII).

[52] Johannes Haussleiter, "De versionibus Pastoris Hermae latinis," *ASPE* 3 (1884): 473.

[53] Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Hermae Pastor* Vol. 3 of *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum* (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1881), XX-XXIX.

*pastoralis* ("pastoral Hermas") wrote *Vis.* 5, the twelve *Mandates*, and *Sim.* 1-7 no later than the last years of Domitian's reign and before the Edict of Trajan (112 C.E.); (2) later, *Hermas apocalypticus* ("visionary Hermas") authored the first four *Visions*, which reflect the persecution of Christians occurring after that Edict during Hadrian's reign; and (3) finally, *Hermas secundarius* ("secondary Hermas"), a contemporary if not the brother of the Pius mentioned in the Muratorian Canon, rounded out the collection by adding *Sim.* 8-10 and a few other linking bits.[54] In Hilgenfeld's judgment, three distinct authors wrote their respective parts of the *Shepherd* over a period of roughly forty years, beginning in the first decade of the second century, each adding his portion onto the last.

Martin Dibelius, writing in his 1923 commentary, affirmed this sort of compositional division and suggested that the *Shepherd* was written in numerous stages by different authors.[55] First came the original *Vis.* 1-4. To them the independently composed *Vis.* 5-*Sim.* 8 were added, connected by *Sim.* 9. Finally, *Sim.* 10 was written as a conclusion to the entire work. Crucially, though, in a fashion far more restrained than Hilgenfeld, Dibelius never numbered, named, or dated the authors who he thought produced the various sections of the *Shepherd*.[56]

Like Hilgenfeld and Dibelius before him, in 1963 Stanislas Giet also argued for a multi-phase composition. In Giet's view the *Shepherd* was composed, augmented, and reordered by three different authors, some of whom betray competing aims:

> The *Visions* constitute, by themselves, an independent work. The "remainder" that the author of the fifth *Vision* pushes back toward the end of the work, without giving any other justification than the alleged urgency of his own teachings, is in

---

[54] Ibid., XXII-XXIII, XXV, XXVIII-XXIX.

[55] Martin Dibelius, *Die apostolischen Väter: Der Hirt des Hermas*, vol. 4, HNT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), 421.

[56] This is correctly observed by Osiek, *Shepherd*, 9.

fact the Shepherd's first revelation (our ninth *Similitude*); it must have been attached to Hermas's *Visions* as a doctrinal supplement. But this supplement was probably not to everyone's liking, for in order to divert attention a third author wrapped it up in the *Mandates* and other *Similitudes*, in which one can see the contribution of a psuedo-Shepherd who tried to replace the preceding teaching with his doctrine.[57]

Giet assigned the *Visions* to the first quarter of the second century, *Sim.* 9 to Pius' episcopacy, and the remainder of the work to the last years of Antoninus Pius (d. 161 C.E.).[58]

In the 1960s, W. Coleborne developed an even more complicated compositional history, which took initial shape in his unpublished Newcastle dissertation of 1965.[59] He considered the *Shepherd* to be "an amalgam put together over a period of approximately 50 years."[60] Coleborne teased this "amalgam" apart, attributing its strands to six figures and stages:[61] (1) an author, who Coleborne hypothesized was the Hermas of Paul's letter to the Romans, penned *Mand.* 1-12.3.3

---

[57] Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs*, 8: "Les Visions constituent, à elles seules, une œuvre indépendante; le 'reste' que l'auteur de la cinquième Vision rejette vers la fin de l'ouvrage, sans donner d'autre justification que l'urgence prétendue de ses propres enseignements, est en réalité la première révélation du Pasteur (notre neuvième Parabole): elle avait dû être adjointe aux Visions d'Hermas, à titre de complément doctrinal. Mais ce complément n'était vraisemblablement pas du goût de tous, car pour en détourner l'attention, un troisième auteur l'a enrobé dans les Préceptes et autres Paraboles: en quoi l'on peut voir l'apport d'un Pseudo-Pasteur qui cherche à substituer sa doctrine à l'enseignement précédent".

[58] Ibid., 294-305, esp. the last sentence of the section ending on p. 305.

[59] William Coleborne, "A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas" (Ph.D. diss., University of Newcastle, 1965). A summary of this dissertation was published as an article under the same title, "A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas," *Colloq* 3 (1969): 133-42. A few years later appeared "The Shepherd of Hermas - A Case for Multiple Authorship and Some Implications," *StPatr* 10.1 (1970): 65-70. Coleborne's dissertation inspired that of David Ian Baker forty years later, whose statistical and linguistic analysis purportedly proved, by contrast, the sole authorship of the *Shepherd* ("*The Shepherd of Hermas*: A Socio-Rhetorical and Statistical-Linguistic Study of Authorship and Community Concerns" [Ph.D. diss., University of Wales, Cardiff, 2006]; for Baker's articulation of his inspiration by Coleborne, see pp. 7, 30).

[60] Coleborne, "Shepherd of Hermas," 67 n. 1.

[61] idem, "Linguistic Approach (1969)," 135-41; cf. idem, "Shepherd of Hermas," 67-70.

ca. 60 C.E.;[62] (2) another author added *Sim.* 1-7 to them at roughly the same time; (3) *Vis.* 5 and

the rest of *Mand.* 12 were added by a redactor at a later, unknown time, but before 90 C.E; (4)

someone penned *Vis.* 1-4 ca. 90 C.E.; (5) *Sim.* 8 was added, perhaps under Nerva (r. 96-98 C.E.)

but by the end of the first century; and, finally, (6) early in the reign of Trajan, *Sim.* 9 was

appended to the lot ca. 100 C.E. (Coleborne's theory does not address the composition of *Sim.*

10, which apart from portions of 10.3.3-5 survives only in Latin translation.) As Osiek has

observed, this highly complex theory has met with little scholarly acceptance.[63] I suggest that

perhaps this lack of acceptance is due, at least in part, to the very early date Coleborne assigned

to the *Shepherd*'s earliest literary *stratum* (60 C.E.).

Graydon Snyder's theory of composition appeared at roughly the same time as

Coleborne's. It is based, at least in part, on a chronology of early Christian persecution and

Hermas's alleged attempt at a pastoral response to that persecution. In other words, unlike most

of the other theories discussed thus far, Snyder's dating largely rests on internal evidence. He

concluded that it was composed in stages between the reign of Trajan (98-117 C.E.) and 140

C.E. As have others, he linked the "impending great tribulation" (τὴν θλῖψιν τὴν ἐρχομένην τὴν

μεγάλην) of *Vis.* 2.2 [6.7] with the persecution Christians experienced or feared under Trajan, as

---

[62] Coleborne puts forward this hypothesis at "Linguistic Approach (1969)," 141. In support of it, he claims, "Chadwick has made a very interesting remark 'Origen preserves an early Roman tradition.' From this it may be concluded that there is more in Origen's equation of Hermas with St. Paul's friend than meets the eye" (141). However, this is a truncated and therefore misrepresentative quotation of Chadwick. In full, Chadwick reads, "I have little doubt that Origen (*Comm. in ep. ad Rom.* x. 31) preserves an early, *though of course not authentic*, Roman tradition in his statement that it was written by the Hermas of Rom. xvi" ("The New Edition of Hermas," 276; emphasis added). Clearly, Chadwick granted the antiquity of the tradition, but he obviously indicated that he thought it was mistaken. Coleborne uncritically assumed its authenticity solely on the basis of Chadwick's admission of its antiquity.

[63] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 9.

described by Pliny (*Ep.* 10.96-97), which provides the *terminus post quem* for the composition of *Vis.* 1-4.[64] Before too long followed *Vis.* 5 through *Sim.* 8, plus 10, all of which Snyder suggested the same writer of *Vis.* 1-4 composed "to describe the nature of repentance for Christians who were undecided about their loyalty."[65] Then, sometime before 140 C.E., *Sim.* 9 was added "to unify the [entire] work and threaten those who had been disloyal to the church and left it."[66]

Return to Single-Author Scholarly Consensus

The novel and in some cases complicated solutions to the perceived problem of the *Shepherd*'s periodic composition offered since Thiersch in the mid-nineteenth century arguably reached their zenith with the work of Giet and then Coleborne.[67] Nearly fifty years later, the scholarly consensus now favors a sole author probably writing and revising the *Shepherd* over a period of years, perhaps even decades, and by extension a nuanced, conditional acceptance of the general

---

[64] Graydon F. Snyder, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, ed. Robert M. Grant, AF 6 (Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1968), 24; cf. the reference to "the great tribulation" (τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης) at Rev 7:14.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid. Snyder supplied two reasons for dating *Sim.* 9 prior to 140 C.E. At that date, he wrote, "the various divisions of the church became evident, and a monarchical bishop or recognized leader was necessary in Rome."

[67] Many scholars initially found Giet's 1963 proposal persuasive. For example, in the published version of her Harvard dissertation Osiek thought Giet's theory of multiple authorship best explained the evidence (*Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*, CBQMS 15 [Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983], 7). But by the time her Hermeneia commentary appeared sixteen years later, she had come to reject it; see *Shepherd*, 10 n. 90. By contrast, Coleborne's theory, which appeared a few years after Giet's and was even more complicated, gained little if any traction among the guild. Even so, despite being unconvinced by it, Brox found Coleborne's study valuable, arguing, "Coleborne legt mit seiner These ungewollt tatsächlich die Grund-Aporie dieser Versuche offen" (*Hirt des Hermas*, KAV 7 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991], 32). By contrast, according to Philippe Henne, "Un seul 'Pasteur', un seul Hermas," *RTL* 23 (1992): 484, "De tels instruments de mesure à eux seuls ne prouvent rien, si ce n'est que l'auteur adapte son langage au but poursuivi".

unity of the work. This shift began in earnest with Joly's ongoing criticism of Giet's theory,

beginning in the late 1960s.[68] (But it was already anticipated if not actually sparked by Robert M.

Grant).[69] The shift that took place in Joly's wake gathered steam with the work of Philippe

Henne, who argued for sole authorship, initial unity, and subsequent splitting of the *Shepherd*

throughout the 1990s.[70] He suggested that it was constructed for the purpose of catechizing new

Christians and moves from addressing baptismal candidates to addressing them after their

baptisms.[71] The *Shepherd* was indeed widely employed in catechesis, as fourth-century authors

such as Eusebius, Athanasius, and Didymus indicate;[72] so it could indeed be, to use Choat and

---

[68] Robert Joly, "Hermas et le Pasteur," *VC* 21 (1967): 201-18. According to Joly, "il [Giet] ressuscite, sur des bases nouvelles, le dépeçage du *Pasteur* qui avait été, il y a un demi-siècle et plus, très à la mode dans l'érudition allemande" (202). Giet's monograph appeared prior to Joly's second edition of his commentary, which engaged it (*Hermas Le Pasteur*). Joly rearticulated his criticism of and counter-proposal to Giet in "Le milieu complexe du 'Pasteur d'Hermas,'" in *ANRW*, ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, Part 2, *Principat*, 27.1 (New York: de Gruyter, 1993), 527-29.

[69] In a review that appeared only a year after Giet's monograph and a full three years before Joly's 1967 article in *VC*, Grant strongly criticized Giet's version of the multi-author hypothesis; see "Review of *Hermas et les Pasteurs: Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas* by Stanislas Giet," *Gn* 36 (1964): 357-59. Grant "agree[d] with Giet that the documents constituting the *Shepherd* were once composed over an extended period of time… but by one author" (358).

[70] Philippe Henne, "Hermas en Egypte: La tradition manuscrite et l'unité rédactionnelle du Pasteur," *CNS* 11 (1990): 237-56; idem, "La pénitence et la rédaction du Pasteur d'Hermas," *RB* 98 (1991): 358-97; idem, "Un seul 'Pasteur', un seul Hermas"; idem, *L'Unité du Pasteur d'Hermas: Tradition et rédaction*, CahRB 31 (Paris: Gabalda, 1992). Henne was roundly criticized by Alastair Kirkland, esp. in "Review of *L'Unité du Pasteur d'Hermas: Tradition et redaction* by Philippe Henne," *NovT* 37 (1995): 305-07. His counter-position was presented at greater length in "The Shepherd of Hermas: Some Aspects of Its Composition and Transmission" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cape Town, 1990); and "The Literary History of the Shepherd of Hermas, Visions I to IV," *SecCent* 9.2 (1992): 87-102. Kirkland's unpublished dissertation was not available for consultation in this study.

[71] Henne, "Un seul 'Pasteur', un seul Hermas," 486.

[72] For a brief summary of the relevant references, see Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 123; Choat and Yuen-Collingridge, "Egyptian Hermas," 201-03. The possible catechetical orientation of the *Shepherd* was recognized long before Henne. The idea goes at least as far back as Ferdinand Probst, *Lehre und Gebet in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen: Laupp, 1871), 85, who

Yuen-Collingridge's label, "a catechetical text inside a catechetical text."[73] Not all scholars have

been persuaded by Henne's catechesis theory or the argument for the redactional unity of the text

that it supports, though.[74] Nevertheless, to my mind, he has persuasively proven the over-arching

and unifying thematic coherence of all three sections of the *Shepherd* and by extension refuted

the claim that it must be the product of multiple authors writing subsequently to each other.[75]

Together, Joly and Henne catalyzed a return to the general sort of single-author theory

proffered previously by Gebhardt and Harnack, as well as those by Link, Baumgärtner, and Funk

in the late nineteenth century.[76] Following Henne, in her 1999 Hermeneia commentary Osiek

discerned recent scholarship's "return to single authorship" as a consensus opinion: "Most

scholars today," she wrote, "have returned to the single author hypothesis, though not without

some hedging about 'multiple sources,' or 'multiple redactions.'"[77] Like others before her, Osiek

---

inferred that the *Mandates* in particular contained catechetical material even though Hermas never explicitly describes it as such.

[73] Choat and Yuen-Collingridge, "Egyptian Hermas," 203.

[74] For a critical response, see Brox, *Hirt*, 33 n. 31. Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 131-32 did not mention Henne by name but rejected the notion that the *Visions* section was used in catechesis, although the *Mandates* and *Similitudes* presumably were.

[75] Henne developed his internal argument for the unity of the *Shepherd* on thematic grounds in *Unité*, 69-162. Prior to Henne, Antonius Hilhorst had already concluded that linguistic analysis of the *Shepherd* could not unequivocally sustain the theory of multiple authorship, which in his view "creates more problems than it solves" ("Cette solution soulève plus de questions qu'elle n'en résout") (*Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, GCP fasc. 5 [Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976], 185-86; the quote is from 186). Juan José Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, FP 6 (Madrid: Editorial Ciudad Nueva, 1995), 25 connected Hilhorst's conclusion with a similar methodological point made by José Pablo Martín. See "Espíritu y dualismo de espíritus en el *Pastor de Hermas* y su relaciones con el judaísmo," *VetChr* 15 (1978): 328.

[76] Adolf Link, *Die Einheit des Pastor Hermae* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1888); P. Baumgärtner, *Die Einheit des Hermas-Buchs* (Freiburg im Breisgau: J. C. B. Mohr [P. Siebeck], 1889); F. X. von Funk, "Die Einheit des Hirten des Hermas," *TQ* 81 (1899): 321-60.

[77] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 10; for supporting bibliography, see n. 90. To Osiek's extensive bibliography, I add the following sources published before and after her assessment: Grant, "Review of Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs*," 358; Leslie W. Barnard, "Hermas, the Church and

argued that "single authorship in several stages and redactions best fits the evidence."[78] A decade

later, Verheyden bluntly agreed with Osiek on the current consensus regarding sole authorship.

In his judgment, "[t]he era of complicated literary-critical solutions to explain the composition of

the *Shepherd* seems over."[79] To be sure, some prominent scholars do still occasionally contest

the consensus position.[80] Nevertheless, I am persuaded by arguments in favor of the

compositional unity of the *Shepherd* and unconvinced of the need to introduce more than one

Judaism," in *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (New York: Schocken Books, 1967), 154, 163; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 23; J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*, NovTSup 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 23-24; Hilhorst, *Sémitismes et latinismes*, 31; Brox, *Hirt*, 33; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 25-26; Metzger, *Canon*, 64-65; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 130-33; Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:165-66; Baker, "*The Shepherd of Hermas*," 241; Bogdan Gabriel Bucur, "Angelmorphic Pneumatology in the Shepherd of Hermas," in *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*, VCSup 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 114; Tornau and Cecconi, *Shepherd of Hermas in Latin*, 1; Franklin Trammell, "(Re)Growing the Tree: Early Christian Mysticism, Angelomorphic Identity, and the Shepherd of Hermas" (Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 2014), 1-3; Hippolyte Agnigori, *Le pasteur d'Hermas: Une vision de l'au-delà au IIe siècle: Conception eschatologique dans la Sim. IX* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2015), 26; Grundeken, *Community Building*, 11-15.

[78] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 10 n. 90. This was already the position of Joly in "Le milieu complexe," 529. But Osiek moved beyond Joly and broke new ground by suggesting that a single "guiding hand" crafted various traditions into what is now recognized as the complete *Shepherd*, whose "loose and fluid structure… is best explained by the close relationship of the written text to the medium of oral performance"(*Shepherd*, 10, 13-16; the quote is from p. 10). Osiek traced the theory of the oral composition of the *Shepherd* back at least to the second half of the nineteenth century (16 n. 124).

[79] Verheyden, "Shepherd of Hermas," 296 n. 8.

[80] For example, in 2006 Clayton Jefford stated that "[his] own view probably falls somewhere into [Osiek's] general observation on authorship" (*The Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006], 25 n. 32). In his view, an "original author" composed *Vis.* 1-4; the rest of the tripartite work "[was] assembled subsequent to these opening materials, either by the original author, a different editor, or a combination of both" (27). Nevertheless, Jefford still seemed to favor the theory of a "practiced editor" (26), as he had affirmed a decade prior, when he rejected the notion of "a single author behind the work," preferring instead "a final editor who combined materials from several sources, making significant alterations in order to provide some theological consistency to the materials" ("The Shepherd of Hermas," in *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996], 139).

putative author into my analysis in order to make sense of the *Shepherd*, even though I do concede that the work was probably composed in stages.

Summary

The preceding discussion has shown that the compositional history of the *Shepherd* is a scholarly minefield, littered with hypotheses attempting to explain the physical features of surviving manuscript witnesses and the forms of the text contained in then. External evidence suggests that certain portions of the *Shepherd* circulated independently from an early date and that an "omnibus" edition of the work might not have been produced until after its constituent parts were completed. Internal evidence indicates that at least one author composed and likely revised these parts, probably over a period of years, perhaps even decades. Over the last century and a half, scholars have developed many creative theories of multi-author or multi-stage composition to explain the evidence. However, in the past twenty-five years or so, a consensus has emerged in scholarship favoring the single-author hypothesis, albeit with certain provisos admitting the possibility if not the likelihood of ongoing revision. This is the simplest and most persuasive explanation for both the internal and external evidence.

Therefore, with the majority of recent scholarship, in this study I shall speak of a single presumed author — "Hermas" — and attribute the *Shepherd* in its three sections to him. I do so recognizing that this work probably came into existence periodically, perhaps even through multiple revisions over an extended period of time, and I do not think that the caveats in this statement preclude the possibility of speaking meaningfully of either historical author or composition. I am fully aware that what Hermas wrote does not precisely correspond to the

earliest attainable text of the *Shepherd* as reconstructed by modern editors on the basis of extant evidence. But good method requires that I work from the best critical text, even as I recognize that it does not replicate any autograph. In fact, as Bonner astutely observed in his edition of the Michigan codex, "…it is doubtful whether there ever was an authoritative text after [Hermas's] autograph copy had perished."[81] Similarly, Osiek has suggested that "it is even doubtful whether the author had one authoritative text," if one assumes (a) an *extended period* of composition and (b) *oral use* of that composition.[82] Even so, in my judgment the textual tradition allows me responsibly to explore the possible interrelationships of two evolving text-corpora, the *Shepherd* and what becomes the *corpus Paulinum*. In doing so, my primary aim is not to isolate specific moments in the process of Hermas's composition or to assign certain layers of composition to particular periods or dates, even though I do hope to assess the degree of Pauline influence on each of the *Shepherd*'s three sections.

*The Attestation of the* Shepherd *in Earliest Christian Sources*

References to and quotations of the *Shepherd* in second-century sources enable us to delimit its period of composition further. Beginning with Harnack, various scholars have attributed knowledge of the *Shepherd* to some of the earliest Christian writers.[83] In numerous instances, authors' putative knowledge of the *Shepherd* is difficult to establish with certainty, and with good reason Norbert Brox correctly dismissed "occasionally conjectured quotations" of it by the

---

[81] Bonner, *Papyrus Codex*, 30.
[82] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 1; see also 15-16.
[83] Brox, *Hirt*, 57 n. 7 provides a bibliography of the relevant literature suggesting knowledge of the *Shepherd* in early Christianity.

authors of the Fourth Gospel and *2 Clement*, as well as the second-century Greek Apologists.[84]

Nevertheless, it is abundantly clear that the *Shepherd* was widely known and loved in antiquity, as Brox himself has noted:

> The "Shepherd" was one of the most popular books of the early Christian period; it was quoted conspicuously often and on all kinds of topics in early Christian literature and met with more interest than many a New Testament writing. With its allegorical and visionary elements it apparently inspired and influenced Christian literature even over the considerably longer term, namely until the Middle Ages and beyond. In Christian antiquity the book's shape and contents were equally quite attractive. What therein seems to today's reader to be fictitious, bizarre, monotonous, and banal was evidently at the time so deeply felt and valued that it virtually invited a reading and was not a barrier at all.[85]

Irenaeus is the earliest Christian author to have "quoted conspicuously" from the *Shepherd*. His quotations provide an initial *terminus ante quem* — 189 C.E. — for the composition of at least one of the major portions of the *Shepherd*, as I shall now demonstrate.

Irenaeus quotes from the famous opening lines of the *Mandates* section: "First of all, believe that God, who created and put all things in order, and who from non-existence made all

---

[84] Ibid., 57 n. 8. The relevant bibliography, although not the proposals themselves, can be found in Gebhardt and Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece*, XLIV n. 22.

[85] Brox, *Hirt*, 55-56: "Der 'Hirt' hat zu den populärsten Büchern der christlichen Frühzeit gehört; er ist in der altkirchlichen Literatur auffällig oft und zu verschiedensten Themen zitiert worden und hat mehr Interesse gefunden als manche neutestamentliche Schrift. Mit seinen allegorischen und visionären Elementen hat er offenbar sogar beträchtlich langfristiger, nämlich bis ins Mittelalter und darüber hinaus, christliche Literatur inspiriert und beeinflußt (s. u.). Im christlichen Altertum waren Form und Inhalt des Buches wohl gleichermaßen attraktiv. Was darin den heutigen Leser fiktiv, skurril, monoton und trivial anmutet, ist damals offensichtlich sehr anders empfunden und bewertet worden, so daß es zur Lektüre geradezu reizte und durchaus keine Sperre bedeutete." For Brox's discussion of quotations from the *Shepherd* in early Christian literature, which he compiled in conversation with the prior work of Harnack, see pp. 57-71; cf. Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893), I/1: 51-58.

things to exist, and who contains all things but is himself alone uncontained, is one" (26.1).[86]

Irenaeus clearly quotes a portion of this passage twice, although in neither instance does he

mention his quotation's source.[87] The first of Irenaeus' quotations, introduced with a formula

labeling what comes from the *Shepherd* as "scripture" (γραφή, *scriptura*), appears in *Against*

*Heresies* 4.20.2: "First of all believe that God, the one who created and put all things in order, is

one."[88] Irenaeus' second quotation is found in his *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* 4:

"And therefore it is proper, first of all, to believe that there is one God, the Father, who has

created and fashioned all things, who made that which was not to be, who contains all and is

alone uncontainable."[89] A third quotation of the same passage from *Mand.* 1.1 in *Against*

*Heresies* 4.20.1, the section directly preceding the first clear quotation already noted is possible,

---

[86] Πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα, καὶ πάντα χωρῶν, μόνος δὲ ἀχώρητος ὤν. For a survey of the concluding clauses' theme in Greco-Roman literature, see William R. Schoedel, "Enclosing, Not Enclosed: The Early Christian Doctrine of God," in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant*, ed. William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken, ThHist 54 (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1979), 75-86, esp. 77 on *Mand.* 1.1 [26.1].

[87] For a recent study of the text and authority of the *Shepherd* in Irenaeus, see Daniel Batovici, "*Hermas*' Authority in Irenaeus' Works: A Reassessment," *Aug* 55 (2015): 5-31; on the references to 26.1, see 10-19.

[88] *Primo omnium crede quoniam unus est Deus, qui omnia constituit et consumnavit et fecit eo quod non erat ut essent omnia, omnium capax et qui a nemini capiatur*. The Latin and Greek texts of Irenaeus are those published in L. Doutreleau et al., eds., *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre 4*, 2 vols., SC 100 (Paris: Cerf, 1965), 2:628-29. Eusebius preserves a portion of this quotation in *H.E.* 5.8.

[89] This English translation of the single complete Armenian translation of Irenaeus' Greek original is that of John Behr, trans., *St Irenaeus, On the Apostolic Preaching*, PP (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997), 42; cf. the Latin text and French translation of Adelin Rousseau, ed., *Irénée de Lyon, Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*, SC 406 (Paris: Cerf, 1995), 88-91. Behr marks Irenaeus' insertions into the quoted text of the *Shepherd* on p. 103 n. 15.

as proposed by Bertrand Hemmerdinger.[90] Although Hemmerdinger did not delimit or describe

this quotation, one can reasonably assume that he was referring to the phrase, "…and it is he

[i.e., God] who created and made and arranged all things by himself."[91] This third proposed

quotation from *Mand*. 1.1 is less substantial and freer than the other two in *Against Heresies*

4.20.2 and *Demonstration* 4, respectively. Perhaps for this reason, Hemmerdinger's proposal has

not met with universal acceptance.[92] Regardless, Irenaeus' first two quotations of the *Shepherd*

stand on firm ground.

Irenaeus composed his *Demonstration* after his five-volume *Against Heresies*.[93]

Therefore, the dating of the latter, which is the earlier of the two, is important for my argument.

In the antepenultimate book of this work, Irenaeus states, "…now Eleutherus occupies the

episcopacy of the apostles in the twelfth position" (*Against Heresies* 3.3).[94] Bishop Eleutherus

ruled ca. 175-89 C.E.[95] So Irenaeus must have composed the treatise during that period. Taken

together, these two data from Irenaeus (i.e., [1] the composition of *Against Heresies* under

Eleutherus; and [2] the quotation from *Mand.* 1 in book 4 of it) provide the most specific

*terminus ante quem* yet for the composition of at least the *Mandates* section, namely the death of

---

[90] Bertrand Hemmerdinger, "Observations critiques sur Irénée, IV (*Sources chrétiennes* 100) ou les mésaventures d'un philologue," *JTS* 17 (1966): 308-09.

[91] *…et ispe est qui per semetipsum constituit et fecit et adornavit et continet omnia.*

[92] For example, in his English translation of the reconstructed Greek text of *Against Heresies* in the SC edition, Robert M. Grant noted the quotation of *Mand.* 1.1 at 4.20.2 but not the one proposed by Hemmerdinger at 4.20.1 (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, ECF [London: Routledge, 1997], 198 n. 4).

[93] Behr, *On the Apostolic Preaching*, 3.

[94] *…nunc duodecimo loco episcopatum ab apostolis habet Eleutherus.* This quotation survives in Greek in a fragment of Eusebius: νῦν δωδεκάτῳ τόπῳ τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατέχει κλῆρον Ἐλεύθερος. These Latin and Greek texts are those published in L. Doutreleau and A. Rousseau, eds., *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre 3*, 2 vols., SC 211 (Paris: Cerf, 1974), 36-38.

[95] Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 6.

Eleutherus in 189 C.E. Only rarely have scholars suggested or implied that the *Shepherd* could

have been composed after this point.[96]

An additional piece of evidence possibly pointing to an even earlier date for the

composition of the *Shepherd*, perhaps in the second quarter of the second century or even before,

is the reference to it made in the so-called Muratorian Canon. This fragment received its name

from its initial editor, Lodovico Antonio Muratori.[97] The relevant portion reads, "But Hermas

composed the *Shepherd* in the city of Rome very recently in our times, while his brother, bishop

---

[96] For example, long ago Arthur C. McGiffert argued that the *Shepherd* was written in the "[l]atter half of the second century," which would include the 190s C.E. ("The 'Didache' Viewed in Its Relations to Other Writings," *AR* 5 [1886]: 436 n. 2). In support of this broad range, McGiffert appealed to a brief note by F. J. A. Hort, "Hermas and Theodotion," *JHUC* 4.35 (1884): 23. That note purported to correct and extend the argument made by J. Rendel Harris that Hermas's mention of Thegri at *Vis*. 4.2.4 [23.4] is "an indirect quotation from the book of Daniel" ("On the Angelology of Hermas," *JHUC* 3.30 [1884]: 75). Hort countered that the passage in view "follows not the true Septuagint version of Daniel, but that of Theodotion, which superseded it in the course of the second century" (23). The text in view is LXX Dan 6:22 ($\theta$'). This suggestion was quickly rejected by George Salmon, who disputed the late date for Theodotion and therefore any implications of Hermas's mention of Thegri, arguing, "If, then, it can be established on other grounds that the Book of Hermas belongs to the early part of the second century, no reason for rejecting that date is afforded by the fact that we find in the book a verse of Daniel quoted in a form for which the Septuagint will not account" ("Note on Hermas and Theodotion," in *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament: Being an Expansion of Lectures Delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin* [London: John Murray, 1885], 654-68; the quote is from 668). In the reprint of his original 1884 note together with Hort's response, Harris acknowledged Salmon's criticism and found "the posteriority of Hermas to be *non-proven*" ("On the Angelology of Hermas," in *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896], 24-25; emphasis original). For recent discussions of the dating of LXX Dan ($\theta$'), see Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 142-54; Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint*, ed. Michael A. Knibb, UBW (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 84-87.

[97] Lodovico Antonio Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicæ medii ævi* (Milan: Societas Palatina, 1740), vol. 3., cols. 851-56.

Pius, held the episcopal seat of the city of Rome."[98] According to Eusebius, Pius took up his

bishopric five years after Antoninus Pius came to power (i.e., 144/45 C.E.), and he held it for

fifteen years.[99] Consequently, the Canon has traditionally been assigned a late if not mid-second-

century date.[100] However, a date in the fourth century has also been proposed, particularly by

Albert C. Sundberg Jr. (1973) and subsequently by Geoffrey Mark Hahneman (1992).[101]

Sundberg and Hahneman's arguments for a fourth-century date have convinced a limited number

of scholars.[102] I am persuaded by the criticism and counter-proposals provided by Everett

Ferguson and Joseph Verheyden.[103] On the one hand, the Canon is not as congruent in form with

---

[98] *Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe roma herma conscripsit sedente cathetra urbis romae eclesiae Pio [episcopo] fratre eius*. The Latin text is that of Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, *Canon Muratorianus: The Earliest Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1867), 20, slightly amended with respect to orthography, scribal errors, and the presence of one *nomen sacrum*; cf. Hans Lietzmann, ed., *Das Muratorische Fragment und die Monarchianischen Prologe zu den Evangelien*, KTVÜ 1 (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1902), 8-9. For an English translation, which generally follows Lietzmann's edition, see Metzger, *Canon*, 305-07.

[99] Eusebius, *H.E.* 4.10-11.

[100] The literature on the dating of the Muratorian Canon is voluminous. For an excellent survey, see Joseph Verheyden, "The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute," in *The Biblical Canons*, ed. J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de. Jonge, BETL 163 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 487-556.

[101] Albert C. Sundberg Jr., "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List," *HTR* 66 (1973): 1-41. Five years prior, Sandberg published the kernel of his argument in "Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon," *SE* 4 (1968): 458-59. The fourth-century alternative dating actually precedes Sundberg's articles; see "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List," 3 n. 13. An even more sustained argument in favor of a fourth-century date is that of Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*, OTM (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), esp. 34-72. The arguments put forward by both Sundberg and Hahneman were subjected to vigorous criticism by, among others, Everett Ferguson, "Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance," *StPatr* 17 (1982): 677-83; idem, "Review of *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* by Geoffrey Mark Hahneman," *JTS* 44 (1993): 691-97; Philippe Henne, "La Datation du Canon de Muratori," *RB* 100 (1993): 54-75; and Verheyden, "Canon Muratori."

[102] A short list of such scholars is given by Verheyden, "Canon Muratori," 488-89.

[103] Ferguson, "Canon Muratori," 681-82; idem, "Review of *Muratorian Fragment*," 697; Verheyden, "Canon Muratori," 556.

the Eastern fourth-century canon lists as Hahneman claims. As Ferguson correctly noted, those

are "bare 'lists'", and the Canon "is considerably more than a list."[104] And, on the other hand, the

Canon engages phenomena of particular concern in the West in the second half of the second

century. These concerns include certain so-called heretics (e.g., Marcion, Valentinus, Basilides)

and the construction of a *regula fidei* (although admittedly not introduced with this label), as well

as other theological notions (e.g., the unity of the four gospels despite their diversity, Christ's

double coming [*gemino eius adventu*]). With the Eastern fourth-century connection severed,

these features firmly situate the Muratorian Canon within Western discursive practices taking

place shortly before the turn of the third century. This dating stands independent of questions

over the veracity of the Canon's reference to Hermas as the brother of Pius, during whose

bishopric it claims he composed the *Shepherd*.

This reference has long flummoxed scholars. Is it correct, either in whole or in part?

Admittedly, some scholars accept it.[105] Others, such as Hahneman, reject it entirely.[106] Already

in the early sixteenth century Roberto Bellarmino refused to take the Canon's reference to

Hermas at face value, suggesting that it referred not to Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd*, but a

different Hermes, who composed a work on the proper day for celebrating Easter, which has not

survived.[107] Carlini was more trusting, at least regarding the implied date of the *Shepherd*'s

---

[104] Ferguson, "Review of *Muratorian Fragment*," 696.

[105] E.g., Dibelius, *Hirt*, 422.

[106] Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, "The Muratorian Fragment and the Origins of the New Testament Canon," in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 406-12.

[107] *Existimo igitur diversos esse auctores, et diversos eorum libros, quamvis idem fere nomen generent: nam praeter ea quae dicta sunt, is qui ab Apostolo salutari jubetur, vocatur Hermam; frater Pii dicitur Hermes: deinde liber, qui scriptus dicitur a fratre Pontificis, praecipue continebat mandatum Domini per Angelum, ut Pascha die Dominico celebraretur: at in libro*

publication that attends the reference to Hermas as Pius's brother. He persuasively argued that

the Canon, whose traditional dating he adopted, refers to the omnibus edition of the *Shepherd*

that gathered together two parts circulating independently.[108] This position allowed Carlini to

avoid any conflict between the Canon's reference to the *Shepherd* in the late-second century as

"very recently composed" and the possible dating of P.Iand. 1.4 to a point decades prior. The

Iandanae fragment, Carlini suggested, could simply be the remains of one of the *Shepherd*'s

independently circulating parts, copied before the omnibus edition appeared.[109] This novel idea

provides "a way out from otherwise unavoidable difficulties" in which the traditional late

second-century dating and an earlier dating of P.Iand. 1.4 do not threaten each other.[110]

But should we really accept the Canon's assertions that (a) Hermas was Pius's brother

and that (b) Hermas composed or, as Carlini showed, published the *Shepherd* in its full version

during Pius's bishopric as historically reliable? I cautiously think that we should. It is difficult to

imagine why the Canon's author would invent two discrete claims — that Hermas was Pius's

brother, and that he composed the *Shepherd* (i.e., compiled its parts) during Pius's bishopric —

---

*Pastoris, qui a veteribus citatur, et qui adhuc exstat, nulla mentio fit Paschatis celebrandi die Dominico. Quare probabile est, librum Hermetis, fratris Prontificis, cito interisse: et solum reliquum esse illum celebriorem, quem scripsit Hermam discipulus Apostolorum* (*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis veteris et novi testamenti* in Vol. 12 of *Opera omnia*, ed. Justin Fèvre [Paris: Vives, 1891], 357; cited in Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs*, 64 n. 3).

[108] Carlini, "Testimone e testo," 25-26. Even if one remains unpersuaded that the Muratorian Canon refers to the publication of an "omnibus edition" of the three parts of the *Shepherd* under Pius in the mid-second century, according to Bagnall "it as at least clear that from the time of the bishop Demetrios [r. 189-232, Alexandria] the totality of the *Shepherd* could have been acquired in a single volume" (*Early Christian Books*, 48; italics added). Bagnall finds evidence for his position in the dating and contents of P. Oxy. 4706. As I noted above, Gonis dated these fragments to the late second/early third centuries ("P.Oxy. 4706," 3). And, crucially, they represent portions of both the *Visions* and the *Mandates*, sections of the *Shepherd* hitherto typically considered to have circulated independently.

[109] Carlini, "Testimone e testo," 29.

[110] Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 47-48; the quote is from 48.

both of which would have been easily falsifiable because they concerned such a prominent

Christian figure (i.e., Pius).[111] This is particularly the case if in fact the Canon stems from a late

second-century Western provenance, where traditions about Pius likely would still have held

sway.


*Summary*

The quotations of the *Shepherd* in Irenaeus clearly indicate that at least the *Mandates* section was

composed by 189 C.E. This *terminus ante quem* finds additional support in the Muratorian

Canon, which, following the majority of scholars, I date to the late second century. Given the

manuscript evidence for the independent circulation of the *Shepherd* in two parts (i.e., [1] *Vis*. 1-

4 and [2] the *Mandates* plus the *Similitudes* with *Vis*. 5 as their introduction), the Canon's

mention of Hermas's having "very recently composed" it during the bishopric of his brother Pius

is best construed as a reference to the collection of the omnibus edition of the work. A mid-

second century date for this omnibus edition prevents a conflict with the potential early dating of

P.Iand. 1.4 to the first half of the second century.

But even if the Muratorian Canon's reference to Hermas as Pius's brother is inaccurate,

the tripartite *Shepherd* can conceivably be dated to roughly the same period from a different

angle. That angle is what Osiek has recognized as all three sections' reflecting the fresh

"collective memory [of local persecution] that projects the possibility of similar catastrophic

---

[111] In his two-fold denial of Hermas's being Pius's brother and a mid-second century date for the
*Shepherd*, Hahnemann did not attempt to explain the origin(s) of what he considered the errors,
although he contended that both the Muratorian Canon's copyist and its Latin translation were
shoddy ("Muratorian Fragment and the Origins," 408-09). In his judgment, the Canon's two
claims are "mistaken" (409), "simply wrong" (409) and "simply confused or mistaken" (411).

events occurring."[112] The persecutions remembered (and projected) by Hermas include that

under Nero following the fire at Rome in 64 C.E.[113] A substantial period of time would need to

pass after such a traumatic event in the lives of Roman Christians before Hermas could have

recorded his visions, because as Osiek persuasively argued, "[he] is more afraid of his listeners

losing their faith than losing their lives."[114] And yet not too much time would have passed,

because Hermas still believed that such a persecution remained possible if not probable in the

future. Specifically bounding this period is impossible. I imagine the Christian fear of

persecution beginning to fall after a generation or two (i.e., the turn of the second century) and

then dropping precipitously after three or four (i.e., mid-second century). Even at the first of

these two points, a collection of at least some of Paul's letters was known at Rome and available

for Hermas to encounter, as I shall now demonstrate.

---

[112] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 20. For a similar statement on the memory of persecution at Rome and Christians' subsequent identity and self-presentation as a persecuted people, albeit without reference to the *Shepherd*, see Candida R. Moss, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions*, AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 74.
[113] The earliest sources that explicitly assert a local persecution under Nero are Tacitus, *Ann*. 15.44 and Suetonius, *Nero* 16.2. In the fourth century, Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.25 repeats the legend. Although the description of the deaths of Peter and Paul in *1 Clem* 5.4-7 does not mention Nero, their martyrdoms are typically assigned to his reign; likewise, the same text's reference to "the sudden and continuous misfortunes and calamities that happened to us" (τὰς αἰφνιδίους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους γενομένας ἡμῖν συμφορὰς καὶ περιπτώσεις, 1.1) is typically taken as an implicit reference to the (purported) persecution under Domitian. However, despite the witness of Tertullian, *Apol*. 5.4 and Melito in Eusebius, *HE*. 3.17-18, 4.26, scholarship has increasingly questioned the existence of a sustained local persecution of Christians at Rome under Domitian. See, e.g., W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), 211-17; Brian W. Jones, *The Emperor Domitian* (London: Routledge, 1992), 114-17; Pat Southern, *Domitian: Tragic Tyrant* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 114-15; Candida R. Moss, *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom* (New York: HarperOne, 2013), 129. The Greek text of *1 Clem* printed here and elsewhere in this study is that of A. Jaubert, *Clément de Rome: Épître aux Corinthiens*, SC 167 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971).
[114] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 20.

34

Dating the Formation of a *Corpus Paulinum*

A collection of the apostle Paul's letters and those written in his name or traditionally attributed

to him (i.e., the seven undisputed letters, the Pauline pseudepigrapha, and Hebrews) must have

been made prior to 144 C.E, the year of Marcion's break with the church at Rome. This assumes,

on the basis of recent scholarship, that Marcion was not the first *collector* of Paul's letters but, as

Clabeaux aptly put it, a "*traditor* of a poorly controlled [*corpus Paulinum*]" that preceded him.[115]

Furthermore, the first of any such collection(s) must post-date the apostle's death, which

presumably occurred in 64 C.E. under Nero.[116] Despite this span of roughly 75 years between

Paul and Marcion, most theories regarding the initial creation of a *corpus Paulinum* argue that,

regardless of who was responsible or where it was made, it emerged before or around the close

of the first century, and additional editions appeared shortly thereafter.[117] A famous exception to

---

[115] John James Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion*, CBQMS 21 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), 129. On this basic point, subsequent scholarship seems largely to agree; see, e.g., Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, ANTF 25 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 293-94; Harry Y. Gamble, "Marcion and the 'Canon,'" in *The Cambridge History of Christianity* Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine*, ed. Frances M. Young and Margaret M. Mitchell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 208-11; Dieter T. Roth, "Marcion and the Early New Testament Text," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 303-04; Jason D. BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013), 205-07.
[116] Udo Schnelle, *Paulus: Leben und Denken*, dGL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 39-40; see also 429-32. The earliest explicit reference to Paul's death at Rome is *1 Clem* 5.5-7.
[117] Harry Y. Gamble, *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning*, GBSNTS (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 41, 43. For a similar position, as well as supporting bibliography, see Stanley Porter's recent summary of what he categorizes as the six major theories, and their variations, on the formation of the *corpus Paulinum* ("Paul and the Pauline Letter Collection," in *Paul and the Second Century*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, LNTS 412 [London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011], 22-35).

this scholarly consensus is the theory of Walter Bauer. Bauer argued that Marcion was "the first

*systematic collector* of the Pauline heritage," by whose editorial activity "[t]he small collections

of Pauline letters, which were cherished at the beginning of the second century in the 'churches'

of Rome — doubtless just as in similarly oriented Corinth, in Antioch and Smyrna — were…

surpassed and replaced."[118] But even Bauer granted the existence of Pauline letter collections at

Rome and elsewhere in the early second century.

  Ultimately, I do not think that it is possible to point to a single moment of genesis that

inaugurated the process of collecting letters in what came to be a recognizable *corpus Paulinum*.

Others have certainly done so, suggesting that this collection occurred under Paul himself

(Richards, Trobisch),[119] Onesimus (Knox, Murphy-O'Connor),[120] an anonymous acquaintance of

Paul at Corinth (Harnack),[121] Luke (Moule, Richards[?]),[122] Timothy (Guthrie),[123] the author of

---

[118] Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel, trans. Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 221-22; the quotes are from p. 221 (emphasis added).

[119] E. Randolph Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, WUNT II 42 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991), 165 n. 169. Richards does not explicitly name Paul as the agent who collected the letters, but he does attribute responsibility to him. Richards writes, "A secretary usually kept copies of the letters… Paul no doubt retained these copies with him, since he used several secretaries… Thus the first collection of Paul's letters were [*sic*] in codex form and arose from Paul's personal copies and *not* from collecting the letters from the various recipients" (ibid.; emphasis original). According to David Trobisch, *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), esp. 55-96, Paul himself was the inaugurator of at least a partial collection of his letters; cf. idem, *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 60-62.

[120] John Knox, *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul: A New View of Its Place and Importance*, rev. ed. (New York: Abingdon, 1959); Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills*, GNS (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), 130.

[121] Adolf von Harnack, *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christlichen Briefsammlungen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926), 8-10.

[122] C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, 3rd rev. ed., BNTC (London: A. & C. Black, 1981), 264-65. Richards does not attribute the initial letter collection to Luke, but as an implication of his own theory of its origins he does imagine the possibility that "[s]uch a

Ephesians (Goodspeed),[124] one or more members of a Pauline "school" (Schenke, Gamble),[125] Marcion (Bauer),[126] a scholarly editor operating in the Alexandrian mode if not the city itself (Zuntz),[127] or an anti-Gnostic one at Corinth (Schmithals).[128] My argument for Hermas's encounter with Pauline letters is, in my judgment, compatible with any of these preceding theories. Admittedly, I generally favor the less specific view that some letters, themselves constituting a *corpus* or even multiple *corpora*, circulated among certain Pauline communities prior to the emergence of a full *corpus* like $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$.[129] This modest position explains the apparent engagement with Pauline letters by Christians in cities beyond those to which they were originally addressed (e.g., 1 Corinthians in *1 Clement*, written at Rome, and the Ignatian letters, written in Asia Minor; Romans in Polycarp, *Philippians*, written at Smyrna), a practice invited at

---

collection might easily fall into Luke's hands at the death of Paul (2 Tim. 4:11)" (*Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, 165 n. 169).

[123] Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 4th rev. ed., MRC (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990), 998-99.

[124] Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The Meaning of Ephesians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), 6. As Gamble has noted, a number of Goodspeed's students modified his theory (*New Testament Canon*, 37 n. 35).

[125] Hans-Martin Schenke, "Das Weiterwirken des Paulus und die Pflege seines Erbes durch die Paulus-Schule," *NTS* 21 (1975): 505-18; Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 39-41.

[126] Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, 32-33.

[127] Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the* Corpus Paulinum, SLBA (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 14-17, 278-79, esp. 279.

[128] Walter Schmithals, *Paul and the Gnostics*, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), 239-74, esp. 266.

[129] E.g., Kirsopp Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul: Their Motive and Origin* (London: Rivingtons, 1911), 358-59; Robert M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (London: Collins, 1963), 171; Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* Vol. 2: *History and Literature of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed. (New York: de Gruyter, 2000), 6. Margaret M. Mitchell makes the point from a different direction: "…there is no evidence in ancient Christianity of individual letters, such as Galatians, circulating beyond their recipient communities in published form outside of some collection of the *corpus Paulinum*" ("The Letter of James as a Document of Paulinism?," in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James*, ed. Robert L. Webb and John S. Kloppenborg, LNTS [London: T&T Clark, 2007], 79).

the conclusion of one of the letters attributed to Paul (Col 4:16).[130] But, faced with the absence of external evidence corroborating the identity and motive(s) of the eventual collection's compiler, scholars who affirm this position refrain from attributing it to any particular person. Simply put, I do not think there is sufficient evidence to move from speculation to specificity on debates over the geography and chronology of — and individual agency associated with — the formation of a full *corpus Paulinum*.[131] What matters for this study is simply the undeniable presence of some letters attributed to (or in the case of Hebrews, associated with) Paul at Rome prior to the time that Hermas composed the *Shepherd*.

*1 Clement* in particular provides proof of that presence. This letter to Corinth was probably written at Rome in the mid-90s C.E.[132] Such a date is prior to what most scholars besides Coleborne consider a plausible *terminus post quem* for the earliest stratum in the

---

[130] Although he assigned the formal collection of the *corpus* to ca. 100 C.E. (and perhaps Alexandria), neither of which I find fully compelling, Zuntz's pithy and pointed question on the use of Pauline letters beyond their place(s) of address was apt: "Even before [the editor of the *corpus Paulinum*'s] time copies of some or all of the Epistles are likely to have been taken — how else would Clement of Rome have known 1 Corinthians?" (*The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the* Corpus Paulinum, 14).

[131] Kurt Aland articulated an even more skeptical position. In his view, the notion of a "standardized *Ur-corpus* [of Paul's letters] from the first century upon which everything else depends is a figment of the imagination or wishful thinking. The history of the formation of the Pauline corpus is obviously much more complicated" ("Das einheitliche 'Ur-Corpus' des 1. Jahrhunderts, von dem alles Weitere abhängt, ist eine Phantasie- bzw. eine Wunschvorstellung, die Entstehungsgeschichte des Corpus Paulinum ist offensichtlich sehr viel komplizierter"; "Die Entstehung des Corpus Paulinum," in *Neutestamentliche Entwürfe*, TBNT 63 [München: Kaiser, 1979], 334).

[132] Like that of the *Shepherd*, the dating of *1 Clement* is contested. Some scholars favor a date as early as 69 C.E. (e.g., A. E. Wilhelm-Hooijbergh, "A Different View of Clemens Romanus," *HJ* 16 [1975]: 266-67); others date it as late as 130-40 C.E. (e.g., John. Sturdy, *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Date of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Jonathan Knight, BibW [London: Equinox, 2007], 4-7, esp. p. 7). Following Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.13-17, it was traditionally assigned to a date closely following the alleged persecution under Domitian (ca. 95 C.E.), which is now widely discredited. For a concise summary of the issues, see Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:23-25, who settles on a date "in the mid 90s" (25), as most scholars do.

*Shepherd*. Among other sources, *1 Clement* probably preserves quotations from the undisputed Pauline letters, particularly 1 Corinthians and Romans.[133] According to Jack Finegan, "Since [Clement] prefaced his citation of 1 Corinthians 1:11-13 by saying, 'Take up the epistle of the blessed apostle Paul' (*1 Clem* 47:1), it is evident that he had a copy of that letter in Rome and therefore probably also had copies of the other letters, in other words already possessed the Pauline collection."[134] (To be sure, *1 Clement* indicates knowledge of *a* collection of the letters, but it does not logically follow that this must be "*the* Pauline collection," even if one were to concede the existence of a single, archetypal *corpus Paulinum*.) Whatever collection Clement had also likely included Hebrews (cf. Heb 1:5-13, *1 Clem* 36.2-6).[135] It probably also included Romans, which the apostle had addressed to the city where *1 Clement* was composed.

Clement's knowledgeable engagement at Rome in the late first century with documents associated with the apostle Paul, which I shall discuss at length below, proves that at least some of the contents of what became the full *corpus Paulinum* were available in the imperial city before its collection and publication were finalized. Further evidence comes from other texts sent to Rome at roughly this time or shortly thereafter that assume knowledge of Pauline letters by recipients (e.g., Ignatius, *Romans*).[136] So even if Hermas did not have access to *precisely* the

---

[133] A. J. Carlyle, "I Clement," in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 37-44.

[134] Jack Finegan, "The Original Form of the Pauline Collection," *HTR* 49 (1956): 85.

[135] Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Herm (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989), 6-7; cf. Carlyle, "I Clement," 44-48. Clement's knowledge and use of Hebrews was recognized already by Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.38, who included it among Paul's letters.

[136] On Ignatius's probable knowledge of 1 Cor in *Rom.*, see W. R. Inge, "Ignatius," in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 65, who concluded that "Ignatius must have known this Epistle almost by heart" (67). This judgment was affirmed by Paul Foster, "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F.

same assemblage of letters that Clement did, the fact that Clement had such access in Rome toward the end of the first century C.E. establishes the possibility and maybe even the likelihood that Hermas could have too.

## Summary

By now I have shown that Hermas most likely composed the *Shepherd* at Rome after some of the apostle's letters and other texts written in Paul's name or associated with him became available in the imperial city. Given the temporal and geographical availability of this material to Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd*, in the following section I explore two *possible* means by which he might have encountered Pauline letters. I do this in order to set up my argument in Chapter 2 that it is *probable* that Hermas engaged some of the letters throughout the *Shepherd*.

## IMAGINING HERMAS'S ENCOUNTER(S) WITH PAULINE LETTERS

How might one imagine Hermas encountering Paul's letters in early second-century Rome? In what follows, I analyze how the *Shepherd* conspicuously portrays Hermas in terms of his literacy and book habits. He is presented as an effective copyist and reader of texts, and by extension as participating in Roman literary culture. I argue that this portrait is not intended primarily to communicate historical facts about Hermas's level of actual literacy. Instead, it aims to convince the reader that Hermas is an able medium of divine revelation. I then engage in a process of imagining how Hermas could have encountered Paul's letters in the community of Roman

---

Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 159-86, esp. 185, in whose determination "a strong case can be mounted for Ignatius' knowledge of four Pauline epistles" (186).

Christians in various ways. But before discussing these possibilities, it is important to understand how the text of the *Shepherd* itself imagines and presents Hermas's encounter with texts.

The *Shepherd*'s Imagined Portrait of Hermas as Semi-Literate

In the *Shepherd*, Hermas is rhetorically presented as at least semi-literate.[137] My use of this descriptive label adopts William Harris's definition of semi-literate people in antiquity as those "who can write slowly or not at all, and who can read without being able to read complex or very lengthy texts."[138] This definition is somewhat vague. But it reflects what Harris rightly recognizes as the existence of "infinite gradations of literacy for any written language" and "avoid[s] an excessively sharp polarity of literacy and illiteracy."[139] Hermas fits Harris's description because the text of the *Shepherd* imagines him as capable of copying a revealed text, writing down another, and reading both to others, admittedly with some challenge, at least in certain instances. In doing so, the *Shepherd* presumes Hermas's relative facility with the book technologies of the period and by extension his meaningful participation in wider Roman literary culture. I argue that Hermas's literacy is presented in this manner in order to reinforce his text's truthfulness and to encourage its acceptance by others.

---

[137] Osiek adopts a similar position, labeling Hermas "at least basically literate" (*Shepherd*, 52). Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005) described him as a "beginner" (174) and "novice" reader (175).
[138] William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 5.
[139] Ibid.

The *Shepherd* offers no explicit evidence to suggest Hermas was formally trained or worked as a professional scribe.[140] But it does depict him as an effective copyist.[141] One particularly relevant passage for my claim of Hermas's imagined literacy is *Vis.* 2.1.3-4 [5.3-4]. There Hermas says to the elderly Lady, "'…I am unable to remember such things. But give the little book to me so that I can copy (μεταγράψωμαι) it.'" He then reverts to his role as narrator. "I took [the Lady's little book]," Hermas says, "and after I withdrew to a particular place I copied (μετεγραψάμην) everything letter-by-letter (πρὸς γράμμα), since I could not distinguish the syllables (οὐχ ηὕρισκον γὰρ τὰς συλλαβάς)."[142] One might understand this statement regarding letter-by-letter copying to prove that Hermas could not, in fact, read the book, presumably because he was illiterate.[143] However, it cannot be intended as a sufficient indicator of Hermas's implied illiteracy, as other passages in the *Shepherd* show.

---

[140] If Hermas was, in fact, engaged in other business affairs to a significant degree, this would increase the likelihood that he had developed a functional "craftsman's literacy." See the distinction between "scribal literacy" and "craftsman's literacy" made by ibid., 7-8. According to Harris, "skilled craftsmen in general [were] far more literate than the population as a whole" (22).

[141] Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 21-22, 36-37.

[142] Κυρία, τοσαῦτα μνημονεῦσαι οὐ δύναμαι· δὸς δέ μοι τὸ βιβλίδιον ἵνα μεταγράψωμαι αὐτό. ἔλαβον, καὶ εἴς τινα τόπον τοῦ ἀγροῦ ἀναχωρήσας μετεγραψάμην πάντα πρὸς γράμμα· οὐχ ηὕρισκον γὰρ τὰς συλλαβάς, 5.4.

[143] Stated somewhat differently, Snyder thought Hermas could not actually read the book, and he implied by his citation of Odes Sol. 23:8 that the self-presentation of Hermas fit a broader pattern within early Christian thought (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 35). The Syriac text of Ode 23:5-8 reads as follows: "And [the Lord's thought] was like a letter, and his will descended from on high. And it was sent from a bow like an arrow that has been forcibly shot. And many hands rushed to the letter, in order to catch (it), then take and read it. But it escaped from their fingers; and they were afraid of it and of the seal which was upon it" (James H. Charlesworth, "Odes of Solomon," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Vol. 2: *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, and Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*, ed. James H. Charlesworth [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983], 755-56).

Hermas is portrayed as able not only to copy (μεταγράφειν) but also to write (γράφειν) at *Vis*. 2.4.2-3 [8.2-3]. Having gone away for a while, the elderly Lady reappears and asks Hermas whether he has circulated her little book as instructed. Hermas tells her that he has not, and the Lady commends him, for she has additional words that she wants to communicate through him. Then she says, "Therefore, you will write (γράψεις) two little books, and you will send one to Clement and one to Grapte."[144] Because the second little book refers to what she will speak directly to Hermas, he must write it down; he cannot merely copy it as he did the her first little book. Thus we see Hermas presented as an effective writer, capable of composition.[145]

The text then describes Hermas as capable of reading too. Having just told him to write two books, not just copy one, the Lady commands Hermas, saying, "…*You* will read [the little book] to this city (εἰς ταύτην τὴν πόλιν) in company with the church's presiding elders."[146] This exhortation confirms Hermas's being at least semi-literate to the *Shepherd*'s audience. Were Hermas imagined to be truly illiterate or even barely able to "distinguish syllables," he would have been unable to heed the Lady's instruction and read to the Roman elders himself. Of course, another translation of the prepositional phrase beginning with εἰς, which takes it as a locative, is possible (i.e., "…You will read [the little book] *in this city*").[147] Such a construal eliminates any indirect object from the sentence, allowing someone — perhaps one of the elders — to read the book on Hermas's behalf. However, even if one accepts the locative reading of εἰς ταύτην τὴν

---

[144] γράψεις οὖν δύο βιβλαρίδια καὶ πέμψεις ἒν Κλήμεντι καὶ ἒν Γραπτῇ, 8.3.
[145] Hermas is depicted similarly at *Sim*. 10.1.1 [111.1] (*postquam perscripersam labrum hunc…*).
[146] σὺ δὲ ἀναγνώσῃ εἰς ταύτην τὴν πόλιν μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προισταμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, 8.3.
[147] The locative reading is adopted by Dibelius, *Hirt*, 453; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 40; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 159; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 58.

πόλιν then the passage still indicates that Hermas is the Lady's intended reader of her little book. This is made clear by the extraposited subject: "*You* will read," she says (σὺ ἀναγνώσῃ).[148]

Hermas is presented as at least semi-literate elsewhere too. In *Vis.* 5.5 [25.5], upon appearing at his house the Shepherd says to him, "I am commanding you, first of all, to write down the commandments and parables, so that you might read them *continually* (ὑπὸ χεῖρα) and be able to keep them."[149] There are numerous possible ways of translating the idiomatic phrase ὑπὸ χεῖρα.[150] Hermas employs it two other times, once in the *Visions* and again in the *Mandates*; on both occasions he does with the sense of "continually."[151] Consequently, my translation of the Shepherd's command here is consistent with Hermas's broader pattern.[152] The Shepherd's expectation that Hermas will "read *continually*" implies that he himself is a capable reader. Otherwise, he would continually need to find someone to read to him, which is unrealistic and therefore implausible.[153] Hermas himself seems willing and able to heed the Shepherd's full command, for he heeds the first half of it explicitly, telling his audience, "So I wrote down the commandments and parables as he commanded me."[154]

---

[148] Snyder's translation of this passage — "…in this city you yourself shall read…" — indicates that he recognized the importance of the extraposited subject, even though he did not comment on it (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 40).

[149] ἐντέλλομαί σοι πρῶτον γράψαι τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ παραβολάς, ἵνα ὑπὸ χεῖρα ἀναγινώσκῃς αὐτὰς καὶ δυνηθῇς φυλάξαι αὐτάς, *Vis.* 5.5 [25.5].

[150] LSJ 1984 offers two possibilities: "under one's own power"; or "at once." BDAG 1083 suggests a third, "continually."

[151] *Vis.* 3.10.7 [18.7], *Mand.* 4.3.6 [31.6].

[152] *Pace* Osiek, *Shepherd*, 98 and others.

[153] Regarding an illiterate or semi-literate person's using an intermediary to encounter the written word, which he describes as "an utterly commonplace occurrence among the Greeks and Romans," see Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 33-34. My claim that Hermas's finding someone to do so would be unrealistic refers to his implied *continual* need to do so, not the need itself.

[154] ἔγραψα οὖν τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ παραβολάς, καθὼς ἐνετείλατό μοι, *Vis.* 5.6 [25.6]. A similar expression appears at *Sim.* 9.1.1 [78.1]

Given these overt references in the *Shepherd* to Hermas's being at least semi-literate, scholars have tried to explain the portrayal of Hermas' difficulty in distinguishing syllabus and need to copy letter-by-letter at *Vis.* 2.1.4 [5.4]. They have frequently done this by appeal to the physical form of the text in the Lady's little book. For example, Joly suggested that it was printed in an uncial hand in *scriptio continua*, the implication being that Hermas would have had trouble making sense of such a script;[155] but, as Henrich Weinel long ago rightly recognized, a continuous uncial script would have presented no problem for someone who fully knew how to read.[156] A somewhat similar explanation was provided by Müller, who attributed Hermas's apparent difficulties to the use of a cursive hand and numerous abbreviations.[157] Raffaella Cribiore associated Hermas's "copying blindly" and "desperately trying to distinguish the various syllabus" with his being at the first stage of literacy development.[158] Despite their creativity, such theories regarding Hermas's alleged inability to distinguish syllables are ultimately unnecessary.

The depiction of Hermas that these theories address is intended not to reflect Hermas's level of historical (il)literacy but to serve a crucial rhetorical purpose within the broader argument of the *Shepherd*. This rhetorical purpose was recognized by Weinel. He linked

---

[155] E.g., Robert Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 1st ed., SC 53 (Paris: Cerf, 1958), 89 n. 2; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 52.

[156] According to Weinel, "Für einen, der überhaupt lesen konnte, war derartiges einfach zu lesen" ("Der Hirt des Hermas," in *Handbuch zu den Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, ed. Edgar Hennecke [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1904], 295.

[157] Hermann Müller, "Zum Pastor Hermae," *TQ* 90 (1908): 93.

[158] Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, ASP 36 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 149; cf. 48. Elsewhere, Cribiore interpreted the passage as evidence of "the struggle of beginners in learning to read" (*Gymnastics of the Mind*, 174). Ultimately, Cribiore concludes, "Since the text appeared to be a formidable mass of letters, Hermas resorted to a practice typical of a novice: passively copying it letter by letter" (175).

Hermas's inability to make sense of syllables with the text's depiction of him being in an ecstatic state, observing that once Hermas awoke from that state he was able to understand what he had written down.[159] Evidence for this latter suggestion is found in *Vis.* 2.2.1 [6.1], where after fasting and praying "the meaning of the [copied] text" (ἡ γνῶσις τῆς γραφῆς) is revealed to Hermas.[160] On Weinel's reading, Hermas's inability to distinguish syllables symbolically represents his inability to understand the inner meaning of the Lady's little book. This, I suggest, in turn reinforces the authority of the visions and by extension their content, inasmuch as they originate not with Hermas but with the various figures — and by extension God — who address him. Hermas's careful copying occurs, then, not because he is unable to make sense of the text but because he recognizes just how important it is. And so he copies it letter-by-letter, in order to preserve the revelation's integrity by not corrupting even the smallest of its sense-units. In doing so, he also ensures the preservation of revelations for posterity.[161] At the same time, I suggest that Hermas's statement is an additional instance of his pattern of self-deprecation.[162] This pattern coheres with the repeated disparagement of Hermas's intellect and his lack of understanding by the two other visionary figures throughout the tripartite work, namely the Lady and the Shepherd himself.[163] Ultimately, then, Hermas's need to copy letter-by-letter is not meant to indicate Hermas's illiteracy. Rather, on the level of the narrative, Hermas's rote

---

[159] Weinel, "Der Hirt des Hermas," 295.

[160] Μετὰ δὲ δέκα καὶ πέντε ἡμέρας νηστεύσαντός μου καὶ πολλὰ ἐρωτήσαντος τὸν κύριον ἀπεκαλύφθη μοι ἡ γνῶσις τῆς γραφῆς, 6.1.

[161] Brox, *Hirt*, 135, according to whom Hermas employed the medium of writing in a way not common to other early Christian prophets.

[162] Similarly, see *Vis*. 4.2.1 [30.1], *Mand*. 10.1.3 [40.3], *Sim*. 5.3.1 [56.1], 9.9.2 [86.2].

[163] E.g., *Vis*. 3.6.5 [14.5], 3.8.9 [16.9], 3.10.9 [18.9], *Mand.* 10.1.2 [40.2], 12.4.2 [47.2], *Sim*. 1.3 [50.3], 6.4.3 [64.3], 6.5.2 [65.2], 9.12.1 [89.1], 9.14.4 [91.4]. Grundeken begins his monograph with a recognition of the rhetorical function of what he calls these "rebukes," but he provides only a partial list of references; see *Community Building*, 1 n. 1.

copying reinforces the idea that the booklet that he is asked to read at Rome was revealed to him by an authoritative figure. He himself did not compose it. Instead, he copied it precisely from its source, almost as if he were taking dictation from its real author, God.[164]

Thus we see how the *Shepherd* imaginatively portrays Hermas as an at least semi-literate figure. He is presented as capable of copying, writing, and reading authoritative texts and of effectively engaging the written medium with others. At points, we see him struggling to copy and make sense of texts. However, particularly in light of Hermas's implied ability to read, these instances of struggle are best understood as rhetorical attempts to confirm his texts' quality as modes of divine revelation and to encourage their broad reception and engagement by others. Hermas himself plausibly engaged a particular collection of texts authored by or associated with the apostle Paul. How might we imagine him doing so?

Imagining Hermas's Encounter(s) with a Pauline Corpus

From the outset, I refrain from assuming *a priori* that Hermas and other Christians at Rome in the early second century lacked copies of at least some of the Pauline letters. Refraining from this assumption is not logically equivalent to assuming *a priori* that Hermas had access to them. I argue in Chapter 2 that he probably did, but at this point my argument aims simply to establish the possibility, not dismiss it out of hand as some scholars do. For example, Mark Grundeken recently argued that the purportedly high cost of copying precluded most early Christian communities from possessing biblical texts (i.e., Jewish scriptures) and so "[i]t cannot be

---

[164] Grundeken, following Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 90 n. 1, suggested that Hermas did not "copy" the Lady's little book but instead took dictation; see *Community Building*, 31 n. 31.

assumed that Hermas's community was an exception."[165] Instead, Grundeken suggests, what

early Christian communities in general and in this case Hermas's community at Rome in

particular possessed were "*their own (Christian) texts*, especially letters," but he does not state

which letters he thinks Hermas's community had.[166] On a strict application of such a model,

owing to financial reasons the Christian community to which Hermas belonged in the imperial

city could only be expected to have possessed a copy of Paul's letter to the Romans, which view

is directly contradicted by the witness of *1 Clement*, as I shall show below.

Harry Gamble has convincingly shown that the cost of neither materials nor labor would

necessarily have prevented early Christian communities from copying authoritative texts. This is

particularly true in the case of letters, which were typically short. In Gamble's judgment,

"…economies could be obtained by copying the text on the back of an existing roll (an

opisthograph) or in an erased roll… or by transcribing the text personally instead of employing a

---

[165] *Community Building*, 31. Assuming for the sake of the argument that Grundeken's point about early Christians' general non-possession of biblical texts is correct, even if they did not possess physical copies, authors like the one who composed *1 Clement* still quoted the LXX as his own scripture (23.5, 34.6, 35.7) and clearly knew it very well.

[166] Ibid., 31 (emphasis added). In support of this claim, Grundeken cited Adolf von Harnack, "Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden," in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1928), 124-41; and Walter Bauer, "Der Wortgottesdienst der ältesten Christen," in *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*, ed. Georg Strecker (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967), 155-209, esp. 190-193. On p. 190, Bauer himself quoted Theodor Birt, *Aus dem Leben der Antike* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1918), 123 as support for his suggestion that the acquisition and copying of texts were cost-prohibitive. Amazingly, elsewhere Harnack cited a prior publication by the same scholar to make precisely the opposite point, namely that the associated costs were relatively affordable (*New Testament Studies*: Vol. 5: *Bible Reading in the Early Church*, trans. J. R. Wilkinson, CTL 37 [New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912], 35-36, 35 n. 3; citing Theodor Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur* [Berlin: W. Hertz, 1882]).

professional scribe."[167] Furthermore, were early Christians to copy their authoritative texts even

onto *new* papyrus, that medium would not have been cost-prohibitive. According to Skeate,

"whatever [papyrus] cost was regarded as a fact of life which had to be accepted;"[168] put

differently, "wherever papyrus may have been regarded as 'expensive,' it was certainly *not* in the

field of book-production."[169] Naphtali Lewis, upon whose work Skeate depended, rightly

recognized that whether a papyrus roll was "a cheap commodity, or a dear one" would have been

considered relative to wealth.[170] Lewis concluded that to many in the ancient world a roll of

papyrus likely did not seem to cost much at all, typically at most only a day or two's wages even

for those on the very lowest rung of the socio-economic ladder.[171] Decades after the final

---

[167] Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 231.

[168] T. C. Skeate, "Was Papyrus Regarded as 'Cheap' or 'Expensive' in the Ancient World?," *Aeg* 75 (1995): 75. Skeate determined the cost of a standard papyrus roll of twenty sheets from Tebtunis, Egypt to have cost 2 drachmae in the first century C.E., near the upper threshold of two days' wages for a laborer (87-90). The material cost of a letter was far less: "If we imagine a papyrus roll of standard length (340 cm.), costing 2 dr., cut into 60 portions, each would measure about 28x22 cm., ample for a [*sic*] average letter, and would cost one-fifth of an obol - surely not an excessive expense!" (90). Crucially, the codex format, adopted by early Christians, could cut this material cost nearly in half, because codices could be inscribed on both sides; in the case of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, the space saved was roughly 44% (idem, "The Length of the Standard Papyrus Roll and the Cost-Advantage of the Codex," *ZPE* 45 [1982]: 173).

[169] idem, "'Cheap' or 'Expensive,'" 93 (emphasis original).

[170] Naphtali Lewis, *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 129-30; the quote is from p. 129.

[171] According to Lewis, "…in social milieux more elevated than that of a prosperous Egyptian villager the purchase of papyrus is not likely to have been regarded as an expenditure of any consequence, but to have fallen, rather, into a category comparable to that of our 'incidentals' or 'petty cash'" (ibid., 133-34; for his broader treatment of the retail price of papyrus, see 129-134). This passage is quoted in Skeate, "'Cheap' or 'Expensive,'" 75. Skeate traces the enduring notion that papyrus was expensive to the influence of Wilhelm Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*, ed. Eberhard Paul, 3rd ed. (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1962). For a contrary view, namely that papyrus "must have been quite expensive for most people's purposes, certainly outside Egypt, which remained the main source of supply," see Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 195.

compilation of the *Shepherd* and accelerating into the third century, Christians did begin to

employ what could be, at least when parchment was used, a significantly more expensive form in

preserving and transmitting authoritative texts, namely the codex.[172] But the relative affordability

of papyrus rolls in the prior period and the means of controlling copying costs argue against

Grundeken's implicit claim that early Christian communities at Rome lacked authoritative texts

beyond those received from their author. In fact, they render Hermas's encounter with a *corpus*

*Paulinum* within the Christian community of early second-century Rome all the more historically

possible.

The greatest barrier, then, was not texts' *cost* but Hermas's *access* to them. Gamble

thought that, in the case of early Christians, this barrier to access would primarily have been

literacy.[173] On this point, I have shown above that the *Shepherd* presents Hermas as at least semi-

literate. And yet access also requires the availability of texts. But I have further demonstrated the

likelihood that a *corpus Paulinum* was in circulation at Rome during Hermas's period of

composition. Consequently, no insurmountable barriers to his somehow encountering such a

*corpus* remain. How then might Hermas have come to know one, given that he nowhere tells us

---

[172] Roger Bagnall has recently shown that book production was expensive and inhibited widespread possession of authoritative books by most besides wealthy Christians in the late second century and beyond. See "The Economics of Book Production," in *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 50-69, esp. 55 and 57 on the additional cost of inscribing texts on parchment versus papyrus codices. But Bagnall's point on pricing largely concerns the period after Christians had begun employing the codex format (i.e., the late second or early third centuries) ("Spread of the Codex," in *Early Christian Books in Egypt* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009], 89). As I have already shown, the *Shepherd* was composed and began to circulate decades before that, when most Christians were probably still employing the cheaper papyrus roll format. Consequently, Bagnall's argument does not directly challenge my claim that the cost of papyrus would not have proved insurmountable to Roman Christians who wanted to copy Pauline letters, even though I grant his point about the relatively high expense of trained copyists' labor.

[173] Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 231-32.

how (or even that) he did, or that he knew sacred texts at all? As I shall now show, numerous possibilities exist along a spectrum of textual encounter, ranging from Hermas's reading Pauline letters individually to his hearing them read in a corporate setting, perhaps that of an early Christian liturgy, from his seeing the contents of a *corpus* with his own eyes to hearing it with his ears.[174] Hermas could have known Pauline letters meaningfully and deeply, I will argue, even if that knowledge did not necessarily come through the technology of reading a book and voicing its words himself.

One way that Hermas might have encountered a *corpus Paulinum* is by reading it himself.[175] He could have done so either with his own voice or through an intermediary.[176] The

---

[174] The idea that these are the two most plausible ways that Hermas came to know a text ultimately collected in the New Testament goes at least as far back as Theodor Zahn, *Hermae pastor e novo testamento illustratus* (Göttingen: Huth, 1867), 7, who argued that Hermas had read James himself. Other modes of influence besides those at these two poles are, of course, possible. See, e.g., James H. Charlesworth, "Towards a Taxonomy of Discerning Influence(s) Between Two Texts," in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt, NTOA / SUNT 57 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 41-54.

[175] This mode of encounter is envisioned in passing by Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus: Book 2: The Later Christian Writings*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, NGS 5/2 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992), 130: "[Hermas] also *looked through* certain epistles of Paul" (emphasis added).

[176] According to Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 19, "…the Greek and Romans, like many other peoples, had a more or less constant supply of persons who could act as substitute writers and readers." The implication is obvious: "It was not at all necessary for an ordinary Christian to read any text for himself" in order to meaningful encounter it (221). The community of early Christians at Rome indisputably included persons who were fully literate. Consequently, it exhibited what Margaret M. Mitchell has labeled "group literacy," the phenomenon whereby one member's literacy ensures an entire group's access to texts ("The Emergence of the Written Record," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity* Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine*, ed. Frances M. Young and Margaret M. Mitchell [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008], 192 n. 89). Even if Hermas were completely illiterate, his use of an intermediary to read texts aloud for him would have prevented him from falling victim to what Gamble presents as the weightiest of three factors affecting private use of books by early Christians. According to Gamble, "The

literature of the second century C.E. assumes and occasionally attests such individual reading of authoritative texts by Christians.[177] Harnack long ago suggested that this kind of textual engagement, although not prohibited, was probably hampered due to a lack of personal copies, which he argued "explains why mention is never made of the private use in the epistles of the New Testament."[178] Such reading might have occurred in homes, a practice which is reflected by the Lady's instruction for Grapte to read Hermas's copy of her little book to widows and orphans (*Vis*. 2.4.3 [8.3]).[179] Or it could have taken place in the library or other archive of a particular community.[180] Gamble has persuasively argued for the existence of such community libraries at Smyrna, Hierapolis, and Antioch in the early second century.[181] In addition to these cities, I suggest that it is at least possible that such a publicly accessible collection of authoritative texts, in this case including Pauline letters, existed among Christians at Rome in the same period, particularly given that the apostle himself had written to them and travelled there. Openness to this possibility is reasonable, since, as I shall show below, roughly contemporaneous Christian texts written at Rome (e.g., *1 Clem*) or to Rome (e.g., Ignatius, *Rom.*) betray familiarity with letters authored by or attributed to the apostle or assume it on the part of their respective implied

---

private use of Christian literature in the ancient church was necessarily qualified by three factors: the extent of literacy, the availability of books, and the cost of books… Thus the only major barrier to the private acquisition and use of Christian books was the capacity to read them" (*Books and Readers*, 231).

[177] Harnack, *Bible Reading*, 32-47; ET of idem, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament*: Vol. 6: *Über den privaten Gebrauch der heiligen Schriften in der alten Kirche* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912), 22-32.

[178] idem, *Bible Reading*, 32-33.

[179] Ibid., 39.

[180] For a discussion of such early Christian libraries, see Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 144-202; see esp. the sub-section on "congregational libraries" (145-54). On what Gamble terms the "private use of Christian books," see ibid., 231-37.

[181] Ibid., 153.

audiences. Put differently, the possibility that Hermas read (some assemblage of) Pauline letters individually, perhaps in a library or other communal archive of some sort, cannot be dismissed out of hand.[182] To the contrary, the existence of such an archive and access to it by a figure like Hermas is historically possible given what we know from extant sources.

In addition to reading parts of it himself, Hermas could also have heard a *corpus* of Pauline letters read or discussed in various settings among his fellow Christians at Rome.[183] One can reasonably assume that portions of a *corpus* were engaged during the various gatherings of the houses churches at Rome, to which Hermas, as a Christian, certainly would have belonged. Perhaps, as Barnett suggested, such reading occurred "on the anniversary of [Paul's] death and on other special occasions."[184] Even more plausible is the suggestion of Salzmann, who correctly observed that the *Shepherd* itself (esp. *Mand*. 11) indicates the existence within the Christian community at Rome of presumably small gatherings around a teacher or prophet, who "…number themselves among the community and yet are in no way excluded on the part of the community."[185] Public reading of Pauline letters, perhaps with subsequent extended discussion,

---

[182] Therefore, Rüpke's unsubstantiated contention that Hermas "*surely* did not use the Roman community's archive" is overstated, given both its non-falsifiability and analogous historical counter-evidence ("A Judaeo-Christian Variant of Professional Religion in Rome: *The Shepherd of Hermas*," in *From Jupiter to Christ: On the History of Religion in the Roman Imperial Period* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014], 67; emphasis added).

[183] For a list of four different forms of public reading in antiquity, see Dan Nässelqvist, *Public Reading in Early Christianity: Lectors, Manuscripts, and Sound in the Oral Delivery of John 1-4*, NovTSup 163 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 15. According to Nässelqvist, public reading by early Christians probably occurred in what he termed a "semi-private setting," examples of which he suggested are the "literary gathering" and "dinner party."

[184] Albert Edward Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), 1.

[185] Jorg Christian Salzmann, *Lehren und Ermahnen: Zur Geschichte des christlichen Wortgottesdienstes in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, WUNT II 59 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994), 215 ("neben den Gemeindenversammlungen zum Gottesdienst gibt es auch Treffen

at gatherings on occasions other than the Lord's Day like these suggested by Barnett and

Salzmann are also conceivable. More likely is Hermas's encountering Pauline letters through one

or more of what McGowan has termed the "various kinds of discourse, including reading and

whatever forms of speech might first have passed for 'preaching,'" that occurred in early

Christian assemblies at Rome, perhaps in the context of a eucharistic meal like the one

mentioned by Paul (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, 1 Cor 11:20).[186] The occasion of baptism, a ritual

reflected at various points throughout the *Shepherd*, is another possible setting and place of

Pauline encounter. In my judgment, it is hard to imagine these community-forming rituals (i.e.,

eucharist and baptism) being performed by Christians at Rome without any consideration of the

apostle's arguments for and reflections on them, particularly since they are mentioned in his

letter to the Romans themselves (6:3-11) and another letter known to have been available in the

city at the time (1 Cor 11:23-26).

---

kleinerer Gruppen um einen Lehrer oder Propheten, die sich zur Gemeinde zählen und noch keineswegs von seiten der Gemeinde deutlich ausgegrenzt sind").

[186] Andrew Brian McGowan, "Word: Reading and Preaching," in *Ancient Christian Worship: Early Church Practices in Social, Historical, and Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014), 73. Here McGowan is following Hal Taussig, *In the Beginning Was the Meal: Social Experimentation and Early Christian Identity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 36-40; the quote is from p. 36, according to whom "meals provided a primary location for the reading of the early Christian documents," particularly the letters of Paul. That apostolic letters were likely read in the context of the Christian meal celebration was also recognized by Salzmann, *Lehren und Ermahnen*, 476. Harry Y. Gamble, "Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping of the New Testament Canon," in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels -- The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P*[45], ed. Charles Horton, JSNTSup 258 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 33 does not explicitly mention a meal context for such reading. Nevertheless, in his judgment, "We must assume that originally and continuously Jewish scriptures were read in Christian assemblies, but it is clear that from a very early time Christian writings began to be read alongside them."

In the late nineteenth century Zahn already posited the "liturgical use" of collections of

Paul's letters,[187] and he later suggested that Pauline letters were gathered into a collection in part

due to its "convenience for liturgical reading."[188] Harnack agreed on both points: Paul's letters

were read regularly during Christians' weekly worship gatherings, for reading them during

worship was one of the purposes of the initial collection of the letters.[189] Both suggestions have

been challenged in subsequent scholarship, but the former concerns my argument more than the

latter.[190] On the basis of what he saw as counter-evidence from *1 Apology*, Goodspeed famously

denied that Paul's letters were read publicly in the period prior to Justin Martyr.[191] The relevant

passage from Justin refers to the reading of the "apostles' memoirs and prophets' writings" (τὰ

ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν, *1 Apol.* 67.3).[192]

Goodspeed's reading of "apostles' memoirs" as equivalent to Gospels (εὐαγγέλια) is presumably

founded on Justin's explication of them as such in *1 Apol.* 66.3. And yet even if by memoirs

Justin does mean gospels and them alone, this need not be taken as a normative description of the

custom elsewhere (even elsewhere in Rome) that precluded reading other texts publicly prior to

his time, and many scholars now assume that the Pauline letters were read in worship well before

---

[187] Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888) vol. 1., pt. 1, 264-65 ("gottesdienstlich Gebrauch").

[188] Theodor Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons: Eine Ergänzung zu der Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1901), 36 ("Zweckmäßigkeit für die gottesdienstliche Lesung").

[189] Harnack, *Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus*, 10-11.

[190] On the general shape of the early Christian liturgy of word, see Salzmann, *Lehren und Ermahnen*, esp. 460-79.

[191] Goodspeed, *Meaning of Ephesians*, 4 n. 2.

[192] The Greek text of *1 Apol.* is that of Edgar J. Goodspeed, ed., *Die ältesten Apologeten: Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915).

the mid-second century.[193] In fact, the reading of apostolic letters was likely one of the practices that marked a meeting of Pauline Christians.[194]

Evidence suggesting such public reading is found in a number of the apostle's letters, both authentic and pseudepigraphic.[195] Indeed, as Meeks has observed, "[t]he form of all the Pauline letters assumes that they will be read at a regular gathering of the [assembly]."[196] The expectation is actually explicit in 1 Thessalonians, the earliest of Paul's letters, which concludes with a plea for its public reading. "I adjure you all by the Lord," Paul writes, "that the letter be read to all the brothers and sisters" (5:27).[197] Colossians extends this Pauline requirement to include the sharing and reading of apostolic letters received by the churches at Laodicea and Colossae (4:16).[198] Such a request assumes the prior practice of publicly reading Pauline letters

---

[193] For a summary of this position, see Gerard A. M. Rouwhorst, "The Reading of Scripture in Early Christian Liturgy," in *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster*, ed. Leonard Victor Rutgers, ISCIA 1 (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 307. Rouwhorst cites the following scholars as supporting it: Theodor Kliefoth, *Die ursprüngliche Gottesdienstordnung in den deutschen Kirchen lutherischen Bakenntnisses: Ihre Destruction und Reformation* (Rostock: Stiller, 1847); Oscar Cullmann, *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, ATANT 3 (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1950), 29-34; as well as a previous edition of Jürgen Roloff, "Der Gottesdienst im Urchristentum," in *Handbuch der Liturgik: Liturgiewissenschaft in Theologie und Praxis der Kirche*, ed. Hans-Christoph Schmidt-Lauber, Michael Meyer-Blanck, and Karl-Heinrich Bieritz, 3rd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 45-71. Similarly, Gamble, "Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping," 33.

[194] Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 80, 150.

[195] Gamble, "Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping," 33.

[196] Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 143, 235 n. 166. For Meek's list of the letters' addressees contained in their respective opening formulae, which he argues implicitly indicate that their author(s) intended for them to be read publicly, see ibid., 235 n. 166. Similarly, Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 206: "Paul himself had expected his letters to be read out to the group he addressed when it gathered for worship."

[197] Ἐνορκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, 1 Thess 5:27.

[198] καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ παρ᾽ ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε, Col 4:16.

in the gatherings of Christian communities in the region.[199] Further evidence of this sort of

communal reading practice is found in 1 Tim 4:13. There the pseudonymous Paul exhorts the

letter's recipient to "devote yourself to reading, to exhortation, to teaching, until I come."[200]

Although only a generic "reading" (ἀνάγνωσις) is mentioned, this is arguably a reference to the

communal reading of authoritative texts, since the other two nouns in the clause refer to

communal acts (exhortation, teaching).[201] Given evidence from 1 Thessalonians and Colossians

for the reading of Pauline letters as authoritative, it is reasonable to assume that the "reading" to

which 1 Tim 4:13 refers could have included them, even if they were not yet regarded as

"scripture," and even if other texts were read too. Less certain, although still possible, is the

inclusion of Pauline letters among the "holy writings" (ἱερὰ γράμματα) of 2 Tim 3:15.

Beyond the *corpus Paulinum*, one finds evidence for the corporate engagement with

authoritative texts, including Pauline letters, in other early Christian literature of the period,

namely *1 Clement*, the letters of Ignatius, Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians*, and the *Shepherd*

itself. According to Eusebius, *1 Clement*, which its author addresses specifically to Corinth, "was

also proclaimed in public in many churches both long ago and in our own day" (*H.E.* 3.16).[202]

---

[199] Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 206.

[200] ἕως ἔρχομαι πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, 1 Tim 4:13.

[201] For example, Luke Timothy Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, AB 35A
(New York: Doubleday, 2001), 252 considers ἀνάγνωσις a reference to "the practice of reading
within the [ἐκκλησία]." The same is arguably in view in the translation of ἀνάγνωσις as "reading
aloud (of the scriptures)" in Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, ed.
Helmut Koester, trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro, Herm (Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
1972), 70.

[202] Τούτου δὴ οὖν ὁμολογουμένη μία ἐπιστολὴ φέρεται, μεγάλη τε καὶ θαυμασία, ἣν ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς
Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τῇ Κορινθίων διετυπώσατο, στάσεως τηνικάδε κατὰ τὴν Κόρινθον
γενομένης. ταύτην δὲ καὶ ἐν πλείσταις ἐκκλησίαις ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ δεδημοσιευμένην πάλαι τε καὶ
καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἔγνωμεν, *H.E.* 3.16. The Greek texts of Eusebius printed here and throughout

That text includes an invitation to its implied audience to "take up the letter of the blessed apostle Paul" (*1 Clem* 47.1).[203] "What did [Paul] write to you first in the beginning of the gospel?" Clements then asks. "Truly he wrote to you in a spiritual manner concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, since even at that time you had divided yourselves into factions."[204] Here Clement apparently was referring to 1 Cor 1:12, where the apostle described how each of the Corinthians had identified themselves with either him or Apollos or Cephas or Christ.[205] This reference clearly indicates that Clement assumed his Corinthian audience both knew at least one of Paul's letters and recognized his and its authority, even decades after Paul's death.[206]

Ignatius of Antioch also presumed a level of knowledge about the apostle's person, letters, and theology — and the recognized authority of all three — in the various communities with which he himself communicated in the early second century. He explicitly named the apostle twice (*Eph.* 12.2, *Rom.* 4.3). The first naming is particularly important. There he described his audience as "Paul's fellow initiates," knew that the apostle "was sanctified and approved and is worthy of blessing," stated that he himself wanted to found in Paul's footsteps,

---

this study are those of G. Bardy, ed., *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire ecclésiastique*, 3 vols., SC 31, 41, 55 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952, 1955, 1958).

[203] Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, *1 Clem* 47.1.

[204] τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλώ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι, *1 Clem* 47.2-3.

[205] λέγω δὲ τοῦτο ὅτι ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει· ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor 1:12 (cf. 3:22).

[206] On Clement's knowledge of and appeal to Paul and Pauline tradition see Carlyle, "I Clement," 37-55; Andrew F. Gregory, "*1 Clement* and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 142-54; Andreas Lindemann, "Paul's Influence on 'Clement' and Ignatius," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 9-16.

and reminded the Ephesians that Paul mentioned them in multiple letters.[207] The second naming

indicates Ignatius's additional knowledge of the apostle: like Peter, Paul gave orders, was an

apostle, and was free.[208] Of Paul's letters themselves, Ignatius certainly knew 1 Corinthians and

probably Ephesians too, possibly others.[209] In his letter to the Romans in particular, he quotes the

former at least three times;[210] doing so presumes that transmission of Pauline tradition will be

meaningful to his letter's audience. Ignatius's custom of writing letters to churches and then

collecting them for use by others was probably modeled on the same Pauline practices.[211]

Apostolic influence is further evident in the various elements of Paul's particular theology that

Ignatius reflected and engaged throughout his corpus.[212]

---

[207] Πάροδός ἐστε τῶν εἰς θεὸν ἀναιρουμένων, Παύλου συμμύσται, τοῦ ἡγιασμένου, τοῦ μεμαρτυρημένου, ἀξιομακαρίστου οὗ γένοιτό μοι ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη εὑρεθῆναι, ὅταν θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω, *Eph.* 12.2. The Greek text of the letters of Ignatius printed throughout this study is that of Andreas Lindemann and Henning Paulsen, eds., *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992).

[208] Οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν. ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐγὼ κατάκριτος· ἐκεῖνοι ἐλεύθεροι, ἐγὼ δὲ μέχρι νῦν δοῦλος, *Rom.* 4.3.

[209] Inge, "Ignatius," 64-69. Inge listed Romans, Galatians, Philippians, 1-2 Timothy, and Titus as possibly known and used by Ignatius (ibid., 69-73). More recently, Foster, "Epistles of Ignatius," 164-72largely confirmed Inge's findings.

[210] The three probable quotations of 1 Cor in Ign., *Rom.* are listed by Inge, "Ignatius," 65.

[211] Rudolf Bultmann, "Ignatius und Paulus," in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii*, ed. J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (Haarlem: de Erven F. Bohn, 1953), 37; Robert F. Stoops, "If I Suffer… Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch," *HTR* 80 (1987): 161-78, esp. 177; David M. Reis, "Following in Paul's Footsteps: *Mimesis* and Power in Ignatius of Antioch," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 296.

[212] Among other focused studies of Pauline influence upon Ignatius, see Rudolf Bultmann, "Ignatius and Paul," in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. Schubert M. Ogden, trans. Schubert M. Ogden, LAB (New York: Meridian Books, 1960), 267-77; Heinrich Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe*, TUGAL 99 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967); Lindemann, "Paul's Influence," 16-24; Harry O. Maier, "The Politics and Rhetoric of Discord and Concord in Paul and Ignatius," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 307-24; Carl B. Smith, "Ministry, Martyrdom, and

Like Clement, Hermas's near contemporary, Polycarp of Smyrna, who presumably wrote after Ignatius's death, similarly encourages the Philippian recipients of his letter to scrutinize the authoritative letters of Paul. "For neither I nor anyone like me," Polycarp wrote, "is able to emulate the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who when he was with you taught those there then the word of truth face-to-face carefully and reliably, and who when he was absent from you wrote letters, which if you examine closely you will be able to be built up in the faith given to you" (*Phil.* 3.2).[213] Polycarp's exhortation to the Philippians to study Paul's letters reveals four things. First, Polycarp knew that Paul wrote letters to believers at Philippi and that the apostle himself had visited them.[214] Second, Polycarp knew that Paul composed other letters too, or at least one more; this is apparent from his statement that "…when he was absent from you [Paul] wrote letters." In fact, Polycarp used particular Pauline letters in his own to Philippi.[215] Third, Polycarp assumes the Philippians possess not just one but multiple letters of

---

Other Mysteries: Pauline Influence on Ignatius of Antioch," in *Paul and the Second Century*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, LNTS 412 (London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 41-55.

[213] οὔτε γὰρ ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου, ὃς γενόμενος ἐν ὑμῖν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων ἐδίδαξεν ἀκριβῶς καὶ βεβαίως τὸν περὶ ἀληθείας λόγον, ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε, δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν, *Phil.* 3.2 (ed. Lindemann and Paulsen, *Apostolischen Väter*).

[214] Polycarp could have learned about the latter from the former (Phil 1:27, 2:12).

[215] On Polycarp's knowledge of and influence by Pauline letters, see P. V. M. Benecke, "Polycarp," in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 84-101; Hans von Campenhausen, *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe*, SHAW, PHK 36 (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1951); Boudewijn Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: An Early Example of 'Reception,'" in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*, ed. Jean-Marie Sevrin, BETL 86 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1989), 281-83; Paul Anthony Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and Its Allusions to New Testament Literature*, WUNT II 134 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 177-79, 216-35; Kenneth Berding, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of Their*

Paul, which must include some of those letters written to other audiences if Paul only wrote one letter to Philippi.[216] Finally, Polycarp assumes the Philippians recognize Paul's letters as authoritative.[217] The letters' authority, which Polycarp's exhortation implicitly assumes the Philippians will grant, presumably on the basis of their community's historic connection with the apostle, can be inferred both from his charge to examine them closely and from his suggestion that they facilitate flourishing in faith. A text lacking authority would neither warrant the former nor enable the latter.

Even the *Shepherd* itself reflects the practice of reading such authoritative compositions in the community. As Grundeken has rightly noted, *Vis.* 2.4.2-3 [8.2-3] indicates that "Hermas seems to have been acquainted with the reading of Christian texts which were composed to be read in the community gatherings."[218] In reading his copy of the Lady's little book in company

---

*Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature*, VCSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Michael W. Holmes, "Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 201-20; Matthew W. Mitchell, "In the Footsteps of Paul: Scriptural and Apostolic Authority in Ignatius of Antioch," *JECS* 14 (2006): 27-45; Michael W. Holmes, "Paul and Polycarp," in *Paul and the Second Century*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, LNTS 412 (London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 57-69.

[216] The possibility that Paul's surviving Philippians is itself a unified letter comprised of multiple underlying apostolic epistles has long been recognized in scholarship. For an excellent summary of the various hypotheses, see John Henry Paul Reumann, *Philippians: A New Translation*, vol. 33B, AYB (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 8-16.

[217] The authority of Pauline witness is also apparent at *Phil.* 9.1, where Polycarp exhorts his audience "to maintain complete endurance" (ὑπομένειν πᾶσαν ὑπομονήν) like that endurance that they saw in Paul.

[218] *Community Building*, 31. Later Grundeken restates his position only slightly differently: "It appears that Hermas was familiar with the phenomenon of Christian texts being written, copied and sent around to be read in the community gatherings. For Hermas, it is not so much the Scriptures as the new documents of the church that matter" (32). In light of my project's overall conclusion that Hermas knew and used wide swathes of what became the *corpus Paulinum*, this

with the elders at Rome, one can imagine Hermas performing a sort of *recitatio* of it on her

behalf among the Roman congregation(s) and then discussing it with them in keeping with the

common practice that early Christians adopted from their broader Greco-Roman culture,

particularly in their public reading of Paul's letters.[219] Surely to perform the entirety of the work

in its three parts would have been exhausting — if not altogether rare — given that that doing so

would have taken 4.5 hours (although only an hour would have been needed for performing the

*Visions* section).[220]

This brief discussion of familiarity and corporate engagement with — and the *expectation*

of familiarity and corporate engagement with — authoritative Pauline texts in *1 Clement*,

Ignatius, and Polycarp's *Philippians* renders all the more possible Hermas's hearing one or more

of the letters attributed to or associated with the apostle read or discussed at Rome. To this

admittedly selective list should be added two other "early reformers" at Rome besides Hermas

who also knew and engaged Pauline letters at roughly the same time, namely Marcion and

---

point cannot be sustained, even though it rightly recognizes the priority Hermas attributed to his revelations.

[219] Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 96, 204-05; similarly, idem, "Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping," 31. Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 225-26 presents the *recitatio* as a means of procuring attention for one's literary work. Communal engagement with the *Shepherd* was also envisioned by Erik Peterson, who proposed that it was composed and discussed in the context of a school, likely a synagogue ("Kritische Analyse der V. Vision des Hermas," *HJGG* 77 [1957]: 369; repr. "Kritische Analyse der V. Vision des Hermas," in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen* [Rome: Herder, 1959], 283-84). Peterson's creative proposal is explicitly rejected by Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 22, 30-31. Josephine Massingberd Ford similarly observed, "Hermas appears to have been a Jewish-Christian prophet performing his work in the liturgical gatherings of the Christian community" ("A Possible Liturgical Background to the Shepherd of Hermas," *RevQ* 6 [1969]: 531).

[220] Rüpke, "Judaeo-Christian Variant," 57, 67. The length of time required to perform the tripartite *Shepherd* might be one reason for the early independent circulation of some of its parts.

Valentinus.[221] In particular, *1 Clement* and Ignatius's *Romans* indicate that numerous Pauline

texts were known in the imperial city prior to or contemporaneous with Hermas's composition of

the *Shepherd* in the first few decades of the second century. The texts associated with Paul that

were conclusively known there at that time were Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and

Hebrews.[222] As we shall see, this assemblage receives striking confirmation in Chapters Three

through Five, where these four prove to be the most important epistles from what becomes a

recognizable *corpus Paulinum* that Hermas engages in the *Shepherd*.


Summary

I have depicted multiple ways in which Hermas might plausibly have encountered a *corpus*

*Paulinum* within the Christian community at Rome. These ways range from his reading a Pauline

letter himself to his hearing such letters read or discussed in a ritual, liturgical, or other public

context. Given that there is no explicit evidence in the *Shepherd* that gives specific details of

how Hermas might have encountered a *corpus*, I remain open to any of these possibilities.

Hermas could conceivably have read some of Paul's letters alone in an archive or a household

library of some sort and also have heard one or more of them read or discussed with other

Christians in a gathering of the community. Even so, I find Rüpke's suggestion that authoritative

"texts were probably known to [Hermas] primarily by word of mouth, in the form of readings

---

[221] The label "early reformers" is that of Einar Thomassen, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome," *HTR* 97 (2004): 251, who also presents the trio as "agents of unity." On Marcion and Paul, see, e.g., Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*; Eric W. Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the* Corpus Paulinum (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). The classic study of Valentinus and Paul is that of Elaine H. Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).
[222] Gregory, "*1 Clement* and the Writings," 144-53; Foster, "Epistles of Ignatius," 164-72.

during services" to be the most plausible scenario.[223] In my judgment, it would have been more likely for a Christian in early-second century Rome to encounter Paul's letters in a corporate setting, given that the reading of them was probably a regular element of the community's liturgical life and that Christians also presumably discussed, perhaps even debated, them together at other times too. Again, this is not to suggest that someone like Hermas could not have read Paul's letters by himself. But relative to the regular reading of letters and other authoritative texts such as the Gospels and the Jewish scriptures in the broader community, such individual reading would have been less common and so in the case of Hermas less likely. Furthermore, Hermas's hearing a *corpus Paulinum* read or discussed sufficiently explains the sort of loose but nonetheless apparent intertextual encounter with it that we find in the *Shepherd*, as we will see in subsequent chapters. Consequently, I suggest that what Hermas heard read or discussed in the gatherings of the Christian community at Rome likely included not only the one surviving letter that Paul sent to them (i.e., Romans) but at least some of the other Pauline letters too. Indeed, given the common Christian practice of publicly reading long lections, not short ones, in liturgical contexts, it is plausible that Hermas heard read aloud in public worship whatever letters attributed to Paul that the Roman community possessed.[224] On the basis of a fresh identification of such attestation in the *Shepherd*, this study seeks to determine which of those lections Hermas might plausibly have heard read or discussed, and then to explore how they are inflected in his various visions.

Hearing portions of a *corpus Paulinum* at Rome read or possibly discussed in such an occasional setting probably would have limited the precision with which Hermas could later

---

[223] Rüpke, "Judaeo-Christian Variant," 66-67.
[224] On the reading of long lections, see Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 8.

have quoted or otherwise interacted with these literary traditions. This is the case because in such

a scenario Hermas would have been drawing upon his own memory of prior aural encounter (and

perhaps the memory of others' encounters too). In subsequent chapters, I shall show that the

loose but nonetheless visible engagement with a *corpus Paulinum* in the *Shepherd*, whereby

Hermas appears formed in particular Pauline patterns of thought and vocabulary, is consistent

with the kind of occasional aural — but still textual — encounter that Hermas would have had

with a *corpus* if he heard it read or discussed but did not study it himself or have a text at hand to

quote when making his own compositions. This lack of precision, to state the matter pejoratively,

or tendency toward free expression, to state it positively, could have been compounded by

Hermas's employment of a scribe to record his own visions. Such a practice would have been

like the one adopted by Paul himself, who employed the services of a scribe in composing his

letters, as was the ancient custom.[225]

Why, though, does Hermas nowhere name the apostle Paul or cite any of the letters

written by or attributed to him directly? It is significant that Hermas mentions no other

authoritative figures. Not even Jesus (or Christ) is named in the *Shepherd*, only God's Son.[226]

Likewise, Hermas only names an authoritative book once (i.e., *Eldad and Modat* at *Vis*. 2.3.4

---

[225] E.g., Richards, *Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, 169-198, although Richards includes evidence from additional Pauline letters beyond the seven undisputed ones (see p. 128). The clearest evidence for Paul's use of a so-called secretary comes from references to concluding inscriptions made by Paul's own hand, which imply he did not inscribe his letters *in toto* (1 Cor 16:21, Gal 6:11, Phlm 19; cf. Col 4:18; 2 Thess 3:17). Tertius' identification of himself as the one who inscribed Romans confirms that this was the case (16:22).

[226] Sinaiticus does attest the *nomen sacrum* for Christ instead of Lord at *Vis*. 2.2.8 [6.8]. This unique scribal feature in the manuscript tradition of the *Shepherd* was recognized at least as early as Charles Taylor, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, 2 vols., ECC (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903), 1:68. Likewise, Codex Athos reads "come to know Christ" (χριστὸν ἐπεγνωκότες) for "come to know God" (θεὸν ἐπεγνωκότες) at *Sim*. 9.18.1 [95.1] (cf. 2 Cor 5:16). This was observed by Hilgenfeld, *Hermae Pastor* (1881), XXIX.

[7.4]). So, on the one hand, the fact that he does not name Paul or cite Pauline letters fits his broader pattern of subsuming sources and traditions within his own text without identifying them. But, on the other hand, Hermas might not name Paul in an attempt to emphasize the uniqueness, importance, and independent authority of what he took to be his own divinely-given revelations. Put differently, Hermas might have thought that naming or citing Paul would have detracted from his own authority as a legitimate prophet — and by extension that of the text he wrote — by shifting his readers' focus away from his words to those written by one who was also ascribed (or at least himself claimed) authority.[227] This explanation need not imply that Hermas understood Paul or traditions associated with him to be controversial or that he himself was at odds with aspects of the apostle's emerging legacy. Rather, it coheres well with the description of Hermas's copying his revealed text letter-by-letter at *Vis.* 2.1.4 [5.4], which I have argued functions to reinforce the *Shepherd*'s independent authority as a medium of divine communication.

CONCLUSION

My aim in this chapter has been to establish the historical possibility of my thesis that Hermas was influenced by and reacted to a form of the Pauline literary corpus in composing the *Shepherd*. Such a possibility hinges on the *Shepherd*'s having been composed after letters attributed to the Apostle began to circulate in Rome, as well as Hermas's having had a means of

---

[227] A similar, albeit more general, point was made by Rensberger. He suggested that "[t]he *Shepherd*'s character as itself an inspired book could be thought to be responsible for its lack of scriptural allusions" ("As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity" [Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981], 85 n. 61). But he immediately rejected this reason on the grounds that Revelation, a text recognized as inspired, "exploits the Old Testament to a much greater extent than does Hermas."

encountering them. As I have shown, abundant evidence indicates that such collections existed at Rome around the turn of the second century, after which the *Shepherd* was almost certainly composed in the imperial city. In fact, there is so much evidence of Pauline letters and readers at Rome or in correspondence with Rome at that point that one might reasonably wonder how Hermas could have even *avoided* encountering them. The *Shepherd* is at pains to present Hermas as at least semi-literate, that is to say capable of effectively copying, writing, and reading texts and by extension participating to a meaningful and significant degree within wider Roman literary culture. Various modes of his encountering Pauline letters are easy to imagine, as I have shown, ranging from Hermas's reading Pauline letters individually to his hearing them read or discussed in a gathering of the Christian community.

The historical possibility of my thesis notwithstanding, the weight of modern scholarship falls against it, as my next chapter will show. Chapter 2 aims to move my own argument from possibility to probability by revealing the strong likelihood of Hermas's encounter with texts associated with the apostle Paul. I shall argue that modern scholarship's failure to find meaningful influence by literary Paul upon Hermas is largely attributable to two related phenomena — a narrow construal of "influence" and an overly restrictive focus on verbal agreement as the sole means of positively proving it. Doing so will set up the argument of Chapters Three through Five, which together aim to describe what I hope will be recognized as Hermas's plausible encounter with a *corpus Paulinum.*

CHAPTER 2: THE PROBABILITY OF ENCOUNTER WITH THE PAULINE LEGACY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter shifts the argument made in Chapter 1 — that Hermas, situated in Rome in the first few decades of the second century C.E., *possibly* encountered a collection of Pauline letters — to the level of *probability*. In his monograph *The Making of Paul*, Richard Pervo argued, "…it becomes increasingly difficult by the mid-second century to assume that an author had never heard of the apostle to the gentiles," and "[w]hen date or locale make ignorance of Paul unlikely, [authors who do not name Paul explicitly] should be considered."[1] Following Pervo, I contend that both the date and the locale of the *Shepherd* "make ignorance of Paul unlikely," even though the text nowhere names the apostle.[2]

I establish Hermas's probable knowledge of and engagement with a *corpus Paulinum* in three steps. First, I show how beginning within a century or so of the *Shepherd*'s final compilation and continuing over the course of the next thirteen hundred years, Hermas and the text he composed were connected with Pauline letters and their putative author in various ways. Second, by means of a thorough analysis of relevant secondary literature, I explain why, in my judgment, most modern scholars over the past two hundred years have argued that Hermas was not particularly interested in what the apostle and his pseudepigraphers had to say, even as those same scholars typically admit that it is at least probable that Hermas did employ elements of

---

[1] Richard I. Pervo, *The Making of Paul: Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 187-88, 192.

[2] Similarly, see Clayton N. Jefford, "Missing Pauline Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers?: *Didache*, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Papias, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, and the *Epistle to Diognetus*," in *The Apostolic Fathers and Paul*, ed. Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite, PPSD 2 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), 49.

specific Pauline letters (e.g., the discussion of remarriage after a spouse's death in 1 Cor 7 and/or the unity formulae in Eph 4). Along the way, I show how skepticism on the question of Pauline influence has frequently been alleged to support broader scholarly arguments on topics such as the history of the canon, so-called early Catholicism, and the recovery of a certain kind of Paul amenable to modern Protestantism. It also regularly reflects scholars' acceptance of a number of false methodological dichotomies, as well as their adoption of an unduly restrictive reading strategy that focuses too narrowly on finding extensive verbatim quotations as the primary, if not the sole, indicator of influence. Finally, in step three I propose a new interpretive approach to the problem of Hermas and Pauline letters that may allow us to detect more evidence of encounter than previous studies have. I shall group my new criteria into four categories that I argue reflect: (1) *coherence* with Pauline literary worldviews; and (2) *adoption*; (3) *adaptation*; and (4) *synthesis* of Pauline literary phenomena. A key feature of my method will be its emphasis on aggregate evidence.[3] Against other scholars' shared tendency to evaluate each potential instance of Pauline influence solely on its own individual merits, I contend that an accumulative case can and should tip the balance of evidence. A plausible account of that evidence of Hermas's engagement with a *corpus Paulinum* will then be offered in Chapters 3 through 5.

---

[3] Instead of "aggregate," Joseph Verheyden, "The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 323 labels such evidence "circumstantial," but he nevertheless acknowledges that it is valuable, because "formal quotations are not the only way to make use of written sources."

ANCIENT AND EARLY MODERN CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE *SHEPHERD* AND

PAULINE LETTERS

In the early history of the *Shepherd*'s reception, a probable connection with Pauline letters and

their putative author was both assumed and highly influential.[4] Origen, writing in his third-

century commentary, famously contended that the *Shepherd*'s author was the Hermas to whom

greetings were sent at the end of the letter to the Romans ("Greet Asynkritus, Phlegon, Hermes,

Patrobas, *Hermas*, and the brothers and sisters with them," 16:14).[5] According to Origen, this

Hermas "is the very author of that book called the *Shepherd*."[6] Eusebius repeats the notion that

the Hermas of Romans composed the *Shepherd*: "…the same apostle [i.e., Paul] in the greetings

at the end of Romans remembered along with the others Hermas too, who is said to be the

*Shepherd*'s author."[7] Following Eusebius, Jerome does too, in his *Lives of Illustrious Men*.[8]

---

[4] For a summary of some of the ways in which and possible reasons why Hermas was connected with Paul, see Antonio Carlini, "Erma (*Vis.* II 3, 1) testimone testuale di Paolo?," *SCO* 37 (1987): 235-36.

[5] ἀσπάσασθε Ἀσύγκριτον, Φλέγοντα, Ἑρμῆν, Πατροβᾶν, Ἑρμᾶν καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφούς.

[6] Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 10.31: "I hold that Hermas is the very author of that book called the *Shepherd*, which appears to me to be a very useful scripture and, I hold, divinely inspired. The reason [Paul] ascribes no praise to [Hermas], I think, is because it seems, just as that work [i.e., the *Shepherd*] declares, that [Hermas] turned back to repentance after many sins. And for that reason [Paul] neither pens any reproach to him, for he had learned from scripture not to upbraid a person turning back from sin, nor does he assign any praise, since [Hermas] was still set under the (authority of the) angel of repentance, by whom he must be presented back to Christ at the appropriate time" (*Puto tamen quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appellatur, quae scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur, et ut puto divinitus inspirata. Quod vero nihil ei laudis ascripsit, illa, opinor, est causa, quia videtur, sicut scriptura illa declarat, post multa peccata ad poenitentiam fuisse conversus: et ideo neque opprobrium ei aliquod scripsit: didicerat enim a scriptura non improperare homini convertenti se a peccato: neque laudis aliquid tribuit, quia adhuc positus erat sub angelo poenitentiae, a quo tempore opportuno Christo rursum deberet offerri*; ed. Migne in PL).

[7] Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.3.6: "But seeing that the same apostle [i.e., Paul] in the addresses at the end of Romans remembered along with the others Hermas too, whose the book of the *Shepherd* is said to be, one must know that even this work has been disputed among some people, because of

70

A few hundred years later, the connection between Hermas and Paul is collapsed, becoming one of explicit identification. The epilogue of a sixth-century Ethiopic translation of the *Shepherd* asserts, "Hermas really is Paul!"; and it berates the reader for assuming differently.[9] In other words, this tradition suggests, the apostle himself wrote the *Shepherd* under a pseudonym, Hermas.[10] This equation was presumably made on the basis of an account in the Acts of the Apostles where the crowd at Lystra acclaims Barnabas as Zeus and Paul as Hermes. "So," the narrator recounts, "they called Barnabas Zeus and Paul Hermes, because he was the

whom it cannot be reckoned among the accepted works, but by others it has been judged essential, particularly for those in need of introductory instruction in basic matters" (ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπόστολος ἐν ταῖς ἐπὶ τέλει προσρήσεσιν τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους μνήμην πεποίηται μετὰ ἄλλων καὶ Ἑρμᾶ, οὗ φασιν ὑπάρχειν τὸ τοῦ Ποιμένος βιβλίον, ἰστέον ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς μέν τινων ἀντιλέλεκται, δι' οὓς οὐκ ἂν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις τεθείη, ὑφ' ἑτέρων δὲ ἀναγκαιότατον οἷς μάλιστα δεῖ στοιχειώσεως εἰσαγωγικῆς, κέκριται). Henry Chadwick attributed this mention of the Hermas of Romans as a possible author of the *Shepherd* to Eusebius' "respect for his great master [Origen]", suggesting Eusebius knew it was a "minority view" ("The New Edition of Hermas," *JTS* 8 [1957]: 276).

[8] Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 10: "Hermas, whom the apostle Paul remembered when writing to the Romans, 'Greet Asynkritus, Phlegonta, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brothers and sisters with them,' they declare to be the author of the book called 'the *Shepherd*,' and among certain churches of Greece even now it is read publicly. It is indeed a beneficial book, and many of the ancient writers have drawn proofs from it, but among Latin speakers it is virtually unknown" (*Herman, cujus Apostolus Paulus ad Romanos scribens meminit: Salutate Asyncritum, Phlegonta, Herman, Patroban, Hermen, et qui cum eis fratres sunt, asserunt auctorem esse libri, qui appellatur Pastor*, *et apud quasdam Graeciae Ecclesias jam publice legitur. Revera utilis liber, multique de eo Scriptorum veterum usurpavere testimonia. Sed apud latinos pene ignotus est*; ed. Migne in PL).

[9] The connection — *re vera Herma Paulus est* — is expounded over an entire paragraph preserved in the Latin translation of the Ethiopic by Antonius d'Abbadie, ed., *Hermae Pastor: Aethiopice primum edidit et aethiopica latine vertit*, AKM II, 1 (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1860), 181-82.

[10] Schodde implied that the Ethiopic translator himself is the source of this idea, but the translator's base text/exemplar, which Schodde asserts originated in Egypt, could already have contained the connection (*Hêrmâ Nabî: The Ethiopic Version of Pastor Hermae* [Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1876], 5). For an argument in favor of pseudonymity but for a different purpose, see Philippe Henne, "Hermas, un pseudonyme," *StPatr* 26 (1993): 136-39.

chief speaker" (14:12).[11] Lightfoot argued that this identification of Paul with Hermas "ought to

be regarded as a *blunder*, rather than a *tradition* founded on Acts xiv. 12."[12] It stems from the

striking orthographic and phonetic similarity between Herm*a*s and Herm*e*s (Ἑρμᾶς vs. Ἑρμῆς,

respectively). Although it is a (biblical) blunder, this is an extreme example of where in early

Christian thought the book was deemed so thoroughly compatible with Paul and his teaching as

to be identified with him as its author. Indeed, the very same Ethiopic epilogue also suggests that

Paul himself actually spoke in the *Shepherd* — in the guise of Herm*a*s, misconstrued as the

gods' messenger Herm*e*s, the apostle conversed with lady Church at the end of *Vis.* 2 [8.4.2-3].[13]

There, in the literary character of Hermas, a mantic or a prophet, Paul was thought to perform the

characteristic role of the Greek god, serving as mediator of communication between the divine

and the *Shepherd*'s audience.

The memory of a close connection between Hermas and Paul resurfaces in surviving

Christian tradition a thousand years later. In a hand-written codex in the library of the Abbey of

Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris, the *Shepherd* was apparently placed immediately following the

Pauline letters, implicitly connecting the works.[14] An even closer connection between Hermas

---

[11] ἐκάλουν τε τὸν Βαρνάβᾶν Δία, τὸν δὲ Παῦλον Ἑρμῆν, ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου, Acts 14:12.

[12] John Reginald Harmer and Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1891), 294 (emphasis added). Nowhere did Lightfoot explain the purported "blunder."

[13] *Vere ergo Herma Paulus est cum ita dicat in visione II* (d'Abbadie, *Hermae Pastor*, 181).

[14] The codex was mentioned by William Wake, *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, S. Barnabas, S. Ignatius, S. Clement, S. Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp*, 3rd ed. (London: Richard Sare, 1719), 83, who cited Cotelier, Annot. ad Herm., 41. I have been unable to confirm this specific citation. According to Jean-Baptiste Cotelier, *SS. patrum qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabae, Clementis, Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi opera edita et inedita, vera, & supposititia; una cum Clementis, Ignatii, Polycarpi, actis atque martyriis* (Antverpiae: Huguetanorum sumtibus, 1698) vol. 1, 73,

and Paul is found in the epigraph to a sixteenth-century manuscript preserving a Latin translation

of the *Shepherd*. Its copyist explicitly stated that Hermas was a "a disciple of the blessed apostle

Paul," presumably under the enduring influence of Origen's reading of Rom 16:14.[15] The title

page of Gerbel's 1522 republication of the text of the *Shepherd* contained in Lefèvre's 1513

*editio princeps* drew an even tighter connection.[16] It labeled Hermas "the disciple of the apostle

Paul" but immediately added the crucial phrase "who also had various visions of the church at

the beginning,"[17] thereby associating Hermas with Paul via both Rom 16:14 and also other

passages in his wider letters that depict the apostle as himself a visionary like Hermas would

later be. Later, in the mid-seventeenth century, the very title of Pringle's translation of the

---

a hand-written biblical codex at the abbey did contain the *Shepherd*, which could have been the manuscript to which Wake referred; its readings are incorporated into his edition. The abbey burned in 1794.

[15] *Explicit liber pastoris discipuli beati pauli Apostoli*. This scribal note is discussed and preserved in Albert Rudolf Maximilian Dressel, *Hermae Pastor* in *Patrum apostolicorum opera* (Lipsiae: J. C. Hinrichs, 1857), XL, LIX. The manuscript is Vat.lat. 3848. Its prologue quotes Jerome's equation, in *De vir. ill.* 10, of the author of the *Shepherd* with the Hermas of Rom 16:14 (ibid., LVIII).

[16] Less than a decade after Lefèvre's edition appeared, Nicholas Gerbel published *Pastoris Nuntii Poenitentiae, Visiones quinq[ue], Mandata duodecim, Similitudines vero decem* (Argentorati: Schott, 1522). According to Irena Backus, "Renaissance Attitudes to New Testament Apocryphal Writings: Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples and His Epigones," *RQ* 51 (1998): 1188, it merely appended an introduction to the (unattributed) Latin text of Lefèvre.

[17] …*Hermae, discipulo Pauli Apostoli. Cui etiam in principio apparuit ecclesia in variis signis.* This Latin text and the accompanying English translation are those of Backus, "Renaissance Attitudes," 1189; see also the wider section on Lefèvre (and Gerbel too) on 1184-92. Backus's discussion of Gerbel's link between Hermas and Paul is cited in Claire Clivaz, "Categories of Ancient Christian Texts and Writing Materials 'Taking Once Again a Fresh Starting Point,'" in *Ancient Worlds in Digital Culture*, ed. Claire Clivaz, Paul Dilley, and David Hamidović, DBS (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 49, but the visionary aspect is not mentioned. Gerbel himself did not expound it or reference the relevant Pauline texts, such as 1 Cor 9:1, 15:8, 2 Cor 12:1-4, and Gal 1:15-16.

*Shepherd* into English likewise attributed the work to Hermas, "the disciple of Paul the apostle," albeit without explanation.[18]


PAULINE CONNECTIONS DISCOUNTED IN THE MODERN PERIOD

Overview

Modern critical research into the question of Pauline influence upon Hermas, however passing, can be traced back nearly two hundred years. With few exceptions, most previous studies have argued that the letters written in the apostle's name probably mattered very little, if at all, to the author of the *Shepherd*. This amounts to a complete reversal of ancient and early modern Christian traditions linking Paul and the Pauline letters with Hermas's work. How can we account for such a collective scholarly about-face? I shall demonstrate that the perception of Hermas's lack of meaningful engagement with the apostle's literary legacy frequently reflects the governing influence of broader preoccupations and emerging assumptions in scholarship. These preoccupations have been, first, the study of the history of the canon; second, the construction of an "early Catholicism" and, analogously, the retrojection of Protestant concerns; third, the discovery — and in some cases the recovery — of a "Paul" or Paulinism rooted in and exclusively reflected by particular ideas and ideals (e.g., "justification by faith") that Hermas is thought at best to ignore and at worst to contest; and, fourth, the belief that because James is an avatar of anti-Paulinism and, moreover, the *Shepherd* was somehow influenced by or at least associated with material preserved in James, the *Shepherd* must necessarily evince an anti-Pauline position too. Furthermore, especially since the early twentieth century, a particular set of

---

[18] John Pringle, *The Three Books of Hermas the Disciple of Paul the Apostle* (London: John White, 1661).

74

methodological presuppositions about literary influence and the means of detecting it became operative.

These presuppositions have frequently assumed, either explicitly or implicitly, at least one of three false dichotomies. First, Hermas either quoted Paul after reading letters attributed to him directly in literary format or cannot be said, at least with any argumentative certainty, to have known him or them at all. This view explicitly disallows hearing the text read or discussed by someone else or knowing an oral tradition about it from consideration as a legitimate mode of influence. Second, Hermas can be demonstrated to have known Paul if and only if a particular Pauline text, cited or quoted without modification, can be isolated as exclusively influential. This view eliminates from consideration the possibility that Hermas drew inspiration from multiple Pauline sources or from general Pauline themes and preoccupations, be they moral, ritual, theological, cultural, etc. Third, Hermas was only (and always) either overtly Pauline or overtly anti-Pauline. This view fails to recognize, as recent scholarly analyses of "Paulinism" in the second century increasingly have shown, that the emerging Pauline legacy was complex and convoluted and, furthermore, that one author might reasonably adopt some positions that are compatible with or even indebted to certain Pauline ones and, at the same time, still others that are not, even in the same document.[19] Choosing between the binary options allowed by these

---

[19] Among the most enduringly influential works of prior generations must be included at least the following studies of "Paulinism": Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, His Epistles and Teachings: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*, ed. Eduard Zeller, 2 vols., 2nd ed., TTFL (London: Williams and Norgate, 1873); and Otto Pfleiderer, *Paulinism: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology*, trans. Edward Peters, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1877). Scholarship exploring the variegated "use" and interpretation of letters attributed to Paul among and beyond the Apostolic Fathers in the second century has blossomed in recent decades and has largely, although, as this chapter will show, not entirely, abandoned the polarities that

animated these earlier studies. See, e.g., Heinrich Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe*, TUGAL 99 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967); Donald Alfred Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, NovTSup 34 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 179-237; Elaine H. Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975); Ernst Dassmann, *Der Stachel im Fleisch: Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1979); Andreas Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979); David K. Rensberger, "As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981); Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia: Westminister, 1983); Rolf Noormann, *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret: Zur Rezeption und Wirkung der paulinischen und deuteropaulinischen Briefe im Werk der Irenäus von Lyon*, WUNT II 66 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994); Peter Wallace Dunn, "The *Acts of Paul* and the Pauline Legacy in the Second Century" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1996); Kenneth Berding, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of Their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature*, VCSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Paul Anthony Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and Its Allusions to New Testament Literature*, WUNT II 134 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), esp. ch. 13; Christopher Mount, *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*, NovTSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2002); James W. Aageson, *Paul, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Early Church*, LPS (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008); Daniel Marguerat, ed., *Reception of Paulinism in Acts = Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*, BETL 229 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009); Pervo, *Making of Paul*; David L. Eastman, *Paul the Martyr: The Cult of the Apostle in the Latin West*, WGRWSup 4 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011); and Benjamin L. White, *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests Over the Image of the Apostle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). Note also the various essays in William S. Babcock, ed., *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, 1st ed. (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990); Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, eds., *Paul and the Second Century*, LNTS 412 (London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011); Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite, eds., *Tertullian and Paul*, PPSD 1 (New York: Bloomsbury; T&T Clark, 2013); and Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite, eds., *The Apostolic Fathers and Paul*, PPSD 2 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017). Such studies have uncovered evidence challenging what was previously seen as a pattern of general indifference to the apostle exhibited by most authors from the first half of the second century. The hypothesis regarding the relative absence of attention to Paul in the second century prior to Marcion goes back as least as far as Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel, trans. Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 213-21. Similarly, see Wilhelm Schneemelcher, "Paulus in der griechischen Kirche des 2. Jahrhunderts," *ZKG* 75 (1964): 1-20; C. K. Barrett, "Pauline Controversies in the Post-Pauline Period," *NTS* 20 (1974): 229-45; Harry Y. Gamble, *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning*, GBSNTS (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 44; Calvin J. Roetzel, "Paul in the Second Century," in *The

false dichotomies necessarily restricts (a) the textual data that literary historians can consider and (b) the sorts of ways that they can describe Hermas's complicated encounter with Pauline letters. From the outset, these restrictions unreasonably limit the likelihood of ever detecting a meaningful encounter with the Pauline legacy by Hermas, and so I suggest they be reconsidered and a new approach be tried.

As I shall now show, in responding to the problem of Hermas and Paul over the past two hundred years, modern scholars have tended to engage it from a strikingly similar direction. By "Paul," most scholars seem to mean not the person but the letters written by or attributed to the apostle; often they favor the authentic letters. Likewise, most scholars also seek to test the hypothesis that Hermas knew the letters directly (although what is meant by *directly* is rarely stated) and quoted or alluded to them consciously and overtly. For them, extended verbatim quotations represent the highest quality of evidence for establishing direct knowledge and use. Indeed, for some they are the only sufficient kind.

The *Shepherd* and Pauline Letters in Modern Research

Initially, modern research, like its ancient and early modern precursors, was marked by an openness to Hermas's influence by the apostle Paul and his literary legacy.[20] In 1835, Karl Jachmann wondered whether the *Pastor* (i.e., *Shepherd*) was so labeled because, like Paul's

---

*Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*, ed. James D. G. Dunn, CCPRC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 227-28.

[20] To my knowledge, no one has attempted a comprehensive history of research on possible Pauline influence upon Hermas. Limited bibliographies within tailored studies do exist, however; see, e.g., Verheyden, "Shepherd of Hermas," 296-322.

epistles from prison, Hermas's writing is fundamentally *pastoral* in nature.[21] But Jachmann

denied any substantial Pauline influence upon Hermas, dismissing three possible points of

intertextual contact as "mere allusions" ("bloße Anspielungen"), because he thought that

admitting them to be anything more would have required doing likewise in the case of what he

labeled allusions to Revelation.[22] And since he did not think Hermas's aim was to offer an

"imitation" ("Nachahmung") of Revelation but of 4 Ezra, substantive knowledge of and

engagement with the documents of the New Testament were out of the question. According to

Jachmann, allusions were insufficient evidence of imitation, construed as necessarily exclusive

(i.e., Revelation, not 4 Ezra).

     In his 1850 monograph on the emergence of early Catholicism, Albrecht Ritschl sought

not to establish allusions or quotations to the Pauline letters in the *Shepherd* but to determine the

second-century religious movement from which he thought it emerged.[23] Ritschl imagined the

potential connection between Hermas and Paul not in terms of *imitation*, as Jachmann did, but

*joint opposition*. In his judgment, Hermas "belonged to an independent circle within Christianity

opposed to Judaism." Such opposition, he suggested, "only fits the Pauline movement, so

---

[21] "…oder ob dieses so benannt ist, weil es wie die Hirtenbriefe des Paulus Verhaftungs: regeln und Lebenslehren enthält,… wagen wir nicht zu entscheiden" (Karl Reinhold Jachmann, *Der Hirte des Hermas: Ein Beitrag zur Patristik* [Königsberg: J. H. Bon, 1835], 28). Dressel, *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, XLI mistook Jachmann's cautious suggestion for his actual opinion, and he suggested others shared Jachmann's view.

[22] Jachmann, *Hirte des Hermas*, 62-63. The "mere allusions" to the Pauline letters that Jachmann listed were *Mand.* 10.1 / 2 Cor 7:10; *Mand.* 10. 3 / Rom 8:26-27; *Sim.* 9.18 / 2 Tim 2:19 (63 n. *).

[23] Albrecht Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche: Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie* (Bonn: A. Marcus, 1850).

Hermas must also be assigned to the same."[24] Here we see the discovery of a Paul presumed to

oppose Judaism. Ritschl's detection of an anti-Jewish orientation in Paul clearly reflects the so-

called Tübingen school's influence.[25] Even the ways he alleged that Hermas's conceptions of

both salvation and faith differ from those of the apostle were not enough to dissuade him from

construing Hermas's theological vision in light of the dominant scholarly perspective of his

day.[26] For Ritschl, the important comparison was with general aspects of putative Pauline

theology, not the specifics of the apostle's letters.

In stark contrast to Ritschl, in his 1852 monograph that was in part a history of the texts

ultimately included in the New Testament canon, Heinrich Thiersch denied any connection

between Hermas and Paul. First, he rejected any *positive dependence* of Hermas on the apostle,

having found in the former's literary product "not a single reference to Paul or his writings" but

instead "odd matters from Jewish theology."[27] Like Ritschl, Thiersch presumed an opposition

between Paul and Judaism. He hunted for explicit references, presumably quotations but perhaps

also obvious allusions, in order potentially to prove Hermas's knowledge of a Pauline corpus.

Thiersch found none. He found the same absence of Paul in the writings of Justin Martyr, so for

---

[24] Ibid., 300: "…der Verfasser einem gegen das Judenthum selbständigen Kreise des Christenthumes angehörte. Dies paßt nur auf die paulinische Richtung, also muß auch Hermas zu derselben gezählt werden." Ritschl stated his position only slightly differently in the second edition of his monograph (*Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche: Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie*, 2nd ed. [Bonn: A. Marcus, 1857], 292).

[25] Ernst Gaâb, *Der Hirte des Hermas: Ein Beitrag zur Patristik* (Basel: Felix Schneider, 1866), 22-23 long ago detected the influence of Tübingen school on scholarly engagement with our problem.

[26] Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 298-99.

[27] Heinrich W. J. Thiersch, *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter und die Entstehung der neutestamentlichen Schriften* (Frankfurt am Main: Heyder und Zimmer, 1852), 350. Again on p. 354, Thiersch denied any allusion to Paul.

him both Hermas and Justin implicitly fit a pattern of purported ignorance of Paul.[28] Second,

Thiersch explicitly denied any *contradiction* between Hermas and Paul, particularly with respect

to what he labeled Hermas's "apocryphal angel-theory"; he also denied that Hermas showed any

*hostility* towards Paul, which Thiersch associated exclusively with the Ebionite "heresies"

("Irrlehren") or "errors" ("Irrtümer") and from which he correctly found Hermas independent.[29]

In other words, according to Thiersch, Hermas did not know and yet at the same time was not

actively opposed to Paul, but the implication is that opposition to Paul is inconsistent with

influence by the apostle. Ironically, though, while he denied Hermas's use of Paul, Thiersch

---

[28] To be sure, like Hermas Justin does not explicitly cite a *corpus Paulinum*. But Justin likely did have access to one and used its contents, especially Romans and Galatians; see Oskar Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 54, 71, 74-75. According to Skaursane, "Among the books that were later assembled as the New Testament, it is first the Gospels and second the Pauline letters that Justin quotes from and makes extensive use of" (ibid., 75). In his judgment, Justin even paraphrases Paul's OT quotations, as in the case of *Dial.* 39 / Rom 11:3-4 / 1 Kings 19:10, 14, 18; and *Dial.* 95-96 / Gal 3:13 / Deut 21:23 (74, 187 n. 92). By contrast, Helmut Koester claims, "It seems that Justin deliberately avoided [Paul's] letters" (*Introduction to the New Testament* Vol. 2: *History and Literature of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed. [New York: de Gruyter, 2000], 9-10; the quote is from p. 10). Similarly, Lee Martin McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*, 3rd ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 285 n. 1. Such a view goes at least as far back as Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 215-16. A mediating position was held by Bruce Metzger: "Although Justin nowhere quotes from the Epistles of Paul, his controversy with Marcion must mean that he had knowledge of at least several of them. Furthermore, occasional Pauline forms of expression and teaching show that the Apostle to the Gentiles had helped to mould both his faith and his language" (*The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, repr. of 1987 ed. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997], 148); as support, Metzger cited Brooke Foss Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*, 6th ed. (London: Macmillan, 1889), 169-71. For a list of scholars attributing knowledge of Paul to Justin, see Rodney Werline, "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho,'" *HTR* 92 (1999): 79 n. 2; Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," 186 nn. 91, 187 95; Pervo, *Making of Paul*, 194-96, esp. 348 n. 73.

[29] Thiersch, *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter*, 354.

nevertheless observed in the *Shepherd* "the only extensive remains" of the very sort of ecstatic Christian prophecies we find attested first in Paul's letters.[30]

Three years after Thiersch offered his view, in his own history of the New Testament canon B. F. Westcott adopted the opposite position.[31] In a manner more explicit than Ritschl only a few years prior, unlike many scholars who would come after him, Westcott argued for the relative closeness Hermas's thought to that of Paul:

> The relation of Hermas to St Paul is interesting and important. His peculiar object, as well perhaps as his turn of mind, removed him from any close connexion with the Apostle; but *their divergence has been strangely exaggerated*. In addition to marked coincidences of language with the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and with that to the Ephesians, Hermas distinctly recognizes the great truth which is commonly regarded as the characteristic centre of [Paul's] teaching.[32]

Hermas might not have been "closely connected" to Paul, Westcott admitted, but to say that the former diverges greatly from the latter exaggerates the situation. For Westcott, Hermas's relative closeness to Paul was indicated by the fact that much of his language "coincides" markedly with language the apostle used in 1 Cor 3 and which his pseudepigrapher picked up in Eph 4.[33] This category of "marked coincidence" seems for Westcott to be different from quotation, allusion, and paraphrase.[34] Despite the fact that he found no quotations of or allusions to Pauline letters,

---

[30] "Überreste dieser Prophetie, und leider fast die einzigen grösseren Überreste derselben, sind in der Schrift des Hermas erhalten" (ibid., 353).

[31] Brooke Foss Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*, 1st ed. (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1855), 213-27. Westcott's position endured through the publication of the seventh edition (1896).

[32] Ibid., 224; emphasis added.

[33] Three "coincidences of language" are listed at ibid., 224 n. 5: *Sim.* 5.7 / 1 Cor 3:16, 17; *Sim.* 9.13.5, 7 / Eph 4:4; *Mand.* 3.4 (cf. *Mand.* 10.1) / Eph 4:30.

[34] Westcott detected "no definite quotations" of Jewish or Christian scripture in the *Shepherd*, and yet he did find numerous allusions, particularly to James and Revelation, as well as paraphrases of the Gospels (ibid., 222-24; the quote is from p. 222). He never said so, but

according to Westcott, Hermas recognized the apostle's "great truth," namely the prioritization of faith over works in what he termed the "Christian economy" of salvation.[35] Similarly, at the end of his monograph's section on Hermas, Westcott concluded, "the teaching of St Paul… is truly recognized in the 'Shepherd.'"[36] Here he inferred Hermas's solidarity with Paul the retrojected Protestant on the basis of the former's recognition of a posited primary characteristic of the latter's theology.

Writing in the late 1860s, like Westcott, Theodor Zahn also argued at length for Pauline influence on Hermas.[37] Hermas, Zahn argued, was "strongly influenced" ("stark beeinflusst") by the historical Paul, whom he took to be the author of Ephesians.[38] Yet Zahn limited Hermas's probable knowledge to only a few of the Pauline letters, because in his view, 1 Thessalonians, Romans, Philippians, and Galatians exerted no influence on Hermas.[39] Zahn found "…no certain traces of [Hermas's] knowledge of any of the letters of Paul except Ephesians and *perhaps* 1 and 2 Corinthians."[40] At the conclusion of his study, Zahn phrased its results more strongly:

> The result of the comparative examination of the *Shepherd* and the Pauline letters
> is therefore this, namely that Hermas *certainly* knew Ephesians and *probably* 1-2
> Corinthians, and that not the smallest trace of a dispute over the teachings

Westcott might have employed it as synonymous to parallel; two parallels with 1 Peter are listed at p. 224 n. 4.

[35] Westcott found this "great truth" in *Vis.* 3.8.3, where faith (πίστις) is depicted as the first of the seven virgins supporting the tower, the church; see ibid., 224-25.

[36] Ibid., 227.

[37] Theodor Zahn, *Hermae pastor e novo testamento illustratus* (Göttingen: Huth, 1867), 39; idem, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1868), esp. 410-20.

[38] Ibid., 415.

[39] Ibid., 412: "Nur das negative Ergebnis möchte unzweifelhaft feststehn, daß die genannten Briefe aus die Gedankenbildung und Wortform des Hirten keinen nachweisbaren Einfluß geübt haben."

[40] "Die sorgfältigste Untersuchung wird keine sicheren Spuren von Kenntnis irgend eines der Briefe des Paulus außer dem an die Epheser und *vielleicht* den beiden Korintherbriefen entdecken" (ibid., 410; emphasis added).

mentioned in those letters and by extension of a rejection of Paul's apostolic authority appears. Rather, the opposite becomes apparent from [the *Shepherd*'s] connections to the mentioned letters.[41]

Zahn clearly stated that it is at least probable that Hermas knew three letters in a *corpus Paulinum*. As Thiersch did before him, Zahn also failed to find in the *Shepherd* evidence of any dispute between Hermas and Paul and, as a result, the former's rejection of the latter's authority as an apostle.[42] Instead, Zahn saw in Hermas's probable, or in the case of Ephesians certain, use of the letters evidence that Hermas did *not* dispute Pauline teaching and did *not* reject his apostolic authority. The underlying logic of Zahn's inference is clear: Hermas, who Zahn assumed could only have been pro-Pauline or anti-Pauline, would not have used Paul's letters if he had a dispute with Paul or did not affirm Paul's apostolic authority. Stated differently, Zahn's paradigm of permitted encounter could not imagine the negative influence of Pauline letters upon Hermas, for example their sparking a critical response from him.

In 1881, like Zahn, Adolf Hilgenfeld found material from the Pauline corpus in the *Shepherd*, whose authors he believed were three in number.[43] Hilgenfeld concluded that only Ephesians was known, and in fact not by all of the authors he posited;[44] on Hermas's knowledge of Ephesians only Hilgenfeld largely mirrored the position that Gebhardt and Harnack had

---

[41] "Das Ergebnis der vergleichenden Durchmusterung des Hirten und der paulinischen Briefe ist also dies, daß Hermas *jedenfalls* den Epheserbrief, *wahrscheinlich* die beiden Korintherbriefe gekannt hat, und daß von einer Bestreitung der darin ausgesprochenen Lehren, also auch von einer Verwerfung der apostolischen Auctorität des Paulus nicht die leiseste Spur sich zeigt, vielmehr das Gegentheil aus den Beziehungen zu den genannten Briefen erhellt" (ibid., 418; emphasis added).

[42] A hundred years later, this finding by Zahn would influence Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 284.

[43] For a description of Hilgenfeld's theory regarding the *Shepherd*'s compositional history, see pp. 16-17 in Chapter 1.

[44] Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Hermae Pastor* Vol. 3 of *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum* (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1881), XXX-XXXI.

adopted in their edition of 1877.[45] Nevertheless, Hilgenfeld went beyond them to imply that two

of the *Shepherd*'s authors sought to combat Pauline teaching, or at least agreed with such an aim.

This is apparent from Hilgenfeld's passing comment on the *Shepherd*'s alleged use of James:

"That the *Shepherd* used the letter of James, who fought Paul's teaching, is not surprising."[46]

Here perceived similarities with James are assumed to signify anti-Paulinism. Within this quote,

presumably as support for it, Hilgenfeld provided a reference to *Mand.* 12.5.2, 6.3 (cf. Jas 4:7,

12), so one can safely assume that he referred here to his *Hermas pastoralis*, the author of the

section containing that mandate. Presumed anti-Paulinism is even more clearly in view on the

part of the author of *Vis.* 1-4: "*Hermas apocalypticus* entirely condemned confessors of the

Pauline faith."[47] As proof, Hilgenfeld cited *Vis.* 3.6.1 [14.1]. That passage mentions "children of

lawlessness" (οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀνομίας) who are hurled far from the Tower being built and do not

obtain salvation.[48] Hilgenfeld understood this "lawlessness" to be a reference to the apostle's

presumed rejection of Jewish law. Thus we see that, in Hilgenfeld's view, two of the *Shepherd*'s

---

[45] Gebhardt and Harnack limited Hermas's knowledge of the Pauline corpus to Ephesians and Hebrews, both of which they thought Hermas probably had read (*Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e codice palatino*, PAO 3 [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877], lxxiv-lxxv). Their theory that Hermas knew only Ephesians among the Pauline letters held sway into the late twentieth century. For example, see Norbert Brox, *Hirt des Hermas*, KAV 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 45 nn. 2, 48; and Metzger, *Canon*, 65-67. Whether Harnack maintained this position is uncertain. By 1893, he did not include Ephesians in his list of texts exhibiting verbal and thematic affinities with the *Shepherd* (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893], vol. I/1, 51).

[46] *Iacobi epistula Pauli doctrinam impugnantis Pastorem usum esse… mirum non est* (*Hermae Pastor* [1881], XXVIII).

[47] *Hermas apocalypticus Paulinae fidei confessores omnino damnavit* (ibid., XXX). Hilgenfeld's ascription of an anti-Paulinist tendency to the putative "Hermas apocalypticus" is correctly recognized by Philippe Henne, "Un seul 'Pasteur', un seul Hermas," *RTL* 23 (1992): 483.

[48] Τοὺς δὲ κατακοπτομένους καὶ μακρὰν ῥιπτομένους ἀπὸ τοῦ πύργου θέλεις γνῶναι; οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀνομίας· ἐπίστευσαν δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει, καὶ πᾶσα πονηρία οὐκ ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν· διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔχουσιν σωτηρίαν, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσιν εὔχρηστοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν διὰ τὰς πονηρίας αὐτῶν, *Vis.* 3.6.1 [14.1].

putative authors contested the Pauline legacy, and one of them (i.e., *Hermas apocalypticus*, the author of the *Visions*) was overtly opposed to Pauline Christianity, even though he himself did not use that label.[49]

A decade after Hilgenfeld, in their first edition of the Apostolic Fathers published in 1891, Lightfoot and Farmer implicitly adopted a more skeptical position on Pauline influence upon Hermas. This position can only be inferred from marginal notes and an index to the edition. Nevertheless, such clues indicate that the editors determined that only two places in the *Shepherd* resembled passages from the *corpus Paulinum* — *Mand*. 4.4.2 / 1 Cor 7:40 and *Vis*. 4.2.4 / Heb 11:33.[50] These Pauline passages were presented as at best *indirect* support for Hermas's ideas.[51] Nowhere did Lightfoot and Farmer outline their criteria for determining support or resemblance, nor did they define these two terms. But by resemblance they meant degree of verbal correspondence, quotation being the most extensive, upon which the probability of support (i.e., influence) was presumably founded.[52] Likewise, their edition's attempt to isolate a single source text (e.g., Heb 11:33) as the exclusive origin of material in a target text (e.g., *Vis*. 4.2.4 [23.4])

---

[49] This mature statement of Hilgenfeld's position in 1881 appeared nearly three decades after he first rejected any connection between the *Shepherd*, whose origins he assigned to Jewish-Christianity in Rome, and the Pauline message in the 1850s: *Die Apostolischen Väter: Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Ursprung der unter ihrem Namen erhaltenen Schriften* (Halle: Pfeffer, 1853), 174-79; and "Das Urchristenthum und seine neuesten Bearbeitungen von Lechler und Ritschl," *ZWT* 1 (1858): 377-440, esp. 438-40.

[50] Harmer and Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 315, 323; on p. 568, *Mand*. 4.4.2 / 1 Cor 7:40 and *Vis*. 4.2.4 / Heb 11:33 are listed in italics, signifying that "the resemblance… is less close than in the other instances" (565).

[51] This is apparent from the definition of the abbreviation cf. as indicating "[w]here an authority, or another passage in the text, may be claimed indirectly in support of a reading" (ibid., 563).

[52] The editors' aim of assessing the degree of verbal correspondence in quotations can be inferred from their explanation of the use of italics in the "Index of Scriptural Passages." Italics indicate where "the resemblance to the corresponding scriptural passage is less close than in the other instances" (ibid., 565).

when another source text or even a combination of sources is plausible (cf. LXX Dan 6:22 [$\theta'$])

assumes direct and exclusive dependence alone can prove influence.[53] In the end, Lightfoot and

Harmer suggested that the *Shepherd* reveals precious little if any contact with the Pauline corpus

and merely resembles parts of it.

One year later, Charles Taylor published his *Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels*. The

volume was in part a history of the NT canon that attempted to prove knowledge and use of the

Synoptics and, in particular, the Gospel of John, in the *Shepherd*, which Taylor contended "is an

incompletely worked mine of allusions."[54] At various points in this work on the Gospels, and

often in passing, Taylor asserted that Hermas also knew portions of a Pauline corpus, but he

nowhere described the form or mode in which he imagined Hermas knowing it or them. Some of

Taylor's claims for Hermas's dependence upon letters attributed to Paul must be inferred from

the references provided in parentheses throughout his monograph, as in the editions of Lightfoot

and Farmer and others.[55] However, at least three times Taylor explicitly asserted Hermas's

dependence upon or direct encounter with Paul's letters. In his judgment, at specific places

---

[53] See the discussion of the angel Thegri at *Vis*. 4.2.4 [23.4] and its proposed background in LXX Dan 6:22 ($\theta'$) on p. 29 n. 102 in Chapter 1.

[54] Charles Taylor, *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels* (London: C. J. Clay, 1892), v. For his fanciful proof that Hermas knew the four canonical gospels, see p. vi, 6, 146-147; similarly, Charles Taylor, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, 2 vols., ECC (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903), 33-37. His proof depends, at least at a theoretical level, upon the sole occurrence in *Vis*. 3.13.2 [21.2] of ἀγγελλία ἀγαθή, by which Taylor thought Hermas meant *evangelium* / εὐαγγέλιον, and his reference to a four-footed couch immediately thereafter, which Taylor took as an allusion to the four gospels.

[55] E.g., *Witness of Hermas*, 56, 88. Similar inferences can be drawn from the notes in his two-volume translation of the *Shepherd* (e.g., *Shepherd of Hermas*, 1:86).

Hermas drew from, referred to, and answered Col 1:23, 2 Cor 3:17, and Eph 4:16.[56] Taylor did

not label any of these a quotation, allusion, or even reminiscence, even though he used these

categories elsewhere. He arguably did this because he understood that Hermas's manner of

engaging the texts ultimately collected in the New Testament, and the Pauline corpus in

particular, was more complicated than these categories could describe.[57]

On this particular point, Taylor was ultimately to be out of step with his time, as the 1905

publication of the Oxford *New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* project [hereafter *NTAF*],

which adopted a much different approach, would show.[58] This project retrojected what

subsequently became recognized as the NT canon back into the late first and early second

centuries in order to study the extent of its influence on — and by extension its authority over —

literature composed in that period. Its tables of source and target texts mapped verbal agreement,

assumed to be an indicator of both quotation and acceptance of authoritative status, and ranked

results in order of probability.[59] Thus, the project's orienting approach to the problem sought to

isolate exclusively influential source texts in order to certify influence, a method that has exerted

---

[56] Taylor, *Witness of Hermas*, 9, 121, 124 n. *. The texts that Taylor connected with these passages from the Pauline corpus were *Vis*. 3.5.4 [13.4], *Sim*. 8.4-5 [70-71], and *Vis*. 3 and *Sim*. 8-9's general description of the building of the Tower, respectively.

[57] In describing Hermas's "way of using his authorities," Taylor concluded, "He allegorises, he disintegrates, he amalgamates. He plays upon the sense or varies the form of a saying, he repeats its words in fresh combinations or replaces them by synonyms, but he will not cite a passage simply and in its entirety. This must be taken into account in estimating the value of the Shepherd as a witness to the canonical Books of the New Testament" (ibid., 29 n. *). Some of these phenomena are included among my reading strategy's criteria for detecting Pauline influence; see p. 120 below.

[58] Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Study, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).

[59] For a description of the project's system of ranking the probability of use, see ibid., iii.

an enduring influence on the trajectory of subsequent scholarship.[60] James Drummond authored

the volume's short essay on the *Shepherd*.[61] He was slightly more open than Hilgenfeld to

Hermas's use of Paul but far less positive than Taylor. He determined that Hermas probably did

know some parts of the Pauline letters, namely 1 Cor 7:39-40 and Eph 1:14, 4:3-6, 30, 5:18-19,

and 25-26.[62] With respect to Ephesians in particular, Drummond saw Hermas "developing in his

own way a phrase that has lodged in his mind" and elsewhere "imitat[ing]" parts of that

pseudepigraphic letter.[63] Like Taylor before him, Drummond recognized that "[i]t is the way of

Hermas not to quote, but to take suggestions, and alter to suit his purposes."[64] However, despite

his astute observation of Hermas's habit, in assessing the "use" of Pauline letters in the

*Shepherd*, Drummond did not deviate from the methodology employed by the broader *NTAF*

project, which focused squarely on identifying possible quotations.

In his 1923 commentary on the *Shepherd*, Martin Dibelius was even less optimistic than

Drummond, as scholars would be for decades. Dibelius concluded that "certain points of contact

with New Testament writings are… *conceivable* (esp. James)."[65] He quickly added, though, that

such conceivable points of contact "by no means must always be interpreted as signs of literary

---

[60] This influence is perhaps most clear in Barnett's employment of a similar ranking strategy; see *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), x. Goodspeed, Barnett's *Doktorvater*, depicted his project as filling a gap in the *NTAF* project, which he thought "had a limited usefulness, at least for Paul" ("Foreword," in *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, by Albert Edward Barnett [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941], vii).

[61] James Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 105-23.

[62] Ibid., 105-07.

[63] Ibid., 106.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Martin Dibelius, *Die apostolischen Väter: Der Hirt des Hermas*, vol. 4, HNT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), 424: "Daher lassen sich dann auch gewisse Berührungen mit neutestamentlichen Schriften (vor allem Jac) *begreifen*" (emphasis added).

dependence."[66] And yet Dibelius still hinted at Hermas's possible encounter with traditions known from Pauline letters. For example, he suggested that the unity formula used in the *Shepherd* "recalls" Eph 4:4-6.[67] Furthermore, Dibelius thought Hermas employed "biblical sayings" from 1 Thess 5 and Rom 15 at *Vis*. 3.9.2 [17.2], but he added a crucial caveat: Hermas did so "without *conscious* quotation."[68] Dibelius also observed that Hermas and Paul adopted equivalent positions on the possibility of remarriage after the death of a spouse.[69] Such statements indicate that in engaging the question of Hermas and the Pauline legacy, Dibelius prized an author's demonstrable conscious, literary dependence upon a prior one.[70] For him, Hermas's potential encounter with Pauline tradition did not rise to that level. This conclusion is arguably compounded by Dibelius's close association of the *Shepherd* with James — because, according to him, the latter was not meaningfully influenced by Pauline letters, the former likely was not either.[71]

---

[66] Ibid.: "…durchaus nicht immer als Zeichen literarischer Abhängigkeit gedeutet werden müssen."

[67] Ibid., 621: "Die Einheitsformel… erinnert an Eph 4:4" (cf. 627).

[68] Ibid., 475: "Die Paränese bewegt sich in traditionellen Wendungen und berührt sich infolgedessen mit Bibelworten (hier 1 Thess 5:13 Rom 15:7), ohne daß deshalb bewußte Zitierung anzunehmen wäre."

[69] Ibid., 513.

[70] Compare the statement in Martin Dibelius, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Michael A. Williams, Herm (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 30: "All things considered, one can say that Jas obviously writes after Paul, but that he is not writing under the sort of Pauline influence which could be explained as resulting from the reading of Paul's letters".

[71] On connections between the *Shepherd* and James, which Dibelius did not label literary dependence in either direction but instead attributed to their sharing "a relatively large store of paraenetic material which Hermas generally passes on in a reworked condition ('expanded paraenesis'), and Jas in the form of sayings," see ibid., 31-32; the quote is from p. 32.

Eva Aleith made an even more forceful and skeptical point than Dibelius in her monograph on early Paulinism (1937).[72] In it, Aleith construed what she took to be the *Shepherd*'s major theological themes as elements of an (implicitly anti-Pauline) early Catholicism in a way that anticipated Schulz's argument nearly forty years later.[73] In Aleith's view, "The *Shepherd of Hermas*, *in which Pauline influence is no longer felt*, shows where the path that the Roman communal theology embarked upon in *1 Clement* and pursued further in *2 Clement* leads. The uniquely catholic stance on justification by works, the emphasis on commandments, and the idea of merit take its place."[74] Particularly important is Aleith's contention that in the *Shepherd* "Pauline influence is no longer felt."[75] This claim is purportedly proven by Hermas's perceived emphases on justification by works (i.e., not faith), commandments (i.e., not exhortations), and merit (i.e., not grace). For Aleith, such emphases represented a devolution of a pristine Pauline theology, assumed to be Protestant, previously accepted at Rome; here Aleith's aim of recovering a certain kind of Paul can also be seen. The *Shepherd*, Aleith suggested, did not follow the path first trod by Paul's followers in the city. Crucially, her brief, sweeping argument operates at the level of extrapolated theme and

---

[72] Eva Aleith, *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche*, BZNW 18 (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1937).

[73] See the discussion of Siegfried Schulz, *Die Mitte der Schrift: Der Frühkatholizismus im Neuen Testament als Herausforderung an den Protestantismus* (Stuttgart: Kreuz-Verlag, 1976), 357-66 on pp. 96-98 below. Surprisingly, Schulz's monograph did not engage Aleith's.

[74] Aleith, *Paulusverständnis*, 3: "Wohin der Weg führt, den die römische Gemeindetheologie im I. Clemens-Brief eingeschlagen und im II. Clemens-Brief weiter verfolgt hat, zeigt der 'Hirte des Hermas', *in dem von paulinischen Einfluß nichts mehr zur spüren ist*. An dessen Stelle tritt die spezifisch katholische Haltung der Werkgerechtigkeit, die Betonung der Gebote, der Gedanke der Verdienstlichkeit" (emphasis added). Passages from the *Shepherd* supposedly supporting what Aleith depicted as elements of early Catholic theology appear at nn. 9-15.

[75] Aleith's position was adopted by Graydon F. Snyder, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, ed. Robert M. Grant, AF 6 (Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1968), 14.

theological crux — its comparison focuses exclusively on the apostle. And yet it contains no

actual engagement with any of the letters written by him, let alone his pseudepigraphers.

A few years later, in his otherwise maximalist monograph, *Paul Becomes a Literary

Influence* (1941), Albert Barnett surprisingly adopted an only slightly less minimalist position

than Aleith. The aim of his study was to discover "acquaintance with Paul's collected letters" by

identifying "passage or passages from the letters that seem to have been in the writer's mind"

when composing a text and, like the *NTAF* project of 1905, ranking them according to

"probability of literary indebtedness."[76] In other words, Barnett sought (substantial) quotations.

Ultimately, he detected "*possible* traces of acquaintances [in the *Shepherd*] with Ephesians, 1

Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Colossians," but he concluded that "[i]n

no instance… is there warrant for *certainty* that Hermas used a letter of the Pauline collection."[77]

This conclusion accepts that certainty can only be established by the existence of quotations.

Barnett's result cohered with his broader narrative of Pauline influence, which construed the

*Shepherd* among the witnesses to the "subsidence of the popularity of [Paul's] letters" that, likely

under the influence of his *Doktorvater* Goodspeed, he thought occurred in the first half of the

second century.[78]

Édouard Massaux was markedly more confident than Barnett in his monumental 1950

monograph on the Gospel of Matthew in early Christianity.[79] The methodological

---

[76] Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, x.
[77] Ibid., 198-203; the quotes are from p. 203 (emphases added).
[78] Ibid., 186.
[79] Édouard Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* (Louvain: Universitaires de Louvain, 1950); reprinted as *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*, BETL 75 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986). The work was translated into English as *The Influence of the*

presuppositions of this project and its results have led to Massaux's being roundly accused of

methodological maximalism.[80] He recognized that "*contacts littéraires* [i.e., strict verbal

agreements] do not exhaust… literary influence."[81] So he sought other sorts of evidence for

influence too, among them "the use of *vocabulary*, *themes*, and… *ideas*."[82] There Massaux was

obviously speaking with Matthew in mind, but his analysis of material associated with Paul in

the *Shepherd* reflected this perspective.[83] Massaux also implicitly granted the possibility of

detecting Pauline influence on Hermas without the need to isolate a discrete underlying textual

tradition. "A Pauline literary influence stands out throughout the texts of Sim. 9," Massaux

argued, "even though not one of the apostle's texts can be found literally. But the *similarity of*

*thought* and the *presence of identical words* leave no doubt with respect to Hermas' source of

---

*Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 1: *The First Ecclesiastical Writers*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, NGS 5/1 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990); *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 2: *The Later Christian Writings*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, NGS 5/2 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992); *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 3: *The Apologists and the Didache*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, NGS 5/3 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1993).

[80] Among the recent scholars who label it thus, see, e.g., Daniel Batovici, "The Second-Century Reception of John: A Survey of Methodologies," *CBR* 12 (2010): 398; Michael J. Kruger, *The Question of Canon: Challenging the Status Quo in the New Testament Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013), 177 n. 131; James A. Kelhoffer, "'How Soon a Book' Revisited: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ as a Reference to 'Gospel' Materials in the First Half of the Second Century," in *Conceptions of "Gospel" and Legitimacy in Early Christianity*, WUNT I 324 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 40 n. 4. Although Pheme Perkins's review of Massaux's project, published after it was translated into English, refrained from accusing him of methodological maximalism, it nevertheless implied that as a significant shortcoming; see "Review of *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* by Édouard Massaux," *SecCent* 8 (1991): 247-48.

[81] Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu*, xviii: "Ces contacts littéraires n'épuisent pas l'influence littéraire."

[82] Ibid.: "on peut s'attendre, sans contact littéraire proprement dit, à l'utilisation du *vocabulaire*, des *thèmes* et des *idées* typiquement matthéennes" (emphasis added).

[83] Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 144-50.

inspiration in his concept of the unity of the Church."[84] Even as he maintained Hermas's

dependence on Pauline writings, Massaux observed that "even when [Hermas] is literarily

dependent on [Paul], he does not follow his texts to the letter."[85] Ultimately, Massaux found

numerous quotations of and allusions to a *corpus Paulinum* in the *Shepherd*, determining that

"Hermas *certainly* knew some of the Pauline epistles" (esp. 1-2 Cor and Eph).[86] But Hermas not

only *knew* them, Massaux contended, "[h]e also *looked through* certain epistles of Paul."[87] In

other words, Hermas had read the letters himself — he possessed or somehow accessed a

physical *corpus Paulinum*. Even so, Massaux thought, like the other authors of the early

Christian apocalypses that he studied, Hermas did "not proceed along the apostle's profound

theological developments," a comparative conclusion founded on Massaux's reconstruction of a

particular kind of "Paul."[88] For Massaux, Paul was one who offered "high theological

speculations" in contrast to someone like Hermas, who focused instead on morality and "the

practice of Christian life."[89] This negative result was taken as proof that Hermas and other

authors of the period "drew the core of the Christian message" from Matthew.[90] According to

Massaux, Pauline letters, however important they admittedly were for Hermas, did not constitute

part of this "core."

---

[84] Ibid., 147 (emphasis added).
[85] Ibid., 150.
[86] Ibid., 144-63. The quote is from p. 144 (emphasis added).
[87] Ibid., 130; emphasis added. For Massaux's summary statement of Hermas's knowledge of Paul, see p. 150. The idea that Hermas not only *knew* but also *read* Pauline letters goes at least far back as Gebhardt and Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece*, lxxiv-lxxv.
[88] Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 163.
[89] Ibid., 162.
[90] Ibid., 163.

Robert Grant adopted a markedly more limited position than Massaux in his short 1965 history of the NT canon, *The Formation of the New Testament*. He thought it unlikely that Hermas knew Hebrews and was uncertain regarding 1 Corinthians.[91] But he considered it "almost certain that he knows Ephesians," and he postulated this knowledge on the basis of close verbal resemblances, themselves among the few allusions to what became the New Testament in the *Shepherd*.[92] For Grant, allusions, however few, were sufficient to establish Hermas's encounter with a Pauline letter. Despite his knowledge and use of at least Ephesians, Grant concluded, "That Hermas regarded [Pauline epistles] as scripture is most unlikely."[93] And yet he also added, "If [Hermas's canon] included Matthew and Ephesians it doubtless included other Pauline epistles."[94]

Beginning with Graydon Snyder's 1968 commentary on the *Shepherd*, scholarship seemed to tack back from the openness exhibited by Massaux and, to a lesser degree, Grant on the question of Hermas and Paul, towards minimalism. Following Aleith, Snyder posited the absence of Pauline influence on Hermas: "While there are several preferred phrases which sound Pauline… the form of the Shepherd and its content has [*sic*] nothing to do with that of Paul."[95] Snyder did not explain what he meant by Paul and Pauline content, but they reflect an identification of second-century Paulinism in particular (unstated) ideas. Snyder dismissed "reading the Shepherd as a document in the development of Pauline… thought rather than as a

---

[91] Robert M. Grant, *The Formation of the New Testament* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1965), 74.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Ibid. Grant did not provide any specific reason(s) for this assessment, but it was presumably founded on the absence of any explicit citation formulae in the *Shepherd* apart from the marked quotation of *Eldad and Modad* at *Vis*. 2.3.4 [7.4].
[94] Ibid., 75.
[95] Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 14.

product of Jewish-Christianity" as an error, and he implied that it contains no hint of Romans.[96]

And yet Snyder's position on the matter of possible Pauline influence upon Hermas was more

complicated than these strong negative statements suggest. His commentary included an index of

scriptural allusions, including twenty-seven to the Pauline letters and eight more to Hebrews.[97]

Even more revealing are those places in his commentary that explicitly name Paul as the source

upon which Hermas drew in developing aspects of his teaching (e.g., 2 Cor 7:8-11/ *Mand.*

10.2.1-4 [41.1-4]).[98] Despite the thirty-five allusions to the *corpus Paulinum* and the numerous

Pauline source texts that Snyder identified in the *Shepherd*, he still staunchly denied apostolic

influence. At the same time, Snyder did state that "[Hermas's] thought is not as alien to Paul as

has been claimed."[99] (Here Snyder echoed Westcott's statement a hundred years prior.) But the

possibility that he posited was not the influence of Pauline letters, merely similarity to a

particular figure of "Paul" that Snyder did not explain.

The same year that Snyder's commentary was published, in the second edition of his own

Robert Joly adopted a thoroughly minimalist position on Pauline influence, denying it entirely.

He asserted, "One searches… in vain in the *Shepherd* for traces of Pauline influence." And then

he explicitly reminded readers that the various references to what became canonical literature in

his commentary "…do nothing but mention some parallel passages, without imposing the idea of

---

[96] Ibid., 19. Snyder does not attribute the alleged "error" to any particular scholar.
[97] Ibid., 163-64. Snyder nowhere stated what counted for him as an allusion or how he determined the existence of one. However, sometimes the passages listed in the index appear parenthetically in the English translation and notes without an accompanying "cf.," which might indicate that Snyder viewed certain allusions as stronger or more probable than others.
[98] Ibid., 84.
[99] Ibid., 14.

conscious quotation or direct use."[100] Ironically, the *Biblia Patristica* project would later

disregard his caveats and list the references in Joly's 1958 edition as allusions in the *Shepherd* to

particular Pauline texts (1 Cor 7:39-40, Eph 3:9, 4:4, 6:13).[101] Nevertheless, the implication of

Joly's reminder is clear. At best, Joly thought, Hermas might have been unconsciously

employing Pauline material, but for him even that was not an indication of the apostle's

influence. Influence required conscious engagement with specific texts.

Roughly a decade later, in 1976 Siegfried Schulz published a monograph that essentially

retrojected the clash between Catholicism and Protestantism back into early Christian literature

of the first and second centuries.[102] He positioned the *Shepherd* of Hermas and other texts among

the so-called Apostolic Fathers within what he constructed as the broad stream of literature that

followed and Catholicized (i.e., corrupted) the pristine presentation of the true gospel by Paul in

his authentic letters.[103] According to Schulz, Hermas "was a prophet *sui generis*… who took the

---

[100] "On cherche aussi en vain, dans *le Pasteur*, des traces d'une influence paulinienne…
Rappelons donc que les références, dans la traduction, à la littérature canonique, références
traditionnelles des éditions du Pasteur, ne font que mentionner des passages parallèles, sans
imposer l'idée d'une citation consciente ou d'une exploitation directe" (*Hermas Le Pasteur*, 2nd
rev. ed., SC 53 [*bis*] [Paris: Cerf, 1968], 415). In defense of this claim, Joly cited Benoît and von
Campenhausen but did not engage any scholars proposing an alternative position: André Benoît,
*Le baptême chrétien au second siècle: La théologie des pères*, EHPR 43 (Paris: Presses
Universitaires de France, 1953), 133, 137; Hans von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und
geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, BHT 14 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953), 155.
Surprisingly, Joly did not engage Aleith.
[101] J. Allenbach et al., eds., *Biblia patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la
littérature patristique* Vol. 1: *Des origines à Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullien* (Paris: Éditions
du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975), 457, 493, 498; Joly's edition is identified
as the source for the entries on the *Shepherd* on p. 35. These entries, and one of them in
particular (1 Cor 7:39-40 / *Mand* 4.4.1-2), would go on to influence Rensberger's treatment of
the subject. See pp. 102-03 below.
[102] Schulz, *Mitte der Schrift*.
[103] Ibid., 355-70.

prophets' ancient cry for repentance but with an early Catholic alteration."[104] Schulz found "no

evidence of an examination of Paul or even a positive influence" of the apostle or letters

associated with him in the *Shepherd*.[105] And yet Schulz still did find Hermas clearly reflecting an

"irreconcilable opposition to Paul," largely predicated on the alleged depiction of salvation

through works not faith.[106] This is but one element in Schulz's broader depiction of the *Shepherd*

as reflecting a legalistic religion ("Gesetzreligion").[107] According to Schulz, "It really cannot be

said in a clearer *or more un-Pauline manner*: Only by means of the law and rigorous fulfillment

of it does a devout person obtain salvation" in Hermas's thinking.[108] For Schulz, "Pauline"

primarily meant antinomian. It meant other things too, because Schulz further contended that

Hermas knew nothing of Paul's distinctive notions of being enslaved to flesh, the power of sin,

the antithesis between flesh and spirit, the eschatological power shift occurring in baptism,

spiritual gifts, apocalyptic, or prophecy.[109] Here we see that Schulz discovered a lack of apostolic

influence upon Hermas based on what he saw as the absence of purportedly primary features of

Pauline theology. And yet, for Schulz, even what one *does* find in Hermas's writing — e.g., the

idea of a second repentance — likewise counted as indication of the absence of Pauline

---

[104] Ibid., 356: "Er war also ein Prophet *sui generis*... Denn er hat zwar den alten Bußruf der Propheten aufgenommen, aber in frühkatholischer Modifizierung" (italics added).

[105] Ibid., 357: "Von einer Auseinandersetzung mit Paulus oder gar von positiven Einflüssen seiner Rechtfertigungsbotschaft ist im gesamten Buch des Hermas nichts mehr zu spüren."

[106] Ibid., 358: "Der unüberbrückbare Gegensatz zu Paulus ist deutlich… Hermas verkündigt unverdrossen die Werkgerechtigkeit..., während ihm die paulinische Glaubensgerechtigkeit verschlossen bleibt."

[107] Ibid.: "Wie jede Gesetzreligion, so hält auch Hermas gegen Paulus unbeirrt am freien Willen des Frommen fest."

[108] Ibid., 359: "Deutlicher *und unpaulinischer* kann es nun wirklich nicht mehr gesagt werden: Nur auf dem Wege des Gesetzes und der strikten Gesetzeserfüllung erlange der Fromme sein Heil" (emphasis added).

[109] Ibid., 359, 360, 363, 366.

influence.[110] Schulz's project, animated by his aim of returning to what he viewed as the ancient, authentic form of (Pauline) Christianity, depicted the *Shepherd* as representative of anti-Pauline early Catholicism, whose legacy endures and which must be abandoned in the modern period. His approach thus bifurcated the literature of the period into either and only Pauline or anti-Pauline (i.e., early Catholic).

Ernst Dassmann's 1979 monograph on the influence of Paul in authors prior to Irenaeus engaged the witness of the *Shepherd* at some length.[111] He concluded, "[Hermas] seems not to be influenced by Pauline theology. What has been detected as literary or material contact with the Pauline letters is at any rate not enough to be able to assuredly maintain a dependence."[112] Dassmann did admit certain verbal overlaps between the *Shepherd* and Pauline letters (e.g., on remarriage in 1 Cor, as well as the Ephesian unity formula). But he attributed these overlaps to authors' merely discussing the same topics or to Hermas's having written such an extensive text that "reverberations of apostolic testimony" were unavoidable.[113] Ultimately, Dassmann ascribed what he termed the absence ("Ausfall") of Pauline tradition in the *Shepherd* not to antipathy or ignorance but to the constraints of the apocalyptic genre.[114] "Hermas," he argued, "wrote about what he as a prophet beheld — he did not quote what he as a reader read about in letters and

---

[110] Ibid., 360.

[111] Dassmann, *Der Stachel im Fleisch*, 226-31.

[112] Ibid., 227: "…er weder Paulus oder Paulusbriefe erwähnt, noch von paulinischer Theologie beeinflußt zu sein scheint. Was an literarischen oder sachlichen Berührungen mit den paulinischen Briefen festgestellt worden ist, reicht jedenfalls nicht aus, um eine Abhängigkeit sicher behaupten zu können."

[113] Ibid., 227-28; the quote ("Nachwirkungen des apostolischen Zeugnisses") is from p. 228.

[114] That the apocalyptic genre of the *Shepherd* necessarily constrained the manner in which Hermas could have engaged his sources was recognized at least as early as Charles Taylor, "The Didache Compared with the Shepherd of Hermas," *JP* 18 (1890): 324, but this seems to have had little effect on the way in which scholars typically have hunted for traces of influence in the tripartite work.

books."[115] But this polarization between being a prophetic visionary and being a reader is belied

by Revelation and other apocalypses, including the *Shepherd* itself, in which the elderly Lady

exhorts Hermas as a mediator of the divine message to read his copy of her little book to others,

as discussed in Chapter 1 (*Vis*. 2.4.3 [8.3]).[116]

At roughly the same time as Dassmann, Andreas Lindemann engaged the *Shepherd* in his

study of second-century Paulinism. He suggested that "[t]he reconstruction of the image of Paul

sketched in individual writings is, methodologically, relatively unproblematic."[117] The method

that Lindemann used had two steps: (1) identify which ideas are *explicitly* connected with the

apostle, and then (2) assign these putatively Pauline ideas to (a) direct knowledge of his own

writings, (b) early tradition, or (c) later legends.[118] Although he focused on finding direct use of

Pauline letters, Lindemann was one of the few scholars to recognize that in theory it is still

possible to speak of "conscious reception of Paul" ("bewußte Paulusrezeption") even in cases

other than direct knowledge or use of the letters.[119] By employing his bipartite method,

Lindemann found that "[h]ere and there in *Hermas* formulations that are reminiscent of ideas of

---

[115] Dassmann, *Der Stachel im Fleisch*, 228: "Hermas schreibt, was er als Prophet geschaut, er zitiert nicht, was er als Lehrer in Schriften und Büchern gelesen hat." Here Dassmann was following Leslie W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), 163, albeit poorly summarized. According to Barnard, "Hermas is no theologian and what theology there is in his book is confused. *We cannot visualize him pondering the Epistle to the Romans* or finding solace in the thought of a Tertullian or a Cyprian. He was essentially a visionary and prophet who sought to express, sometimes in quaint language, what he had 'seen'" (ibid.; emphasis added). Barnard did not justify his inability to imagine Hermas "pondering" Romans, but it is arguably an extension of his view regarding Hermas's alleged inability to think in a theologically sophisticated manner rather than an assessment of the historical likelihood that Hermas somehow had access to Paul's letter(s).

[116] See pp. 41-47 above, esp. pp. 43-44.

[117] Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 15: "Die Rekonstruktion des in den einzelnen Schriften entworfenen Paulusbildes ist methodisch verhältnismäßig unproblematisch."

[118] Ibid.

[119] Ibid., 18-19.

Pauline theology do turn up."[120] Three were particularly important; others exist but were likely

accidental.[121] First was the striking correspondence between the Shepherd's teaching on

remarriage after the death of a spouse in *Mand*. 4.4.1-2. Lindemann found it hard to deny that

here Hermas likely was thinking about 1 Cor 7:39-40.[122] In making this observation, Lindemann

acknowledged how astonishing it was that "the Shepherd… 'reveals' to Hermas a piece of

Pauline paraenesis," presumably because this is the strongest piece of counter-evidence

challenging his overall conclusion.[123] Of course, Lindemann argued, Hermas need not

necessarily have known that this paraenesis was in fact Pauline, the implication being that he

could very well have (or likely?) integrated it unwittingly.[124] Second was the description of

baptism in *Sim*. 9.16.2-4, which Lindemann suggested "brings to mind Rom 6 and Eph 2,"

especially the latter.[125] However, he concluded, given that the passage "lacks a christological

aspect… the tradition-historical connection with Eph 2 is *no longer conscious*."[126] Third was

Hermas's passing statement that "some have died, but some are still living" (*Vis*. 3.5.1 [13.1]).

Lindemann thought this made no sense at all in context and so was "an *echo* of the Pauline

---

[120] Ibid., 288: "Im Herm finden sich vereinzelt Formulierungen, die an Gedanken der paulinischen Theologie erinnern."

[121] The list of additional agreements ("Übereinstimmung") that Lindemann detected between the Pauline corpus and the *Shepherd* appears at ibid., 286. "But in all of these cases," he argued, "the partial verbal correspondences happened by accident" ("In allen diesen Fällen beruhen die z.T. wörtlichen Analogien aber wohl auf Zufall").

[122] Ibid., 284.

[123] Ibid.: "…obwohl es natürlich eine im ersten Augenblick überraschende Vorstellung ist, daß ὁ ποίμην, ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς μετανοίας... dem Hermas ein Stück paulinischer Paränese 'offenbart.'"

[124] Ibid., 285.

[125] Ibid.: "Das hier vorgetragene Taufverständnis erinnert an Röm 6, vor allem aber an Eph 2."

[126] Ibid., 286: "Im Herm sim IX 16,2f fehlt der christologische Aspekt, was wohl dafür spricht, daß der traditionsgeschichtliche Zusammenhang mit Eph 2 *nicht mehr bewußt* ist" (emphasis added).

formulation in 1 Cor 15:6," indicating that Hermas "*seems* to have known 1 Cor 15:3-7."[127]

"But," he immediately added, indeed without explanation, "it is probably not a 'quotation' or

*even a conscious allusion*."[128] In the end, Lindemann concluded, "[T]he author of *Hermas knew*

Pauline letters, especially 1 Cor; at any rate, several formulations suggest this assumption. But he

did not really '*use*' the Pauline letters — in contrast to the Gospels — in the composition of his

text."[129] Stated differently, according to Lindemann the *Shepherd* indicates "no [conscious] use

of the Pauline letters and the absence of Pauline theology."[130] And so for Lindemann there was

insufficient evidence in the *Shepherd* to support claims that its author was either (a) positively

influenced *by* Paul or (b) explicitly critical *of* Paul;[131] he likewise denied that Hermas was even

*implicitly* anti-Pauline, if by that one means implicitly opposed to Paul *as apostle*.[132] In the end,

Lindemann's conclusion is clear: Hermas knew Pauline tradition, admittedly, but he did not

knowingly use it.

---

[127] Ibid.: "Eigenartig ist jedoch die Bemerkung, die einen seien gestorben, die anderen lebten noch. Da diese Bemerkung im Kontext überhaupt keinen Sinn hat, liegt m.E. die Vermutung nahe, daß es sich um einen Nachklang der paulinischen Formulierung von 1 Kor 15,6 handelt — d.h. der Vf des Herm *scheint* 1 Kor 15,3-7 gekannt zu haben" (emphasis added).
[128] Ibid.: "Um ein 'Zitat' oder *auch nur um eine bewußte Anspielung* handelt es sich aber wohl nicht" (emphasis added).
[129] Ibid., 289: "Der Vf des Herm wird paulinische Briefe, insbesondere 1 Kor, gekannt haben; zumindest legen einige Formulierungen diese Annahme nahe. Er hat die paulinischen Briefe - im Unterschied zu den Evangelien - aber bei der Abfassung seiner Schrift nicht wirklich '*benutzt*'" (emphasis added).
[130] Ibid., 290: "Die Nichtbenutzung der paulinischen Briefe und das Fehlen der paulinischen Theologie."
[131] Ibid. On the problem of construing literary relations solely in terms of "continuity" (i.e., influenced by) or "discontinuity" (i.e., critical of) and the mediating potential of the notion of "correction," see Margaret M. Mitchell, "Corrective Composition, Corrective Exegesis: The Teaching on Prayer in 1 Tim 2,1-15," in *1 Timothy Reconsidered*, ed. Karl P. Donfried, MRB; BÖA 18 (Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 44 n. 14.
[132] Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 284. Lindemann was following Zahn, *Hirt*, 418.

In his unpublished Yale dissertation, completed two years after Lindemann's monograph appeared, David Rensberger also sought to track the use of Paul's letters in the second century C.E.[133] He offered a history of the letters as, so his thesis went, an increasingly engaged and recognized collection of authoritative writings. His investigation targeted overt use of letters written by Paul or in his name, the chief indicator of which he took to be explicit citation, not merely tacit allusion.[134] Rensberger aimed to discover a particular kind of use, which he labeled "direct acquaintance with [Paul's] letters."[135] By this he meant an author's *reading them* and then *consciously integrating material from them* in his own literary production.[136] He was uninterested in (and intentionally avoided) "possible vague reminiscence[s]," whose detection and analysis he thought to be too subjective.[137] Clearly, Rensberger's method precluded some sorts of possible influence from consideration, indeed by intention. In order to reduce the effects of subjectivity, Rensberger employed the *Biblia Patristica* as the barometer of reading and conscious integration, which of course merely reproduced the limited data in Joly's edition of 1958.[138] In the end, Rensberger distilled only *one* candidate for possible use of Pauline letters by Hermas, even though the *Biblia Patristica* listed five. This one candidate is 1 Cor 7:28, 39-40 in *Mand.* 4.4.1-2; but according to Rensberger it "is very far from certain."[139] And yet even the

---

[133] Rensberger, "As the Apostle Teaches." Rensberger engaged Lindemann on pp. 2 n. 2, 48-53; he had access to both Lindemann's Göttingen *Habilitationsschrift* (iii) as well as the published version.

[134] Ibid., i; references to these two heuristic categories can be found through Rensberger's dissertation. Rensberger purportedly sought evidence for both the authentic and pseudepigraphic letters, although not Hebrews (58).

[135] Ibid., 60.

[136] Ibid., 2, 60.

[137] Ibid., 59; similarly, 339.

[138] Ibid. See the discussion of Joly's edition and *Biblia Patristica* on pp. 95-96 above.

[139] Ibid., 84.

original *NTAF* project considered this a quotation and ranked it (b) "probable." By comparison, Rensberger's position, largely attributable to Joly's edition but exhibiting an even greater skepticism, seems extremely minimalist. To be sure, Rensberger admitted that language at multiple places in *Sim.* 9 was similar to the unity formulae of Eph 4:3-6, but he attributed the similarities to the "use of traditional formulaic language."[140] Ultimately, Rensberger concluded that "[Hermas's] treatment of Paul is merely a feature of [his] general usage [of books], and tells us nothing one way or the other about his opinion of the Apostle and his letters."[141] This statement suggests that Rensberger was open, at least in theory, to possible Pauline influence upon Hermas, but given the strictures of his method, he ended up with little data to assess. This purported absence of significant data, coupled with Hermas's atypical manner of engaging his sources, enabled Rensberger to avoid conceding the *Shepherd* as counter-evidence to his discovery of "the trend… toward greater and more explicit use of the Pauline epistles as time went on."[142] At the same time, Rensberger imagined Hermas could only have had one opinion about Paul, either pro or con.

A decade after Rensberger, in his massive and enduringly influential commentary on the *Shepherd,* Norbert Brox briefly discussed what he took to be its connection(s) with other early Christian literature.[143] Breaking with much prior scholarship, which he contended was overly confident in its capacity to document the existence of biblical quotations in the *Shepherd*, Brox sought instead to determine "whether its indisputable contacts with contemporaneous literature go beyond the expression of obvious circulating ideas or themes belonging to a common body of

---

[140] Ibid., 84 n. 59. Rensberger labeled these similarities "verbal identities."
[141] Ibid., 84-85; similarly, 332.
[142] Ibid., 332, 358; the quote is from 358.
[143] Brox, *Hirt*, 45-49.

thought and are attributable to the *Shepherd*'s literary relationships with particular texts."[144] The

burden of proof that Brox established for determining what, in our case, is "Pauline" material

versus merely the conceptual "koine" of early Christianity is readily apparent — an exegete must

prove direct, literary dependence or else be satisfied with common, presumably oral, tradition as

the source of Hermas's thinking.[145] He thus turned the (contestable) assumption that direct

literary dependence alone can prove influence into a methodological mandate. Brox found

Hermas to exhibit "an *irritatingly loose* approach to his sources, which he allows to disappear

behind his own manipulation and alteration";[146] he also described this authorial approach as

"*imprecise* and *indiscriminate*."[147] Despite Hermas's allegedly careless approach, Brox still

determined that the *Shepherd* contained "reminiscences" of Ephesians, themselves presumably a

weaker form of use than allusion and quotation.[148] His conclusion assumes that the only

alternative to (a) verifiable quotation of or allusion to particular texts is (b) unverifiable memory

of broader ones. In the end, Brox's conclusion was clear. Any "overlaps" ("Überschneidungen")

---

[144] Ibid., 45: "In der Diskussion darum geht es also nicht mehr um die Frage, ob man Zitate im PH... identifizieren kann, sondern darum, ob die unbestrittenen Berührungen des 'Hirten' mit zeitgenössischer Literatur über den Niederschlag naheliegender umlaufender Ideen oder Motive eines verbreiteten Gedankengutes hinausgehen und auf literarische Beziehungen des PH zu den jeweiligen Schriften zurückzuführen sind."

[145] Brox's binary construal was explicitly followed by Juan José Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, FP 6 (Madrid: Editorial Ciudad Nueva, 1995), 27-28, according to whom recent scholarship has favored Hermas's influence by oral traditions that were common at Rome.

[146] Brox, *Hirt*, 47: "Erstens praktiziert H einen irritierend freien Umgang mit seinen Quellen, die er hinter seiner eigenen Verarbeitung und Veränderung verschwinden läßt." In support of this statement, Brox cited Taylor, "Didache Compared," 325. But nowhere in that article did Taylor state anything that would conceivably support Brox's harsh statement that Hermas's approach to his sources was "*irritatingly* loose," an obviously evaluative judgment. To the contrary, Taylor's conclusion to his article gives the impression of admiration, not frustration (esp. pp. 324-25). Elsewhere, Taylor did describe the *Shepherd* as "an incompletely worked mine of allusions" (*Witness of Hermas*, v), which could imply deficiency, but Brox did not engage that statement.

[147] Brox, *Hirt*, 48: "ungenauen und wahllosen Gebrauch der Quellen."

[148] Ibid.

between the *Shepherd* and other early Christian literature are due to common tradition, not direct use.[149]

In her Hermeneia commentary of 1999, Carolyn Osiek aptly recognized that "[t]he attempt to determine literary sources for *Hermas* has been long and frustrating."[150] So instead of testing direct literary influence, as was common in prior scholarship, Osiek argued "it is wiser to speak of general allusions and literary parallels."[151] On the one hand, Osiek concluded, "There are no *explicit* allusions or quotations from… Pauline writings."[152] But on the other hand, at various points in her commentary she came close to arguing for Pauline influence construed in the traditional mode. For example, Osiek suggested that at least one aspect of Hermas's teaching, namely on remarriage after death of a spouse being permissible but not ideal, "follows closely that of Paul."[153] Another, his passing mention of justification, had a "peculiarly Pauline ring."[154] Furthermore, Osiek hypothesized that Hermas might have felt forced to mention two forms of grief because of their being well known from Paul (2 Cor 7:10).[155] She also found at least one "*near*-quotation" of a Pauline letter, even though she did not explain why the phrase in question — "think the same things" (τὰ αὐτὰ φρονεῖν, *Sim*. 9.13.7) — was not an *actual* quotation.[156] And, she argued, one of Hermas's "favorite allusion[s]" was to 1 Thess 5:13.[157] Elsewhere,

---

[149] Ibid., 49.
[150] Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Herm (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999), 24.
[151] Ibid.
[152] Ibid., 26; emphasis added.
[153] Ibid., 116. The relevant passage is *Mand*. 4.4.1-2 [32.1-2]; cf. 1 Cor 7:39-40.
[154] Ibid., 120. The (Pauline) concept is justification by the most holy angel at *Mand*. 5.1.7 [33.7].
[155] Ibid., 137.
[156] Ibid., 236; emphasis added. The phrase τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ("think the same thing"), only slightly different owing to its singular direct object, appears in Rom 12:16, 15:5, 2 Cor 13:11, Phil 2:2, and 4:2.
[157] Ibid., 207; see also 87.

though, even slight differences between the language used by Hermas and by Paul, such as in their respective descriptions of baptism, precluded Osiek from affirming the apostle's influence.[158]

A full century after its initial publication, the Oxford *NTAF* project was revised in 2005. Joseph Verheyden authored the relevant chapter on the *Shepherd*, in which he drew attention to the enduring minimalist trajectory of scholarship on the question of Hermas's "use" of the New Testament. He noted, "when looking at the history of research, one might get the double impression that it reads very much as a dispute between 'believers' and 'disbelievers', and that the latter have won."[159] Yet Verheyden acknowledged what he considered the 1905 Oxford project's methodological constraints:

> The [1905] committee does not speculate too much on how the influence has played, but seems to assume that (in all c rated cases) Hermas was consciously borrowing from or relying upon these writings, whether Hermas actually looked up the relevant passage, or merely had it 'in mind'. The comments illustrate that *it would be unwise to try to explain all of the evidence [of influence] from one and the same perspective*. That certainly is the main reason why the committee is hesitant to extrapolate the relatively assured conclusions that it has reached for some of the parallels, and one sees it literally struggling in some of its comments to restrain itself from a more "confident" defence [*sic*] of the dependence hypothesis. *A major problem with the approach is that the lists that are drawn up invite one to discuss the evidence in an atomistic way*. There is a real danger that one concentrates (almost) exclusively on particular verses, phrases, or even words, while little or no attention is given to the larger context or to the function the paralleled material plays in the *Shepherd*'s composition.[160]

With his rejection of attempts "to explain all of the evidence [of influence] from one and the same perspective," Verheyden posited the possibility of Pauline influence even in cases where

---

[158] E.g., ibid., 238: "[t]he language of death is similar to Pauline language but is not exactly the same" at *Sim*. 9.16.1-4 [93.1-4].
[159] Verheyden, "Shepherd of Hermas," 296.
[160] Ibid., 304-05 (emphasis added).

Hermas did not read part of a letter himself. Thus, Verheyden implicitly rejected the need to prove influence on the basis of direct literary dependence alone. However, he also rejected it explicitly. "[F]ormal quotations are not the only way to make use of written sources," he argued, "even though the evidence that can be cited in this respect must necessarily always remain 'circumstantial' to some degree."[161] Verheyden also denied that influence could only be established exclusively from a discrete source. This is apparent from his criticism of atomistic approaches that focus on "particular verses, phrases, or even words" divorced from their broader function in context, which he presumably thought could help establish plausible influence. Given these identified methodological and interpretive weaknesses, Verheyden still considered the NT's influence on Hermas to be an open question. "Should it all end like this?" he asked. "I hope it does not, if only because nothing can be gained from no longer studying the evidence."[162] After issuing this call to arms, which my project seeks to answer, Verheyden himself explored new avenues for Hermas's interaction with Pauline tradition by analyzing the "remarkable parallels" between *Mand*. 4.4.1-8 and 1 Cor 7:10-11, 28.[163] He found Hermas to "agree" with Paul on particular points but also to "go beyond" him as well.[164] He concluded: "Hermas is in full agreement with Paul's teaching. But perhaps more important still than the agreement on the praxis is the agreement in the way the argument is formulated. Remarrying is allowed, but refraining from it is 'better'… Moreover, Paul and Hermas agree in qualifying the rule in terms of 'sinning.'"[165] These conceptual agreements, and the form of Hermas's argument on

---

[161]  Ibid., 323.
[162]  Ibid., 322.
[163]  Ibid., 322-29; the quote is from p. 324.
[164]  Ibid., 325-26.
[165]  Ibid., 326.

remarriage in particular, led Verheyden to the conclusion that it is plausible that Hermas "effectively made use" of 1 Cor, although he readily admitted that some scholars would likely demand more — if not a different kind of — evidence in order to be persuaded.[166]

In his 2010 monograph *The Making of Paul*, Richard Pervo sought to avoid a bipolar distinction between an author's potentially being only Pauline or anti-Pauline by positing a spectrum of possible attitudes toward the apostle. He briefly engaged the question of Pauline influence upon Hermas, correctly recognizing the author of the *Shepherd* as one of those writers who do not name but instead "are silent about Paul."[167] Pervo's list of such authors appears within a chapter on "representatives of anti-Paulinism," possibly suggesting that he took Hermas to reflect an anti-Pauline stance like that presumed to be common in so-called Jewish-Christianity.[168] And yet, according to Pervo, "Silence is, in general, not a valid ground for assuming animosity toward Paul, unless it is supported by other factors. Those who neither name Paul nor appropriate aspects of his theology *may* have had negative views of the apostle, but this thesis cannot be assumed."[169] Following Rensberger, Verheyden, and authors, Pervo determined it was "relatively certain" that Hermas knew 1 Corinthians.[170] But, he suggested, "[g]iven [Hermas's] techniques, both his silence about Paul and some use of his letters are

---

[166] Ibid., 329.

[167] Pervo, *Making of Paul*, 192. This is the title of the subsection on pp. 192-98.

[168] Ibid., 187-98; i.e., Chapter 5. Pervo linked anti-Paulinism with "Jewish Christianity" on p. 187.

[169] Ibid., 187 (emphasis original).

[170] Ibid., 192; see the bibliography on 347 n. 38. He also noted the essay by John Muddiman, "The Church in Ephesians, *2 Clement*, and the *Shepherd of Hermas*," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 107-21, but did not engage it or state whether he was convinced by its claims.

unremarkable";[171] in other words, Pervo argued, the absence of explicit engagement with Pauline letters fits Hermas's broader pattern of not quoting [i.e., citing] authoritative texts.[172] As time went on, particularly by the mid-second century, Pervo's overall argument claimed, it became increasingly unlikely that a Christian author could have been ignorant of the Pauline legacy.[173] Ultimately, though, in the case of Hermas Pervo apparently could not find enough evidence to make a determination either way. The *Shepherd* finds no place among anti-Pauline texts on Pervo's "Pauline Family Tree."[174] Then again, it finds no place anywhere on the tree at all.

Most recently of all, Clayton Jefford included the *Shepherd* in his analysis of early Christian texts typically thought to reflect the absence of Pauline influence.[175] Jefford contended that the problem is not as simple as scholars have long taken it to be and compiled a short list of parallels in the *Shepherd* to Paul's letter to Christ-believers at Rome.[176] He correctly observed that "though *Hermas* does not appeal directly to the authority of Paul or to the distinction of his correspondence, there is much reliance on Pauline terminology and phraseology that is not likely coincidental."[177] Ultimately, Jefford suggested that the "passive approach to Pauline teachings"

---

[171] Pervo, *Making of Paul*, 192.
[172] Ibid.
[173] Ibid., 187-88.
[174] Ibid., 241-44. Note the appropriate caveat on p. 241: "No diagram of this type can begin to comprehend the complexity of the situation… A better approach would portray a number of 'trajectories' intersecting at various points, but this diagram may nevertheless provide helpful orientation to early understandings of Paul."
[175] Jefford, "Missing Pauline Tradition?", esp. 49-52, 59.
[176] Ibid., 50.
[177] Ibid., 51. He goes on to say, "The concentration of such language throughout the whole of the writing (and not only in individual tropes or pericopae)… suggests that some more conscious employment is at work in the mind of the author, and consideration of this aspect implies that the text falls within the broader spectrum of the apostle's influence" (ibid.).

in the *Shepherd* might reflect "an anti-Marcionite bias."[178] Stated somewhat differently, Hermas

"may have wished to avoid the influence of Marcion and his followers and thereby chose to

avoid direct reference to Paul in the process."[179] This hypothetical explanation for the lack of

overt reference to Pauline letters, although intriguing, does not account for the likely

composition of at least the earliest *strata* of the *Shepherd* at Rome prior to 140 C.E., the year that

Marcion arrived there.[180]


Summary

Regarding Hermas's potential influence by or engagement with the emerging Pauline legacy,

these scholarly treatments of the problem run the gamut from openness to outright opposition.

Prior investigations have typically recognized that Hermas knew at least a part of 1 Corinthians

and/or Ephesians. However, more often than not this recognition functions as a concession to the

over-arching view that Hermas did not engage these or other Pauline letters to any meaningful

degree. On this point, Verheyden's determination that the "disbelievers" have won is accurate.[181]

---

[178] Jefford, "Missing Pauline Tradition?," 52.

[179] Ibid., 59. On this point, Jefford acknowledges that he follows Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 282-90.

[180] Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, ed. Marshall D. Johnson, trans. Michael Steinhauser (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003), 244.

[181] Verheyden, "Shepherd of Hermas," 296. The disbelievers' generally skeptical view is rarely opposed. Clare Rothschild has contended that the author of the *Shepherd* probably knew Hebrews and tried to refute its notion of only one opportunity for repentance (cf. *Mand*. 4.3.1-2, Heb 6:4-6); see *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*, WUNT I 235 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 30, 33 nn. 83, 141. According to Rothschild, "Although it cannot be said with certainty, this testimony [i.e., that underlying *Mand*. 4.3.1-2] probably witnesses disagreement in Rome over Hebrews' teaching against second repentance from which, again, we may infer its ordinary usage" (ibid., 30). A more cautious statement of this possibility was put forward by William Coleborne, albeit without reference to the question of Hebrews and the *corpus Paulinum*: "…the Mandates/Similitudes…

In my judgment, though, this victory is largely obtained via an unduly atomistic method that

over-emphasizes the fact that Hermas does not formally cite what becomes the *corpus Paulinum*.

To the contrary, I argue that if Hermas knew one Pauline letter, as virtually all scholars admit,

and especially if he knew two, then it means he had access to a *corpus Paulinum* in some

manner, which itself makes it probable that Pauline influence upon him was even more

considerable.[182]

The trajectory of modern scholarship on the question of Hermas and the Pauline legacy

reflects the inertia and inheritance of the Tübingen school. According to its construal of our

problem and consequent historical reconstruction, the (supposedly) Jewish-Christian Hermas

could not possibly have cared about the (supposedly) anti-Jewish Paul. Such a position can be

traced back into the 1850s in the work of Adolf von Hilgenfeld. His stringent rejection of

substantial Pauline influence upon Hermas has governed much subsequent scholarship.[183] The

---

could well be an answer to the rigorism of Hebrews" ("A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas," *Colloq* 3 [1969]: 140-41; the quote is from p. 141). Grant was less certain than Rothschild and even Coleborne in his assessment: "The teachers [Hermas mentions] may well have been relying on Hebrews (6:4-6)… but Hermas probably does not know the book" (Grant, *Formation*, 63).

[182] A similar two-part point is made by Mitchell with respect to knowledge of a *corpus Paulinum* by the author of James ("The Letter of James as a Document of Paulinism?," in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James*, ed. Robert L. Webb and John S. Kloppenborg, LNTS [London: T&T Clark, 2007], 88). The claim rests upon the recognition that "…there is no evidence in ancient Christianity of individual letters… circulating beyond their recipient communities in published form outside of some collection of the *corpus Paulinum*" (79). Similarly, Jack Finegan, "The Original Form of the Pauline Collection," *HTR* 49 (1956): 85. Grant made a comparable point with particular reference to the *Shepherd*, implying that if Hermas knew Ephesians he would have known other Pauline letters too (*Formation*, 75).

[183] The influence of Hilgenfeld's position can be traced through, among others, the following scholars: R. A. Lipsius, "Der Hirte des Hermas und der Montanismus in Rom," *ZWT* 8 (1865): 275; Ernst Hückstädt, *Der Lehrbegriff des Hirten: Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des zweiten Jahrhunderts* (Anklam: A. Schmidt, 1889), 6-7, esp. 6 n. 7; Charles Bigg, *The Origins of*

negative position solidified with the appearance of the Oxford *NTAF* project in 1905, whose

governing minimalist methodology has held sway even to the present day.[184] The history of

scholarship also reflects the staying power and gravitational pull of Reformation debates and

polemics. These have typically rooted the "true" Paul and by extension Paulinism itself in

particular identifiable "Pauline" concerns, such as justification by faith and antinomianism.

Furthermore, they frequently operated with a view of ancient Christianity that included a strong

concern for combatting an "early Catholicism" — and by extension an anti-Paulinism —

putatively centered in Rome, as well as the indisputable assumption that James and Hermas with

him were opposed to the emerging Pauline legacy. These collective assumptions, all of which in

my judgment are contestable, inevitably and necessarily generate a negative response to the

question of Pauline influence upon Hermas that is at odds with the earliest traditions of the

church, as I showed at the beginning of this chapter. Since this is the case, should the matter not

be reconsidered anew *in toto*?

As I have already discussed, in his contribution to the 2005 revision of the *NTAF* project,

Joseph Verheyden said that he hoped scholarly discussion of Hermas's possible engagement with

texts eventually collected in the New Testament would not end with "believers" pitted against

"disbelievers."[185] After Verheyden, I ask, Can we move beyond the categories of scholarly

---

*Christianity*, ed. T. B. Strong (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 72-84, esp. 81; Theodore Dierks, *Reconciliation and Justification* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1938), esp. 119; Thomas F. Torrance, "The *Shepherd* of Hermas," in *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948), 111-25, esp. 117; Schulz, *Mitte der Schrift*, 358-61; and Charles J. Guth, "The Relationship of Faith and Works in the Soteriologies of the Apostolic Fathers" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1994), 276-307.

[184] Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Study, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*.

[185] Verheyden, "Shepherd of Hermas," 322.

"belief" and "disbelief" into "plausibility" in investigating the *Shepherd* and the *corpus Paulinum*?[186], And, following Jefford's recent short inquiry, I ask further, Is it not likely the case that Hermas was much more strongly and demonstrably influenced by Pauline letters than the history of scholarship suggests? In order to prepare for the argument presented in Chapters 3 through 5, where I aim for plausibility, I now present a more supple methodology for engaging the literary-historical question of Pauline influence upon the *Shepherd* of Hermas that admits the possibility of more solutions than the false dichotomies that have animated much previous scholarship allow.

## READING STRATEGY

### Dominant Quotation and Allusion-Based Reading Strategies

Ancient texts may have been influenced by or otherwise connected to earlier ones, but proving such influence or connection is both difficult and contentious, as the preceding analysis of scholarship has showed. Scholars of biblical and early Christian studies often mine texts for allusions and echoes, which are commonly thought to indicate the influence or dependence of one text upon another and also to establish authority and hence canonicity.[187] Perhaps most influential among the earliest biblical scholars to employ an explicitly intertextual reading

---

[186] Verheyden himself aimed for plausibility too. "Finally," he asks, "does all this make it a plausible conclusion (for plausibility rather than certainty is all to which we can aspire) that Hermas effectively made use of the gospel of Matthew and one of Paul's letters to the Corinthians?" (ibid., 329).

[187] Of course, the concepts of "intertextuality" and "echo" are not the exclusive domain of biblical studies. The former was coined by Julia Kristeva in a lecture in the mid-1960s ("Le mot, le dialogue et le roman," in *Sēmeiōtikē: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*, PE 96 [Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969], 82-112). The latter came to prominence partly through the work of Roland Barthes (see, e.g., *S/Z*, PointsLit 70 [Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1970]).

strategy was Richard Hays. In his influential 1989 monograph *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, he proposed seven criteria by which to assess the plausibility of intertextual echoes in scriptural texts.[188] Over the past twenty-five years, numerous scholars have challenged Hays' criteria on various grounds.[189] At least one has called for abandoning altogether the use of purportedly objective, scientific criteria for determining allusions and echoes.[190] Nevertheless, criteria themselves are methodologically useful, even as they necessarily lead to both inclusion and exclusion of certain pieces of evidence.

For many decades before Hays published his influential list of criteria for determining intertextual echoes, scholars had sought to uncover the influence of those texts that eventually were collected in the New Testament upon the Apostolic Fathers. The most prominent of such attempts is, as we have seen, that of the 1905 Oxford *NTAF* project. Strategies like that adopted

---

[188] Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29-32. The criteria are (1) availability; (2) volume; (3) recurrence; (4) thematic coherence; (5) historical plausibility; (6) history of interpretation; and (7) satisfaction. These criteria continue to enjoy widespread application in the discipline, especially but not exclusively among Hays' students and their studies of the Pauline letters. A full bibliography of those studies employing a methodology such as the one Hays proposed is beyond the scope of this chapter. But Paul Foster has recognized that "[t]his sub-discipline continues to grow and has become more than a 'cottage industry'. The rapid appearance of studies in this area is more akin to a mechanized production line, with its own methodology and theological agendas" ("Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament," *JSNT* 38 [2015]: 98).

[189] Among other critiques and counter-proposals, see J. C. Beker, "Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 83 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 64-69; Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Methodology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79-96; Foster, "Echoes without Resonance"; Christoph Heilig, *Hidden Criticism? The Methodology and Plausibility of the Search for a Counter-Imperial Subtext in Paul*, WUNT II 392 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 35-46, esp. 42.

[190] Marko Jauhiainen, *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation*, WUNT II 199 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 33-34.

by *NTAF* laudably attempt to establish control over the difficult process of determining the extent of intertextual relationships. And yet, unlike Hays, the original Committee never explicitly articulated how it imagined such relationships to have developed and never defined what it meant by "quotation," "acquaintance," "dependence," and "use."[191] Even so, the structure of the project's tabular presentation — on the left, an alleged "quotation" in an author, and on the right, the corresponding NT text(s) — signaled that its investigation of influence was focused primarily on determining the existence of quotations. This emphasis on finding quotations is confirmed by the first sentence of Drummond's chapter: "The author of the Shepherd of Hermas nowhere supplies us with a *direct quotation* from the Old or New Testament, and we are therefore obliged to fall back upon *allusions* which always admit of some degree of doubt."[192] Drummond clearly constructed the category of allusion as a necessary concession to the reality that Hermas does not formally cite or extensively quote the Old or New Testaments. Given that he does not, all one can hope for, Drummond implied, are allusions.

The 2005 revision of *NTAF* attempted to employ greater precision than its predecessor volume in response to the question of the Apostolic Fathers' "use" of the NT.[193] Its object was the intertextual "reference," defined as "an umbrella term to refer to any apparent *use of one text in another*."[194] Such "apparent use" included *quotations* and *allusions* that were determined on the basis and degree of verbal correspondence. Quotations were defined as "instances in one text

---

[191] Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Study, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, iii-iv.

[192] Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 105 (emphasis added).

[193] Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, "Reflections on Method: What Constitutes the Use of the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers?," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 61-82.

[194] Ibid., 64.

showing a significant degree of verbal identity with the source cited," allusions as "instances containing less verbal identity," and the editors noted possible slippage between them and the category of paraphrase.[195] Consequently, individual contributors were free to define the criteria by which they established the existence of both quotation and allusion, but the goal was still simple and shared, namely to determine and distinguish between "directly literary dependence on, or indirect knowledge, of [NT] texts."[196] The methodological and definitional advancements not withstanding, in the end the 2005 project's target was the same as in 1905.

Decades ago, Kurt Aland correctly recognized that uncovering traces of engagement with the Pauline legacy in the literature of the first half of the second century typically requires a "very refined technique, represented in the image of the watchmaker's magnifying glass and associated tools."[197] In my judgment, a quotation and allusion-based approach like that of both *NTAF* projects, which establishes influence primarily on the basis of verbal "identity," is not a sufficiently refined technique, because it suffers from two major weaknesses. First, such an approach cannot detect where an author like Hermas might have been composing an *expansion* or *modification* of some portion(s) of Paul's letters; by design, it observes only agreement assumed, by Lindemann and others, to signal that an author is pro-Paul. Second, and most problematically, this approach is atomistic, as Verheyden and others have noted, treating

---

[195] Ibid.

[196] Ibid., 69.

[197] Kurt Aland, "Methodische Bemerkungen zum Corpus Paulinum bei den Kirchenvätern des zweiten Jahrhunderts," in *Kerygma und Logos: Beitrage zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum: Festschrift für Carl Andresen zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Adolf Martin Ritter (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979), 31: "Das Auffinden und die Auswertung von Zitaten aus den Paulusbriefen… bedarf bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts einer sehr verfeinerten Methode, im Bilde gesprochen: der Uhrmacherlupe und entsprechender Werkzeuge."

potential pieces of evidence of an author's potential interaction with Pauline tradition in isolation

from each other, divorced from any broader web of thought in which they might be found. It also

disallows aggregative judgments.[198] This necessarily limits the ultimate likelihood that individual

molecules of tradition are in fact Pauline. Such a reading strategy requires the literary historian to

take a "connect the (positive) dots" approach, but application of the method produces very few

dots and cannot draw any connections between them. Given these weaknesses, a new interpretive

approach capable of uncovering the full range of Hermas's potential encounter with those texts

that ultimately were collected in the *corpus Paulinum* is needed.

Recent scholarship has suggested that an authoritative set of data demonstrating the so-

called use of "Paul" in the second century is already established. For example, Benjamin White

has dismissed the need to offer "a compendium of uses of Paul in the second century," because

in his view "the data are now widely available."[199] I admit that the data are "available" in the

sense that they exist in the primary sources. But *pace* White I vigorously dispute the suggestion

these data are firmly established and generally agreed upon by scholars, in part because I think

that many relevant data have long been overlooked for methodological reasons. In particular, I

shall seek to challenge the foundations of the accepted consensus regarding what evidence

should be considered in investigating the influence of Pauline letters upon Hermas.

---

[198] See the discussion of aggregate evidence, which Verheyden terms "circumstantial" but still valuable, on p. 107 above.

[199] Benjamin White, *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests Over the Image of the Apostle*, 10. According to White, "In providing a new narrative for the rise of Paul, Lindemann, Dassmann, and Rensberger also set out the full range of data on the use of Paul in the second century" (10).

Proposed Reading Strategy

In order to assess the probability of Hermas's engagement with Pauline letters, this study does

seek, at least in principle, verbatim quotations of them in the *Shepherd*. Such quotations would

constitute the clearest or at least the most straightforward evidence for Hermas's use of letters

written by or attributed to Paul and by extension our author's place within the letters' history of

effects. But, in tackling this topic, one should not limit the inquiry to extensive, precise

quotations of "Paul" in the *Shepherd*. Hermas never offers a *formal* quotation (i.e., one with a

citation formula) of any letter authored in Paul's name. One might hope, by contrast, for frequent

*informal* quotations of a *corpus Paulinum*. However, as the 1905 *NTAF* project showed, even

Hermas's informal quotations are both short in length and few in number.[200] But this need not

necessarily imply that Hermas's various visions lack any engagement with the Pauline legacy.

To the contrary, I contend that rigorous study of the possible influence of Pauline letters upon the

author of *Shepherd* should not retreat upon recognizing that Hermas did not cite them formally

and rarely quoted them at significant length; other kinds of supporting evidence besides

quotations should be sought too. This is particularly appropriate given the widely acknowledged

pattern whereby apocalyptic texts rarely contain extensive verbatim quotations, which Hermas's

habit of virtually never citing a previously composed text confirms.

Drummond himself, who authored the chapter on the *Shepherd* in the original *NTAF*

project, realized that Hermas's encounter with canonical Paul could not be fully accounted for in

terms of rote repetition (i.e., quotation) of the letters attributed to the apostle alone. Regarding

what he listed as the highly probable ("b" strength) quotation of Eph 4:30a at various places in

---

[200] Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 105-06 listed only two "probable" quotations of the
Pauline corpus.

*Mand.* 10, Drummond determined, "…it seems likely that Hermas is developing in his own way a phrase that has lodged in his mind."[201] Shortly thereafter, he concluded, "These passages have all the appearance of *being imitated* from Ephesians. It is the way of Hermas not to quote, but to *take suggestions*, and *alter* to suit his own purposes."[202] Drummond's observation that Hermas imitated, took suggestion from, and altered a letter eventually included in the *corpus Paulinum* was groundbreaking.[203] But in the intervening century it has largely been ignored in the scholarly literature, despite the enduring influence of the larger *NTAF* project.

Taking inspiration from Drummond's overlooked observation, this study aims to uncover those additional places where Hermas betrays engagement with the emerging legacy of documents that were eventually collected in the Pauline corpus. In doing so, I reject the assumption that such evidence be strictly categorizable within the quotation-allusion framework in order to count as evidence. So what other data should be considered? Among the other kinds of evidence that could to further evince Hermas's encounter with Pauline letters, I include the following:[204]

---

[201] "Do not grieve God's holy spirit…" (μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, Eph 4:30a).

[202] Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 106 (emphasis added).

[203] Drummond was, to my knowledge, the first scholar to describe Hermas's manner of engaging received literary tradition in this way and then to explicitly connect it with Pauline letters. But others before him had described Hermas's general approach similarly. See, e.g., Zahn, *Hirt*, 452; Taylor, "Didache Compared," 324-25.

[204] This list clearly betrays the influence of Margaret M. Mitchell, both in print and in person. See, e.g., the of various forms of possible evidence of Pauline influence discussed in "James as Document of Paulinism?", esp. 85-92: theological compatibility (83); same vocatives, favored locutions, combination of argument and exhortation, question-and-answer style, theological shorthand expressions (85); constellation of shorthand terms, shorthand locutions (86); concatenation of phrases and content (90); contextual recasting and recombination, combinatory hermeneutic, shared lexical terms (91). On "shorthand references" in particular, including the "brief phrase," "synecdochical reference," and "metaphorical allusion," see Mitchell's prior essay "Rhetorical Shorthand in Pauline Argumentation: The Functions of 'the Gospel' in the

(1) *Coherence* with Pauline literary worldview:
  (a) key *terminology*
  (b) foundational *assumptions* or *narratives*
  (c) nagging *preoccupations*
  (d) *identified problems*
  (e) *solutions* given to identified problems

(2) *Adoption* of Pauline literary phenomena:
  (a) *quotations*, whether brief or extended
  (b) *vocabulary* and *shorthand locutions*, which may or may not strictly be quotations
  (c) *metaphors*
  (d) *theological concepts* and *themes*
  (e) *argumentative structure* and *rhetorical form*

(3) *Adaptation* of Pauline literary phenomena:
  (a) s*ynonyms*
  (b) *conceptual equivalents*
  (c) *expansions*

(4) *Synthesis* of Pauline literary phenomena:
  (a) *connections*
  (b) *harmonizations* of apparently competing concepts
  (c) *clusters* of related concepts

Data like these are typically overlooked — or even explicitly dismissed — by reading strategies that focus on finding verbatim quotations and substantial allusion.[205] And yet considering them to be merely natural, assumed, or in the cultural air that an early Christian author like Hermas breathed can result in easily missing material that has a distinct Pauline pedigree.[206]

---

Corinthian Correspondence," in *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*, ed. L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson, JSNTSup 108 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 63-88, esp. 63-69; the list of labels is from p. 69.

[205] For example, Bauer dismissed what he thought were weak Pauline allusions in the writings of part of Justin Martyr and denied that they indicated a "living relationship with Paul" (*Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 215).

[206] The in-the-air theory can be found in Calvo's commentary. He stated as the scholarly consensus the view that Hermas engaged "expressions and ideas common in the church of Rome," not what became the biblical books themselves (*El Pastor*, 27-28: "…la crítica tiende

This material with a Pauline pedigree was not always adopted wholesale by Hermas. To the contrary, my analysis proceeds from the assumption that Hermas, a Christian seer who considered himself a prophetic transmitter of visions entrusted to him by God, likely felt able — if not actually *led* by God — to engage tradition loosely in a manner that at times deviated from but still did not threaten its authority.[207] *Pace* the group of scholarly "disbelievers" identified by Verheyden, it is possible to uncover evidence of engagement with a *corpus Paulinum* in a methodologically refined way, even within a text like the *Shepherd*, which underwent a process of oral expansion and revision, as discussed in Chapter 1. And so I shall closely attune my ear to the dynamism of these two collections of "living texts," rather than dismissing the very possibility of Hermas's encountering Pauline letters by selecting an interpretive method incapable of revealing such an encounter.

As I shall show in Chapters 3 through 5, in composing the *Shepherd* Hermas reveals himself to be impacted by particular Pauline themes and ideas, even as he does not aim primarily to engage them directly or quote them at length. Hermas thus joins other early Christian authors who were, according to Robert Grant, "concerned not with the letter but with the spirit of [authoritative] texts."[208] Stated differently, it is generally unrealistic to imagine Hermas sitting with copies of Pauline letters rolled out before him, copiously and carefully engaging these

---

hoy a pensar no tanto en uso consciente de los libros bíblicos cuanto en el testimonio de expresiones y pensamientos comunes en la iglesia de Roma por la influencia de aquéllos").

[207] On this phenomenon among second-century Christians more broadly, see Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the* Corpus Paulinum, SLBA (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 268: "The reliance of the believers upon the continuing action of the Spirit easily led them to disregard the letter; where the two appeared to be at variance, the urge to interpolate what was felt to be true was not always resisted. Hence we find not only a general looseness of quotation but also… free variations."

[208] Grant, *Formation*, 120. For a direct challenge to this idea, see Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 17, who considers it "sicher zu optimistisch."

written *Urtext(e)* at length and in minute detail. This is the case particularly because Hermas purportedly aimed to provide a written account of his ecstatic encounters with divine intermediaries within the broad constraints of the apocalyptic genre. Therefore, one should not hope to find in the *Shepherd* much of what is usually taken to be the best sort of evidence for knowledge of or direct literary influence by a prior text (i.e., verbatim quotations), if by "direct literary influence" is meant the narrowly conceived process of one author reading a physical copy of another's work and carefully integrating unaltered portions of it into her own. Indeed, tackling the problem of Hermas and "Paul" with a method like that employed by the original *NTAF* project or its progeny would fail to address the implications of recent advances in the study of early Christian literature and Paulinism in particular. These advances force us to grapple with the presumably *aural* nature of Hermas's encounter(s) with documents ultimately collected in the *corpus Paulinum* and the way in which his tripartite text likely underwent a back-and-forth process of *oral* (re-)presentation, as well as the convoluted complexity that marked second-century Paulinism.[209] These phenomena need not render Hermas's meaningful encounter with a *corpus Paulinum* impossible or unverifiable. They simply require a reconsideration of the types of influence in the development of early Christian literary culture and what evidence for such influence might look like.

---

[209] For an excellent description of the *Shepherd'*s oral origins, see Carolyn Osiek, "The Oral World of Early Christianity in Rome: The Case of Hermas," in *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, ed. Karl P. Donfried and Peter Richardson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 151-72, esp. 160-68. According to Osiek, "If such oral proclamation is the context for the *Shepherd*, two conclusions follow. First, what has survived as the manuscript is not the whole message but a more or less full outline. Second, there never was an original version, since each successive proclamation would alter the content slightly as appropriate to the context" (161).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has attempted to shift discussion from the mere possibility that Hermas knew and engaged Pauline letters, established in Chapter 1, to that of probability. In order to do so, in the first section I described various probable connections made between the *Shepherd*, Hermas, the apostle, and Pauline letters in antiquity and continuing into the early modern period in order to then show, in section two's analysis of relevant secondary literature, how and why these connections have largely been discounted by scholars in the modern period. Most modern treatments of the problem of Hermas and Paul coalesce around the view that Hermas probably knew parts of 1 Corinthians and/or Ephesians. In my judgment, Hermas's engagement with specific parts of these two texts as sources of authoritative tradition greatly increases the probability that he not only knew but also engaged parts of other letters eventually collected in the *corpus Paulinum* in a similarly meaningful manner too. Admittedly, scholars typically argue that Hermas did not engage them in any substantive way. But I have demonstrated that such scholarly rejection of Pauline influence upon Hermas is due, at least in part, to the common employment of a dominant methodology that focuses upon — and largely rejects data that are not — verbatim quotations of what became the *corpus Paulinum*. In my judgment, such approaches, which have been frequently deployed within arguments focusing on the history of the canon, constructing a particular history of "early Catholicism," or recovering a "Paul" sympathetic with modern Protestant theological concerns, suffer from identifiable heuristic weaknesses. They are also limited by numerous false dichotomies, including the assumptions that direct, literary influence is the only verifiable kind of intertextual encounter, that it must take the mode of reuse without modification, and that Hermas could only have ever been pro- or anti-

Pauline in orientation. All of these shortcomings, I contend, have necessarily hampered the likelihood of scholars' ever satisfactorily describing Hermas's encounter(s) with letters written by or associated with Paul. Finally, given that this is the case, in the concluding section of this chapter, I presented an expanded set of criteria potentially capable of more sufficiently evincing the scope of Hermas's complex encounter with the emerging Pauline legacy. I shall employ these criteria in Chapters 3 through 5, where I aim to offer a plausible account of Hermas's engagement with Pauline letters vis-à-vis the *Mandates*, *Similitudes*, and *Visions* sections of the *Shepherd*, respectively.

CHAPTER 3: THE *MANDATES* AND THE PAULINE LEGACY


INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyzes Hermas's encounter with traditions attributed to or associated with the

apostle in the *Mandates*, where in my judgment Pauline influence is most prominent in the

*Shepherd*. I demonstrate that, by adopting, adapting, and synthesizing Pauline traditions across

his *Mandates*, Hermas reveals himself to be a creative interpreter and re-fashioner of traditions

ultimately collected in the *corpus Paulinum*. First, in order to fully frame that that claim, I offer

an overview of the *Mandates* section, including its characters, topics, and foci. Then I briefly

survey the various ways that the commandments spoken by the Shepherd to Hermas cohere with

what becomes the Pauline literary corpus. These instances of coherence establish the

compatibility of Hermas's descriptions of God, the believer, and the believing community in the

*Mandates* with those of the apostle and authors writing in his name. A driving emphasis of the

commandments is the believer's calling to "live to God" (ζῆν τῷ θεῷ) through them, as I shall

show in my third section. There I argue that Hermas's use of this phrase reflects and extends its

use by Paul himself, as well as later Pauline authors. In the fourth section, itself the heart of this

chapter, by employing the criteria that I presented in Chapter 2, which seek to uncover the ways

in which Hermas has adopted, adapted, and synthesized Pauline literary phenomena, I seek to

determine where else in the *Mandates* such influence might be evident, starting with the

evidence that I think has the strongest claim to probability. I start with what the history of

scholarship has already proposed for some time as the most likely examples of Pauline influence,

because once one grants that there is strong evidence in some specific cases for direct Pauline

influence upon Hermas, that opens the door for broader investigations, even within examples already recognized. The first example is the question of remarriage after divorce or death of a spouse, which Paul discusses in 1 Corinthians. I expand that topic and relate it to the broader question of marital sexual ethics in both the *Shepherd* and Pauline letters. The second subject is grieving the holy Spirit. Like the first, this idea has long been seen in scholarship as potentially influenced by the Pauline corpus, particularly Ephesians, but I show how influence from 2 Corinthians and Romans as well is more pervasive than previously recognized. The third part of this section discusses Hermas's apparent denial of post-baptismal repentance. It is, I argue, a pastorally sensitive and realistic response to a problem attested in Hebrews. Given the substantial contact with material preserved in letters eventually included in the *corpus Paulinum* on these issues, in the remainder of this final section I present three more distinctive Pauline notions that Hermas adopts and adapts in his *Mandates*. The first is his description of authentic, Spirit-filled prophecy occurring in the Pauline mode in and for the community. The remaining two are his use of the particular Pauline metaphors of clothing oneself with a virtue and arming oneself for resistance of evil. Cumulatively, this chapter demonstrates that there is a large body of evidence in the *Mandates* suggesting that Hermas was an informed and creative Pauline interpreter.

OVERVIEW OF THE *MANDATES*

In modern editions, the *Mandates* section formally begins with the Shepherd's first commandment to Hermas (*Mand.* 1 [26]). However, in the unfolding narrative of the final version of the text, the Shepherd initially appears to Hermas at the end of what becomes the

preceding *Visions* section. That is effectively an introduction to the *Mandates* that follow.[1] After

the conclusion of Hermas's encounter with the elderly Lady and her departure in *Vis*. 4.3 [24], at

the beginning of *Vis*. 5 [25] we find Hermas praying in his house and sitting on his couch. There,

in a vision, he sees yet another figure. He envisions "a man distinguished in countenance, with

the outward appearance of a shepherd, wearing a white goat skin, and with a traveler's bag on his

shoulder and a stick in his hand" (25.1).[2] An extended conversation ensues with this Shepherd,

which will run through the entirety of *Mand*. 1-12 and then *Sim*. 1-9.[3] The Shepherd tells Hermas

that he was sent by "the most holy angel" (τοῦ σεμνοτάτου ἀγγέλου) to live with Hermas for the

remainder of his life, and Hermas has been entrusted to him.[4] Throughout the *Mandates* section,

this Shepherd will fulfill a variety of functions.[5] But his primary role is to lead others to

repentance.[6] This is clear not only from the *Mandates*' repeated references to repentance but

---

[1] For a discussion of the independent circulation of the *Shepherd*'s sections and *Vis*. 5 as an introduction to the *Mandates* and *Similitudes*, which sometimes circulated together independently of *Vis*. 1-4, see pp. 13-14 in Chapter 1.

[2] ἀνήρ τις ἔνδοξος τῇ ὄψει, σχήματι ποιμενικῷ, περικείμενος δέρμα αἴγειον λευκόν, καὶ πήραν ἔχων ἐπὶ τὸν ὦμον καὶ ῥάβδον εἰς τὴν χεῖρα, *Vis*. 5.1 [25.1].

[3] In the conclusion to the tripartite work (*Sim*. 10), the Shepherd is still present, but he and Hermas are joined there by the messenger (*nuntius*) who had entrusted Hermas to the Shepherd in the first place (*Sim*. 10.1.1 [111.1]).

[4] Ἀπεστάλην ἀπὸ τοῦ σεμνοτάτου ἀγγέλου, ἵνα μετὰ σοῦ οἰκήσω τὰς λοιπὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς σου, *Vis*. 5.2 [25.2]; cf. 32.3.

[5] For example, he can compel obedience [46.3], he rules over devil [47.7], and he can make believers strong in the faith [49.1].

[6] Compare Paul's claim in Rom 2:4b that "God's kindness leads to repentance" (…ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει;).

from Hermas's description of the Shepherd as "the angel of repentance" (ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς μετανοίας) immediately before the *Mandates* themselves begin.[7]

In order to bring about repentance, the Shepherd will give commandments (and eventually, in the *Similitudes* section, parables too). Hermas is instructed to write them down, which he does (*Vis*. 5.5-6 [25.5-6]). In the manuscript tradition and thus in the editions, these are presented as a collection of twelve *Mandates*. Each *Mandate* is dedicated to one or two related topics and often contains exhortations or dissuasions within it. Individually, the twelve *Mandates* primarily focus on the following issues: (1) faith in and fear of God; (2) sincerity; (3) truth; (4) purity in marriage, and repentance; (5) patience and sharp temper; (6) the Two Ways of righteousness and wickedness; (7) fear of the Lord; (8) exercise of self-control; (9) double-mindedness; (10) grief and cheerfulness; (11) false and true prophets; and (12) evil and good desire. All twelve are oriented toward sparking repentance (*Vis*. 5.7 [25.7]). The Shepherd tells Hermas that they must be kept, not neglected, in order for him — and by extension his audience — to obtain salvation (*Mand*. 12.3.6 [46.6]). Furthermore, as I shall now show, the description of the believer's proper life that is presented to Hermas and discussed with him at length by the Shepherd in these *Mandates* coheres specifically with ideals communicated by the apostle and his pseudepigraphers to the various communities that they addressed in their respective letters.

---

[7] ταῦτά μοι πάντα οὕτως γράψαι ὁ ποιμὴν ἐνετείλατο, ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς μετανοίας, *Vis*. 5.7 [25.7]; the same character designation appears at *Mand*. 12.4.7 [47.7], 12.6.1 [49.1]. The Shepherd himself says, "I am in charge of repentance" (ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας εἰμί, *Mand*. 4.2.2 [30.2]).

THE *MANDATES*' COHERENCE WITH PAULINE WORLDVIEWS

The construction of an ideal Christian community and manner of living in the *Mandates* coheres strongly with the ideals of Pauline letters.[8] In what follows, I briefly collect, under three categories, the instances of coherence with the *corpus Paulinum* that I observe most prominently in the *Mandates*.[9] Other interpreters, I suspect, might observe even more. These categories are, first, Hermas's description of the nature and activity of God; second, the Christian person; and, third, Christian community.[10]

Regarding Hermas's vision of God, perhaps most importantly, God is One.[11] This one God created all that exists, indeed according to a plan.[12] God is truthful and to be feared.[13] But

---

[8] For a thorough study of multiple ways in which the *Shepherd* constructs specific forms of Christian community, see Mark Grundeken, *Community Building in the* Shepherd of Hermas*: A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects*, VCSup 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

[9] Upon the conclusion of this project, I became aware of Peter Wallace Dunn, "The *Acts of Paul* and the Pauline Legacy in the Second Century" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1996). In a manner strikingly similar, at least on procedural grounds, to my outlining of instances of coherence with the Pauline letters in the *Mandates* section of the *Shepherd*, Dunn dedicated an entire chapter to "Attitudes Shared by the *Acts of Paul* and the Pastoral Epistles" (89-100), which functioned as a sort of conceptual foundation for his comparison of the former with Pauline tradition. According to Dunn, "No comparison of the two bodies of tradition can be complete without looking at these affinities" (89). Dunn's dissertation regrettably remains unpublished, but see more recently his essay "The New Testament in the *Acts of Paul*," in *Christian Apocrypha: Receptions of the New Testament in Ancient Christian Apocrypha*, ed. Jean-Michel Roessli and Tobias Nicklas, NTP 26 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 149-71.

[10] Compare the division of commonalities in Paul and James under the categories of social-historical world and theological/religious world in Margaret M. Mitchell, "The Letter of James as a Document of Paulinism?," in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James*, ed. Robert L. Webb and John S. Kloppenborg, LNTS (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 86-87.

[11] 26.1; cf. Rom 3:30, 1 Cor 8:4, 6, Gal 3:20, Eph 4:6, 1 Tim 2:5.

[12] 26.1, 47.2-3; cf. Rom 8:21, Eph 2:10, 3:9.

[13] On being truthful, see 28.1; cf. Rom 3:4, 7, Heb 6:18. And on fear of God, see 26.2, 37.1-5; Rom 3:18, 2 Cor 5:11, 7:1, Col 3:22.

God is kind and calls to compassion.[14] And, finally, God issues a call (κλῆσις) to sinners,

justifies (δικαιοῦν) those who repent and live rightly, and gives them a particular form of

ministry (διακονία) to complete.[15]

Coherence with Pauline letters extends to Hermas's vision of the Christian person. First

of all, he understands himself to be a sinner.[16] Sin, Hermas suggests, works death upon a

person.[17] Sinful persons can be tempted and attacked by the devil, who although fearful has no

real power and must be resisted.[18] They are also inhabited by competing powers, said to be the

angels of righteousness and wickedness, that pull a person in competing directions.[19] And yet, at

the same time, as I showed above, Hermas understands the (believing) human to be a place

where the Lord and the Spirit live.[20] Ultimately, though, despite the fact that a believer sins,

because of divine action that person is, in Hermas's imagination, a "slave of God" (δοῦλος τοῦ

θεοῦ).[21]

The community of those enslaved to God must take on a particular character and be

marked by specific ways of life. This is the third major way that Hermas's *Mandates* cohere with

---

[14] 31.5, 39.2-3; cf. Rom 9:15, Phil 1:8, 2:1, Col 3:12.

[15] On God's call, see 31.6; cf. Rom 11:29, 1 Cor 1:26, 1 Cor 7:20, Phil 3:14, 2 Thess 1:11, Eph 1:18, 4:1, 4, 2 Tim 1:9, Heb 3:1. On the divine act of justifying, see 33.7; Rom 2:13 *et passim*. Various forms of ministries and gifts given by God are apparent at 27.6; cf. Rom 12:4-8, 1 Cor 7:6, 12:4-11.

[16] 30.3; cf. Rom 3:7, 5:8, Gal 2:17, 1 Tim 1:15.

[17] 29.2; cf. Rom 7:13.

[18] 47.6-7, 48.2; cf. 1 Thess 2:18, 1 Cor 7:5, 2 Cor 2:11, 12:7, 2 Thess 2:9, Eph 6:11, 1 Tim 3:7, 5:15, 2 Tim 2:26.

[19] 36.1-10; cf. Rom 7:14-15.

[20] 28.1, 33.3, 6, 41.5; cf. Rom 8:9-11, 1 Cor 3:16, 2 Cor 13:5, Gal 2:20, Col 1:27.

[21] 28.4 *et passim*. Paul refers to himself as "slave of Christ" at Rom 1:1, Gal 1:10, and Phil 1:1 (together with Timothy). He uses the label in reference to another person in 1 Cor 7:22. In later Pauline literary tradition, we see find both "slave of Christ" (Eph 6:6, Col 4:12) and "slave of God" (Tit 1:1).

what becomes the Pauline literary corpus. Broadly speaking, the community imagined in the *Mandates* is oriented in large part toward doing good works as an expression of one's Christian identity.[22] Membership in the community begins in the waters of baptism, and there the forgiveness of sin occurs and a new life starts.[23] This community gathers together, presumably on a regular basis, where truly Spirit-filled prophecy, when properly tested and presented, is central to its common life.[24] A primary marker of this life is righteousness, as well as the pursuit of it.[25] Other markers are holiness and purity.[26] Adultery and sexual immorality are chief threats to that purity, and those who practice it must be avoided.[27] Members of the community must properly exercise self-control, avoiding the bad and not shirking the good.[28] One of the most damaging wrongs is slander.[29] By contrast, chief goods are giving generously to and caring for those in need.[30] The latter includes caring for widows and orphans.[31] Not surprisingly, such care of others extends to hospitality.[32]

Individually, and perhaps even collectively, these instances of coherence are themselves perhaps not substantial enough to independently establish an encounter with Pauline letters. But

---

[22] 27.4, 30.2, 37.4, 38.2, 8, 42.1, 46.1; cf. Rom 2:6-11, 13, 3:31, 13:3, Gal 6:10, Phil 1:6, Col 1:10, 2 Thess 2:17, Eph 2:10, 1 Tim 2:10, 5:10, 2 Tim 2:21, 3:17, Tit 1:16, 3:1.

[23] 31.2; cf. Rom 6:3-4, Gal 3:27.

[24] See pp. 177-83 below for the relevant references to the *Mandates* and *corpus Paulinum*.

[25] 26.2, 33.1, 36.3, 38.2, 10, 45.4, 49.2; cf. Rom 6:13, 16, 18-19, 14:7, 2 Cor 3:9, 6:7, Phil 1:11, 1 Tim 6:11, 2 Tim 2:22, 4:8,

[26] 29.1, 31.2, 32.3, 36.3; cf. 1 Thess 3:13, 1 Cor 1:2, 3:17, 7:14, 34, 2 Cor 7:1, Rom 1:7, 12:1, Col 1:22, 3:12, Eph 1:4, 5:27, 1 Tim 4:12, 5:2, Heb 3:1, 12:10.

[27] 29.4-6, 9, 38.3, 45.1; cf. 1 Thess 4:3, 1 Cor 5:9-11, 6:9, 13, 15-18, 7:2, 10:8, 2 Cor 12:21, Gal 5:19, Col 3:5, Eph 5:5, 1 Tim 1:10, Heb 13:4.

[28] 26.2, 35.1, 38.1-12; cf. 1 Cor 7:9, 9:25, Gal 5:23, Tit 1:8.

[29] 27.2-3, 38.3; cf. Rom 1:30, 2 Cor 12:20.

[30] 27.4-5, 38.10; cf. 1 Cor 12 :25-26, 2 Cor 8:13-14, 9:10-14, Rom 12:8, 13, Eph 4:28.

[31] 38.10; 1 Tim 5:3-16.

[32] 38.10; cf. Rom 12:13, 1 Tim 3:2, Tit 1:8, Heb 13:2.

they represent additional ways in which Hermas could potentially have been impacted by the apostle's (and later Paulinists') ways of thinking. At the very least, such coherence demonstrates that Hermas's descriptions of the Christian faith and life through the Shepherd's twelve *Mandates* are fundamentally compatible with the broad parameters of the Pauline letters and their collective view of the believing community.[33] An umbrella concept by which Hermas unites these commandments is, as it is by Paul in his letters and by later Pauline authors, "living to God."

LIVING TO GOD (ζῆν τῷ θεῷ, *Mand*. 1.2 *et passim*)

In first *Mandate*, which commands proper faith in and fear of God, as well as self-control, Hermas uses a curious phrase — ζῆν τῷ θεῷ — that will guide the form and give force to the second major section of the *Shepherd*. He frequently employs it as a concluding formula, as in *Mand*. 1.2 [26.2].[34] The phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ has rightly been labeled "one of the keys to Hermas's message."[35] In total, Hermas employs it thirty-nine times;[36] twenty-three of these are in the

---

[33] Massaux similarly spoke of and listed "[t]he convergence in Hermas of expressions similar or very close to Paul" (*The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 2: *The Later Christian Writings*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, NGS 5/2 [Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992], 149).

[34] This was noted by Martin Dibelius, *Die apostolischen Väter: Der Hirt des Hermas*, vol. 4, HNT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), 525, who labeled it a "Schlußformel." The phrase concludes all but *Mand*. 5 and 11 (Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Herm [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999], 104). Sometimes it is found at the very end of a *Mandate* (e.g., 3.5, 6.2.10), but at other times it is somewhat removed from the conclusion (*Mand*. 2.6, not 2.7; 4.4.3, not 4.4.4). It even concludes certain key sections within particular *Mandates* (e.g., 4.2.4 [30.4], 13.3 [46.3]).

[35] F. Barberet, "La formule ζῆν τῷ θεῷ dans le Pasteur d'Hermas," *RevScRel* 46 (1958): 379 ("une des clés du message d'Hermas").

*Mandates* section.[37] Giet correctly noted that in the *Shepherd* "…the sense of ζῆν τῷ θεῷ is not

always identical."[38] Owing partly to this reason, determining precisely how to translate the

---

[36] This count differs slightly depending on the edition of the *Shepherd* used. For example, Barberet (mistakenly) counted forty occurrences, allegedly based on Funk's edition (ibid.). However, Osiek's statement that "[the phrase] occurs *twenty-nine* times beginning [at *Mand.* 1.2]" is simply incorrect (*Shepherd*, 104 n. 7; emphasis added). Because the phrase appears nowhere in *Vis.* 1-4; 33 times in *Vis.* 5-*Sim.* 8; and 6 times in *Sim.* 9, Barberet noted "the rather striking correspondence" between its appearances and "the three redactional layers long pointed out in [Hermas's] work" ("Notons la correspondance assez frappante qui existe entre les résultats de notre relevé du matériel sémantique d'Hermas sur ce point précis de la 'vie', et les trois couches rédactionnelles depuis longtemps indiquées dans son oeuvre…"; "La formule ζῆν τῷ θεῷ," 381 n. 8). Giet extended Barberet's observation in light of his own thesis regarding the compositional history of the *Shepherd*. In Giet's view, the author of *Sim.* 9 used the phrase to refer to the life given by God to those Christians who suffer persecution faithfully, whereas the author of the *Mand.* and *Sim.* 1-8 by it referred to "the life of the spirit in [one's] soul that campaigns against the spirit of evil" ("L'auteur des Préceptes et des autres Paraboles paraît plus réservé sur le sens de la formula… Mais cette vie [i.e., 37.5] n'est-elle pas surtout la vie de l'esprit qui milite dans son âme contre l'esprit du mal?"; *Hermas et les Pasteurs: Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas* [Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1963], 269). For Henne's rejoinder to Giet's suggestion, see *L'Unité du Pasteur d'Hermas: Tradition et rédaction*, CahRB 31 (Paris: Gabalda, 1992), 82-83. Given my argument in Chapter 1 for a single author of the *Shepherd*, I assume that all instances of the phrase are themselves Hermas's literary products, not those of some unknown author(s), redactor(s), or compiler(s). To be sure, the absence of the phrase in the *Visions* is surprising, since Hermas engages the topics of life and death throughout them. For a summary of "life" and "death" in the *Visions*, see Barberet, "La formule ζῆν τῷ θεῷ," 381-84, esp. 383.

[37] The explicit phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ appears at 26.2, 27.6, 28.5, 30.4, 32.3, 36.10 [2x], 37.5, 38.4, 38.6, 38.11, 38.12 [4x], 39.12 [2x], 42.4 [2x], 45.2, 46.1, 49.3, and 49.5. Similarly, it appears with a pronoun at *Mand.* 7.4 [37.4], 12.3.1 [46.1]. Nineteen similar uses of the verb ζῆν alone are at 16.5, 28.3, 30.3, 31.6, 62.4, 68.6, 68.7, 68.9, 73.1, 74.1, 74.5, 91.3, 93.4, 98.2, 98.4, 100.3, 103.5, 113.4, 124.1. (Graydon F. Snyder, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, ed. Robert M. Grant, AF 6 [Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1968], 64). Like Snyder, Osiek also mentioned "an additional nineteen references lacking the object," but did not list them (*Shepherd*, 104 n. 7).

[38] "Or le sens de ζῆν τῷ θεῷ n'est pas toujours identique" (*Hermas et les Pasteurs*, 269); similarly, Henne, *Unité*, 83. Hermas overwhelmingly employs the phrase in the future tense — 33 of the 39 times the phrase is attested in surviving Greek manuscripts; even the sole occurrence of the phrase where only the Latin survives is in the future tense (…*et vivent deo, quoniam ex bono genere sunt*, 107.5). The phrase appears four times in the aorist tense: once in the infinitive (38.4), and thrice as the main verb in the subjunctive in a clause introduced by ἵνα (45.2, 77.1, and 105.8). It never appears in a first-person finite form, whether singular or plural. Hermas the

phrase has long flummoxed interpreters.[39] The most common rendering of it into a modern

language is the equivalent of "live *to* God," a rather wooden translation, at least in English.[40]

"Live *for* God" is another very popular option.[41] Significantly less common are "*have* life *with*

God";[42] "live *in* God";[43] and "live *unto* God." [44] Another possibility, largely overlooked, is

"*obtain* life *with* God."[45] Crucially, the phrase is used in the *Shepherd* without any explanation

character never speaks it, except in *Mand.* 7 when he asks the Shepherd what it means. Hermas the author, through the character of the Shepherd, only uses the phrase in reference to others.

[39] Dibelius made this point forcefully. When trying to adjudicate between the various possible meanings of the phrase for Hermas, he said, "…no certain verdict can be obtained" (*Hirt*, 499: "So läßt sich auch bei ζῆν τῷ θεῷ keine sichere Entscheidung treffen").

[40] Barberet, "La formule ζῆν τῷ θεῷ," 380 but note the qualification and openness to other prepositions on 396; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 65; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 103-04; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols., LCL 24-25 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 2:239; Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 505.

[41] Auguste Lelong, *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*, TDEHC 4 (Paris: A. Picard, 1912), 73-74n. 2 adding, "dans la pensée d'Hermas, l'expression ζῆν τῷ θεῷ renferme très probablement à la fois les deux significations de vie qui plaît à Dieu et de vie éternelle"; Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs*, 269 n. 5: "Ce serait une erreur de traduire : *mourir pour Dieu*, parce que ces mots ont en français un tout autre sens; mais on ne voit pas la nécessité de traduire l'expression contraire : *vivre à Dieu*, quand *vivre pour Dieu* a le même sens, avec la même indétermination que comporte l'expression grecque: ζῆν τῷ θεῷ" (emphasis added); Robert Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 2nd rev. ed., SC 53 [*bis*] (Paris: Cerf, 1968), 145 n. 4:: "'Tu vivras pour Dieu' ne signifie pas : 'Tu vivras de façon à plaire à Dieu' mais 'Tu vivras aux yeux de Dieu', 'Dieu t'accordera la vie (éternelle)'"; Henne, *Unité*, 83; Martin Leutzsch, *Schriften des Urchristentums* Vol. 3*: Hirt des Hermas*, SUC 3 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), 193.

[42] E.g., Dibelius, *Hirt*, 497: "Leben haben bei Gott."

[43] E.g., Anna Vezzoni, ed., *Il pastore di Erma: Versione Palatina*, NM 13 (Firenze: Casa editrice Le lettere, 1994), 87 *et passim*: "vivere in Dio."

[44] E.g., J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers: Revised Texts* (London: Macmillan, 1898), 422; Leslie W. Barnard, "Hermas, the Church and Judaism," in *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (New York: Schocken Books, 1967), 162; Outi Lehtipuu, *Debates Over the Resurrection of the Dead: Constructing Early Christian Identity*, OECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 113.

[45] This possible rendering of the phrase was suggested by Prof. David Martinez in a graduate seminar at the University of Chicago Divinity School in 2011; cf. *Mand.* 3.5 [28.5].

whatsoever. This means that Hermas assumes it is readily intelligible to his audience. But why and from where?

I contend that Hermas learned how to use the multivalent phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ meaningfully from Paul, in whose conception "living *to* God" reflects a life lived *for*, *with*, *in*, and *unto* God.[46] As for Paul and later Paulinists well into the second century, so too for Hermas the believer's proper life in relation to, in, and with God — in a nutshell, ζῆν τῷ θεῷ — is a life that begins in one's coming alive in baptism, spans the current age to the future one, and must take a particular moral form in the present that is marked by fidelity to divinely given directives. Consequently, I side with the majority of scholars in translating the phrase as "live *to* God," even as I do so for a different reason, which to my knowledge has never before been argued.[47]

---

[46] *Pace* Barberet, who suggested that the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ represents "la transposition en langage chrétien du ζωῇ ζήσεται de la Septante" and thereby reflects Hermas's (exclusive?) influence by Ezekiel ("La formule ζῆν τῷ θεῷ," 401-07; the quotation appears on p. 402). Some form of the phrase is found at LXX Ezek 3:21, 18:9, 13, 17, 19, 21, 28, 33:15; cf. 4 Kgdms 8:10, 14; Sir 48:11. The similarity between the messages of Ezekiel and Hermas was already recognized by Hans Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origenes: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1908), 357. The occurrence of the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ in Paul's letters is noted by Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 65; and Osiek, *Shepherd*, 104 n. 7. Dibelius, *Hirt*, 499 did not note the phrase's occurrence in Paul and seemed to root the origins in the LXX; see the references to the "alte Motiv" in 4 Macc, Prov, and Sir on 499 and 525. Surprisingly, it is also not mentioned in Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 144-50. Norbert Brox, *Hirt des Hermas*, KAV 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 193 argued that its use by Hermas is a "sign of Jewish piety" ("Signal jüdischer Frömmigkeit").

[47] My translation "live *to* God," which construes the dative τῷ θεῷ as a dative of association (Smyth 1523), recognizes that for Hermas the believer's life is to properly be in association with God (*Mand*. 7.5 [37.5]). At the same time, my translation construes relevant forms of ζάω as essentially equivalent to forms of βιόω, the resulting sense being to "live, pass one's life" (LSJ 758), recognizing, though, that the envisioned life continues after death. "Live *to* God" is very similar in sense to Vezzoni's "live *in* God" (*Il pastore di Erma*, 87 *et passim*). Vezzoni's translation finds textual support in Codex Athos' singular reading of ζωὴ ἐν αὐτῷ at 37.5, which I agree is the preferable one.

With only one exception, every time the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ appears in the *Mandates* it is linked either implicitly or explicitly to fulfilling a particular commandment. The sole exception to this pattern is when Hermas himself asks what ζῆν τῷ θεῷ means in *Mand*. 7.5 [37.5]. The Shepherd explains it, replying, "…those who fear [the Lord] and keep his commandments, theirs is life with God (ἐκείνων ἡ ζωή ἐστι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ). But those who do not keep his commandments also do not have life in him (οὐδὲ ζωὴ ἐν αὐτῷ)."[48] This explanation reveals that for Hermas the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ refers to, at least in part, a living in and with God that begins eschatologically in baptism in the present age and takes moral form, flowing from fidelity to divinely given commands.[49] Put differently, for Hermas the commandments promise and promote a participation in the divine life. A form of this idea is, of course, fundamental in Israel's scriptures, where Israel's life is depicted as contingent upon keeping God's commands.[50] But, as I will discuss below, only in Paul's letter to the Galatians do we find the linkage of law

---

[48] τῶν οὖν φοβουμένων αὐτὸν καὶ φυλασσόντων τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, ἐκείνων ἡ ζωή ἐστι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ· τῶν δὲ μὴ φυλασσόντων τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ζωὴ ἐν αὐτῷ. Here I adopt the more difficult reading of Codex Athos (i.e., "life *in him*," ζωὴ ἐν αὐτῷ) against Leutzsch's edition, which follows the witness of the Latin and Ethiopic traditions, where the equivalent of "life in them" (ζωὴ ἐν αὐτοῖς) is attested. Curiously, both the Vulgate and Palatine translations omit Hermas's inquiry, and the Vulgate omits the first half of the Shepherd's response as well. Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 214-15 notes that Hermas's question is also not attested in Antiochus of Palestine's homiletic text of *Mand*. 7. The scribal error of *parablepsis* would explain the omission in L[1]: a copyist's eye could have skipped from *eius* near the end of 37.4 to the *eius* directly preceding *eorum vita est* near the end of 37.5 in a putative exemplar. The omission in L[2] is difficult to explain on the basis of scribal error alone and therefore would seem more likely to be intentional.

[49] The eschatological meaning of the phrase in the *Shepherd* is widely acknowledged. See, e.g., Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 64; Brox, *Hirt*, 192-93; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 104. But scholars have not previously recognized that the phrase functions eschatologically for Hermas in a manner only observable, among those places where it is attested in prior and contemporary sources, in emerging Pauline literature, particularly the apostle's authentic letters.

[50] E.g., Lev 18:5, Deut 4:1, 8:1, 11:8, 30:16, Neh 9:29, Ezek 18:9, 17, 21, 20:11, 13, 21, 33:15, 19.

(i.e., divine commands) with a particular kind of life, that is what becomes the Pauline shorthand locution "living to God" (ζῆν τῷ θεῷ, Gal 2:19).

The most frequent of the Shepherd's commandments that enable such "living to God" are keeping or walking in God's ordinances, as signaled clearly in *Mand.* 1, and exercising self-restraint.[51] But he gives many more as well, such as fearing God, repentance, proper service, avoiding improper desire, abstaining from something evil, and doing something good.[52] Together these commandments depict what, according to Hermas, is expected of a Christian who seeks to live fully and rightly and thus with and in God. All of them are necessary outgrowths of faith.[53] But none alone is sufficient; indeed all of them together are not sufficient.[54] Crucially, nowhere in the *Mandates* does anyone say that a person is justified by works or adherence to commandments, a notion repeatedly rejected by Paul (Rom 3:20, 28; Gal 2:16).[55] To the

---

[51] Commandment observance is enjoined at 26.2, 28.5, 30.4, 38.12, 49.3, 49.5, 61.4, and 77.4 [*bis*]. A similar condition, doing the works of the Angel of Righteousness, appears twice in *Mand.* 6.2.10 [36.10]. Calls to be self-restrained are found at 38.4, 38.6, 38.11, and 38.12 [*tris*].

[52] The Shepherd's frequent commands include fear of the Lord or God (37.4 [*bis*], 49.3, 54.5), repentance (77.1, 77.3, 97.4, 99.4), proper service (39.12, 46.1 [*bis*]), avoiding improper desire (45.2, 49.5, 105.8.), abstinence from something evil (28.5, 39.12, 54.5), and doing something good (97.4, 107.5). Still more conditions are stated only once (27.6, 32.3, 39.12, 42.4, 60.4, 77.3 [*tris*], 106.3, 110.1).

[53] This is apparent from Hermas's description of proper living as doing "the works of faith" (τὰ ἔργα τῆς πίστεως, *Sim.* 8.9.1 [75.1]), a label first attested in the Pauline letters (1 Thess 1:3, 2 Thess 1:11).

[54] This is because in Hermas's view, the very possibility and hope of fulfilling the mandates rest on a theological foundation like the one found in Paul: a complex interplay between election, faith, baptism, and participation in and with God, as I shall show in Chapters 4 and 5. In various ways throughout his work, Hermas depicts God's election and believers' faith as primary, and so too he construes the Christian life as beginning in — indeed, the believer's moving from death to life in — the waters of baptism (*Sim.* 9.16 [93]).

[55] *Pace*, e.g., Eva Aleith, *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche*, BZNW 18 (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1937), 9; Thomas F. Torrance, "The *Shepherd* of Hermas," in *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948), 117; Siegfried Schulz, *Die*

contrary, in Hermas's imagination it is repentance, itself flowing from faith, that results in

justification (*Mand.* 5.1.7 [33.7]).[56]

Of those places where it appears in surviving Greek literature, the function of the phrase

ζῆν τῷ θεῷ in the letters of Paul and the developing Pauline literary tradition (including Luke-

Acts, the *Acts of Paul*, and Tatian) is most relevant for my argument.[57] As I shall show, the use

---

*Mitte der Schrift: Der Frühkatholizismus im Neuen Testament als Herausforderung an den Protestantismus* (Stuttgart: Kreuz-Verlag, 1976), 358; Charles J. Guth, "The Relationship of Faith and Works in the Soteriologies of the Apostolic Fathers" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1994), 287.

[56] Similarly, at *Vis.* 3.9.1 [17.1] justification is said to come through the Lord's mercy; and at *Sim.* 5.7.1 [60.1] justification of the flesh is accomplished by the Spirit. Elsewhere, Hermas explicitly says that the elect are saved through Faith, the primary woman supporting the Tower, the church (*Vis.* 3.8.3 [16.3]).

[57] Klaus Berger, *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschickes Jesu in frühchristlichen Texten*, SUNT 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 379-381 lists most of the occurrences, which my study augments with additional references in Philo, the Acts of Paul, and Tatian. Among the few Jewish and Christian sources possibly composed prior to the *Shepherd* that attest it, see Philo, *Her.* 111 and *Mut.* 213 (cf. *Spec.* 1.345; *Det.* 48, 78); 4 Macc 7:18-19, 16:25; and Luke 20:37-38. Of these, the earliest datable with certainty is Philo, who died sometime after his return from the embassy to emperor Gaius in Rome in 41 C.E, prior to which the relevant treatises were written (Jean Daniélou, *Philo of Alexandria*, trans. James G. Colbert [Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014], 24). This places Philo's activity at least a decade before Paul and just under a century before Hermas. 4 Macc could be even earlier. But this is unlikely, given that its most plausible period of composition runs roughly from 30-120 C.E. (Hans-Josef Klauck, *4. Makkabäerbuch*, JSHRZ 3; ULF 6 [Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1989], 668). Arguments exist in favor of early and late dates within this range, and even for dates (potentially far) beyond it; for a brief survey of recent scholarship, see David Arthur DeSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*, SCS (Leiden: Brill, 2006), xiv-xvii. Among the few scholars who date it beyond, indeed well beyond, the range given by Klauck is Douglas Campbell, who argues that it was composed "definitely after 135 CE, and possibly up to a century later" (*The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26*, JSNTSup 65 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], 219-28; the quote is from 228. Likewise, Luke's use of the phrase probably pre-dates the final compilation of the *Shepherd* too, even if we assign a late date of 110-20 C.E. to Luke-Acts, as Richard Pervo does (*Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* [Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2006], esp. 309-42; *Acts*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, Herm [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009]).

of the phrase by Hermas in the *Mandates* has much in common with Pauline texts — and with the authentic Pauline epistles in particular. In doing so, I aim not to establish the original origin(s) of the phrase itself.[58] Rather, my goal is to demonstrate that what we find in the *Mandates* is the distinctive Pauline usage of the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ and Paulinist appropriation of that usage. The key Pauline letters to compare with the *Mandates* are Galatians and Romans. There the apostle employs the explicit phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ twice and a similar phrase once (ζῆν τῷ κυρίῳ). In all these locations, we find the Pauline antithesis between "living to" something and "dying to" another. The plausibility of my reading Hermas's use of the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ in the *Mandates* as primarily influenced by Pauline texts is strengthened by Hermas's employment of this antithesis in the *Similitudes*.[59]

In his letters, the historical epistolary Paul first uses the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ in Gal 2:19.[60] We find it within his broader argument in vv. 15-21 that justification occurs not "from works of

---

[58] Given the absence of a firm date for 4 Macc, one cannot with certainty determine on external grounds whether its author or Philo was the first to use the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ. Likewise, we cannot be sure if the phrase ἀποθνήσκειν τῷ θεῷ originates with Paul, as Moule and Wedderburn tentatively suggested, or the author of 4 Macc. Following the suggestion of Wedderburn, one of his students, who termed it a "syntactical novelty," Moule tentatively agreed that the use of a Greek verb of dying together the dative may have originated with Paul, who would have modeled it on the more common, analogous phrase that used the verb ζῆν with the dative. See C. F. D. Moule, "Death 'to Sin,' 'to Law,' and 'to the World': A Note on Certain Datives," in *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, ed. A.-L. Descamps and André de Halleux (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), 367-75, esp. 368-69; the quote is from p. 368. The unstated assumption of their suggestion is, of course, that 4 Macc postdates Paul's letters.

[59] See p. 196 in Chapter 4 below.

[60] For the label "historical epistolary" in reference to the apostle, I am indebted to Margaret M. Mitchell. See, e.g., "The Continuing Problem of Particularity and Universality within the *corpus Paulinum*," *ST* 64 (2010): 135 n. 28; and "Introduction" in *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality*, WUNT I (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, Forthcoming).

(the) law but through faith in Jesus Christ" (v. 16; cf. v. 21).[61] "For through the law *I died to the law* (νόμῳ ἀπέθανον)," Paul writes, "so that *I might live to God*" (θεῷ ζήσω).[62] The locus of Paul's death to law, he says, is his co-crucifixion with Christ, asserted in v. 19b.[63] Here the language of *mystical death to law* is preferable to *literal death*, even though Paul uses a form of ἀποθνήσκειν.[64] This is the case, because, according to Paul's argument, law lacked the capacity to bring those under it to life (ζωοποιεῖν, 3:21). And so, in a certain sense, Paul did not consider himself alive, at least not fully so, until faith came (3:23); but now that it has, Paul confirms that he is alive, since Christ lives in him (2:20-21). Importantly, the phrase νόμῳ ἀπέθανον in v. 19a is not a strict negative counterpart for the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ. The verbs ἀποθνήσκειν and ζῆν in v. 19a and b, respectively, take different referents, not the same one as Paul used in his arguments in Rom 6 and Rom 14.

In Rom 6:3-11, following his description of the believer's baptism into death and burial with Christ, the apostle sets up a contrast between Christ's prior death and his current life. Paul states, "In what way [Christ] died, *he died to sin* (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν) once for all.[65] But in

---

[61] οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Gal 2:16a.

[62] On the alternative use of ἀποθνήσκειν + dative with the sense of death implying separation, in this case from law, see BDAG 111; cf. Rom 7:4, 6. But, according to Paul it is not the law but sin that kills (Rom 7:9-10, 13). My decision not render the dative here as one of advantage, like at 2 Cor 5:15 and Rom 14:7, perhaps also at Rom 14:8, preserves the parallelism of Gal 2:19. Paul elsewhere speaks explicitly of doing something "for Christ," though; see, e.g., 2 Cor 5:20, 12:10, Phil 1:29.

[63] Cf. Gal 6:14: "through [the cross] the world has been crucified to me and I to the world" (δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ).

[64] Compare Paul's description of Christ's self-giving "in order that he might *remove us* (ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς) from the present wicked age" (Gal 1:4).

[65] This is not to imply that for Paul Christ was previously united with or subject to sin, a notion unthinkable to him (2 Cor 5:21, Gal 2:17), only that Christ's final defeat of sin comes at his death.

what way he lives, *he lives to God* (ζῇ τῷ θεῷ)" (v. 10).[66] This double statement contains a two-fold contrast. One aspect is the opposition between Christ's *dying* and his *living*, the former being with reference to sin and the latter with reference to God. Another aspect relates to the *temporality* and *duration* of Christ's being dead and living. Christ died in the *past* (ἀπέθανεν), Paul says, "once for all" (ἐφάπαξ); but he lives now to God in the *present*. For Paul, Christ's past renunciation of sin through his death and his present living to God — together with the believer's participation into that past death and present life in baptism (vv. 7-8) — necessarily result in an imperative. And so Paul implores his Roman audience, "Consider yourselves to be, on the one hand, *dead to sin* (νεκροὺς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) but, on the other, (consider yourselves) *living to God* (ζῶντας τῷ θεῷ) in Christ Jesus" (v. 11).

Rom 14:7-8 also contains a positive-negative pairing. However, it functions in a somewhat different manner. There the verbs ζῆν and ἀποθνῄσκειν are construed not with the word *God* but the words *self* and *Lord*: "For none of us lives to himself, and no one dies to himself. For if we live, *we live to the Lord* (τῷ κυρίῳ ζῶμεν), and if we die, *we die to the Lord* (τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποθνῄσκομεν). So if we live or die, we are the Lord's."[67] Paul's final statement in v. 8b — "we are the Lord's" — provides the logical foundation for the preceding ones. Because he

---

[66] For the same referential use of the relative pronoun ὅ, see Gal 2:20.

[67] The verbal forms ζῶμεν and ἀποθνῄσκωμεν could be translated as hortatory subjunctives, not indicatives as I have done, without significantly affecting the sense of the passage. The parallelism of v. 7 and v. 8 is arguably better preserved by translating the forms in v. 8 as indicatives, as those in v. 7 can only be.

and the Roman Christ-believers belong to the Lord, whatever they do is "to the Lord" (τῷ κυρίῳ).[68]

To sum up, the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ is a shorthand locution and a characteristic feature of the argumentation in several of Paul's authentic letters. Notably, everywhere Paul uses the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ/κυρίῳ he also includes a reference to death, thereby indicating an antithetical coupling. This is clearly the case in Rom 6 and Rom 14, because a negative counterpart for the phrase is found at each of these places. This observation holds even for Gal 2. Although it lacks the specific phrase ἀποθνήσκειν τῷ θεῷ/κυρίῳ, the context in which the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ appears includes two references to death, namely Paul's statements that he "died to the law" and was "co-crucified with Christ" (v. 19). As I shall show, development of this phrase and others like it, whether in syntax or sense, is a characteristic of the Pauline tradition as it takes shape into the second century. This can be seen from the writings of Luke, the *Acts of Paul*, and Tatian.

The author of Luke-Acts uses the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ once, albeit in pronomial form (i.e., αὐτῷ ζῆν). He places the words on the lips of Jesus in Luke 20:37-38.[69] There Jesus offers God's self-identification to Moses before the burning bush of Exod 3:6 as proof of resurrection, adding "but he is not God of the dead but of the living, for all (of them) *live to him* (αὐτῷ ζῶσιν)." Here the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ appears in the context of an affirmation of the ongoing life of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Indeed, they have died, Jesus admits, but God is God of the living, because, even in death, the patriarchs live to God (cf. Rom 14:8).

---

[68] Cf. the dative of advantage in 2 Cor 5:15 (ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν), so indicated by the parallel uses of ὑπὲρ + genitive elsewhere in the verse.

[69] The broader passage in which this saying is found also appears in Mark 12:24-27 and Matt 22:29-33, but neither of them includes it. On the assumption of Markan priority, it is a Lukan insertion, attributable to Luke's redactional activity.

The *Acts of Paul* attest a similar line of thinking. In a passage from the so-called Ephesus

Act attested in Greek in P. Hamb. 1 (=*AP* 9.13), the character Paul compares "living in God"

(ζῆν ἐν θεῷ) with "dying in sins" (ἀποθανεῖν ἐν ἁμαρτίαις).[70] Similarly, at various points in the

*Martyrdom of Paul* 4 (=*AP* 14.4) the apostle states that he already lives to his King, to his Lord

Jesus Christ, and to God.[71] And following his execution, Paul says to Caesar, "I am not dead, but

*I am alive in my God* (ζῶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ μου)."[72] Here we find the character Paul affirming that he

still lives "in God," despite the fact that Nero has already heard the report of Paul's beheading.

---

[70] This is the reconstructed text of P. Hamb. published in Carl Schmidt and Wilhelm Schubart, eds., *Πράξεις Παύλου: Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek* (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1936). The Coptic reads slightly differently; cf. Rodolphe Kasser and Philippe Luisier, "Le Papyrus Bodmer XLI en Édition Princeps: L'Épisode d'Éphèse des *Acta Pauli* en Copte et en Traduction," *Mus* 117 (2004): 326, 328. The account is also preserved in P. Bodmer 41. For a critical edition of this Coptic manuscript, see Kasser and Luisier, "Le Papyrus Bodmer XLI"; the Coptic text is presented in parallel with the Greek text of P. Hamb., together with an accompanying French translation on 326-29. For the label "Ephesus Act," I am indebted to Glenn E. Snyder, *Acts of Paul: The Formation of a Pauline Corpus*, WUNT II 352 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 66-99. By "Paul," I mean the literary character constructed by the author of the *Acts of Paul*, not the historical figure.

[71] ἐγὼ ζῶ τῷ ἐμῷ βασιλεῖ… ζῶ τῷ κυρίῳ μου Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ… ζῶ τῷ θεῷ. The Greek text of the *Martyrdom of Paul* is that of R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, eds., *Acta apostolorum apocrypha* (Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1891), 104-17. For details of other editions, including a mention of a forthcoming critical edition of the *Acts of Paul* by Willy Rordorf, see Snyder, *Acts of Paul*, 23 n. 2.

[72] *Acts of Paul* 14.6 [*Martyrium Pauli* 6]. In his recent commentary, Richard Pervo's translation reads simply, "I have not died, but live," presumably on the basis of the omission of the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ θεῷ μου in some witnesses (*The Acts of Paul: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014], 39, 318); cf. the (admittedly meager) critical apparatus in Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, 116. Most modern translators include the phrase. See, e.g., Wilhelm Schneemelcher, "The Acts of Paul," in *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson, rev. ed. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 263; J. K. Elliott, ed., "The Acts of Paul," in *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*, trans. J. K. Elliott (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 388. As I do, Pervo appears to follow the reading of P. Hamb. (ζῆν ἐν θεῷ) against the Coptic of P. Bodmer 41 at *Acts of Paul* 9.13, as well as the readings ζῶ τῷ ἐμῷ βασιλεῖ and ζῶ τῷ κυρίῳ μου Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ at 14.4; see *Acts of Paul*, 24, 38, 225, 318, 324.

All of these examples from the *Acts of Paul* — with the exception of the final one — use the

phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ or one like it to refer to a life beginning before death.

Tatian was also influenced by and reacted to the Pauline letters.[73] He used the phrase ζῆν

τῷ θεῷ once as well, in his *Oration to the Greeks* 11.2. He does so together with a phrase similar

to the negative counterparts that we found in Galatians and Romans: "*Die to the world*

(ἀπόθνησκε τῷ κόσμῳ) by rejecting the madness in it. *Live to God* (ζῆθι τῷ θεῷ), by rejecting

the old state of being through the direct perception of him."[74] Tatian's use of the phrase ζῆν τῷ

θεῷ with an explicitly ethical sense is directly relevant for my study of its use by Hermas.[75]

Virtually everywhere that the phrase appears in the *Mandates* it is found with an attendant ethical

imperative, whether stated or only implied. Tatian's use is important for another reason too. He

uses the phrase, as well as its negative counterpart, to refer to the present. Like Hermas, Tatian

suggests that "living to God" begins *before* death. This conception of an ethically-oriented

"living to God" in the present falls squarely within that river of Pauline tradition emerging from

the headwaters of the apostle's authentic letters, which construes proper moral activity in the

---

[73] On Tatian's use of and influence by the Pauline letters, see, e.g., Robert M. Grant, "The Heresy of Tatian," *JTS* 5 (1954): 65; Robert M. Grant, "Tatian and the Bible," *StPatr* 1 (1957): 297-306; Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 3: *The Apologists and the Didache*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, NGS 5/3 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1993), 113-14; Emily J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian*, RECM (London: Routledge, 2003), 19, 36-45.

[74] ἀπόθνησκε τῷ κόσμῳ παραιτούμενος τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ μανίαν· ζῆθι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ καταλήψεως τὴν παλαιὰν γένεσιν παραιτούμενος (ed. Edgar J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten: Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915], 278).

[75] Dibelius noted this parallel, but he apparently dismissed it as irrelevant on the basis of its "ethical meaning": "Tatian or. Ad Graecos 11 2 hat ζῆθι τῷ θεῷ, *aber in ethischer Bedeutung*" (*Hirt*, 499; emphasis added). *Pace* Dibelius, I argue that it is precisely this "ethical meaning" that makes Tatian's use of the phrase important for interpreting Hermas's use of it relative to early second-century Paulinism.

present as in some way "living with God." The use of the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ in a Pauline manner by Tatian, who was active in Rome only a few decades after Hermas, and in a context marked by ethical imperatives that govern life in the present age, confirms the plausibility of Hermas's having done so too.

So, then, to what should we attribute Hermas's linking the phrase "live to God" with ethical imperatives in the *Mandates* section? I contend that Hermas adopted and adapted this linkage from the authentic letters of Paul, probably Galatians but possibly Romans too. In my judgment, the *Mandates* in general and Hermas's use of the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ in particular reflect, first, a compression and, second, an expansion of the logic of Paul's argument in Gal 2:19. Hermas does not pick up the specifically Pauline ideas of dying to law or being co-crucified with Christ found in Galatians;[76] the absence of the latter in particular is consistent with Hermas's broader pattern of rarely referring to the Son of God. And yet in his theological imagination it is precisely through the commandments (i.e., the *Mandates*) that a person "lives to God." The compression of Pauline logic operative in Gal 2:19 lies in Hermas's directly connecting faithful observance of divine commands and living *to* God; in doing so, Hermas is synthesizing Pauline tradition. For Hermas, the full Pauline "*through the law* I died to the law, so that *I might live to God*" effectively becomes "*through the law… I might live to God.*" It is possible that Hermas has made sense of this key part of Galatians by means of Gal 5:13-6:10, where the apostle's thick description of life in the Spirit, marked as it is by freedom, undercuts the suggestion that the coming of faith results in the absence of moral rigor or at least offers

---

[76] However, as I shall show in Chapter 4, like Paul Hermas does depict baptism as the locus of a dead believer's coming-to-life; see pp. 240-41 below.

145

license to act illicitly. According to Hermas, the τέλος of the law, then, is to enable living to God, just as for Paul the τέλος of the law is Christ (τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς, Rom 10:4), in whom the apostle says believers are "living to God" (ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Rom 6:11). The expansion that follows lies in the Shepherd's commandments being additions to, perhaps even replacements of, the law given by God to the people of Israel. At the very least, they constitute an expanded law like the "law of Christ" (νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ), which Paul exhorted the Galatians to fulfill and of which their bearing one another's burdens was one element (6:2; cf. τήρησις ἐντολῶν θεοῦ in 1 Cor 7:19).[77] Furthermore, the tension between law and new life that is apparent in Hermas's *Mandates* is consistent with the one that Paul constructs in Rom 7. According to the logic of Paul's argument there, although a Christ-believer has "died to the law" (ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ, v. 4) and "has been set free from the law" (κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, v. 6a), nevertheless that person is still a slave "in the newness of (the) Spirit" (ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος, v. 6b) and "to the law of God" (αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῒ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, 25b).

Hermas's using the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ in a manner strikingly similar to the apostle and later Pauline authors, such as the authors of Luke-Acts and the *Acts of Paul* and Tatian, confirms the plausibility that in doing so Hermas was engaging Pauline tradition. Hermas apparently knows and compresses even further the identifiably Pauline linking of law and his shorthand "living to God," which is mostly clearly attested at Gal 2:19. And his depiction of the tension between the new life that begins in baptism and the law that a believer must follow thereafter

---

[77] Ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Gal 6:2. According to *Sim*. 5.6.3 [59.3], the Son of God (i.e., Christ) himself is law-giver (δοὺς αὐτοῖς [sc. τῷ λαῷ] τὸν νόμον, ὃν ἔλαβεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ).

coheres strongly with Paul's discussion in Rom 7. Hermas adopted and adapted material from Rom 6-7 elsewhere in the *Shepherd*, namely in his treatment of marriage in *Mand*. 4, as I shall argue in my next section, and in his depiction of baptism in *Sim.* 9, which will be discussed fully in Chapter 4. This compounds the probability that in employing the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ Hermas was influenced by this part of Paul's letter to the Romans too. From Pauline letters, Hermas learned to speak of a believer's present "living to God" as beginning in baptism. Hermas also made the believer's ongoing experience of that life in some sense contingent upon continued fidelity to particular modes of ethical behavior. Thus we see that yet another aspect of Hermas's Pauline inheritance is the tension presented between the various modes of divine participation and the contingency of human ethical conduct (e.g., Gal 5:13-26, 6:8-10). Hermas responds to this Pauline tension by adding additional commandments for properly faithful living that he received from the Shepherd. Tatian, an author active shortly after Hermas who was deeply influenced by Pauline letters, similarly linked "living to God" with proper ethical activity. This makes my reading of Hermas's *Mandates* on this particular point all the more historically plausible.

HERMAS, A PAULINE INTERPRETER

*Marital Sexual Ethics* (*Mand.* 4.1 [29], 4.4 [32])

Hermas's use of the phrase ζῆν τῷ θεῷ as the governing theme of the *Mandates* does not exhaust Pauline influence in this section of the *Shepherd*. Within his broader depiction of the commandments to be followed in order to fully "live to God," the Shepherd's descriptions of marital sexual ethics in *Mand.* 4.1 [29] and 4.4 [32] are especially influenced by what becomes

147

the *corpus Paulinum*, particularly 1 Cor 5 and 7. Pauline influence is especially visible, I argue, in Hermas's adoption of the apostle's statements on (1) the ideal of singleness and (2) proper marriage as "in the Lord," as well as (3) his painting outsiders as sexual deviants and (4) forbidding relationships by believers with those practicing immorality.

    *Mand.* 4 begins with the following command by the Shepherd to Hermas: "…defend purity (ἀγνεία), and do not let a thought for someone else's wife or any sexual immorality (πορνεία) or anything similar to such evils go up into your heart."[78] Here for the first time in his tripartite work Hermas introduces an activity, sexual immorality, that he considers particularly problematic, despite the text's obvious and repeated erotic overtones.[79] The Shepherd labels such a wicked desire for another's wife a "great sin" (ἀμαρτία μεγάλη), by which he says a person "brings death upon himself" (θάνατον ἑαυτῷ κατεργάζεται, 29.2; cf. 29.8).[80] Here sin performs the same function that it does for Paul in Rom 7:13 — it produces death.[81] The sin that Hermas then asks the Shepherd about is adultery (μοιχεία). He constructs the example of a man having a faithful wife "in the Lord" (γυναῖκα ἔχῃ τις πιστὴν ἐν κυρίῳ, 29.4). This wife, in Hermas's example, is found by her husband "in some adultery" (ἐν μοιχείᾳ τινί, 29.4). Hermas asks, "If he

---

[78] Ἐντέλλομαί σοι, φησίν, φυλάσσειν τὴν ἀγνείαν, καὶ μὴ ἀναβαινέτω σου ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἀλλοτρίας ἢ περὶ πορνείας τινὸς ἢ περὶ τοιούτων τινῶν ὁμοιωμάτων πονηρῶν, 29.1.

[79] That Hermas finds sexual immorality particularly problematic is apparent from the inclusion of πορνεία together with μοιχεία at the beginning of a long list of vices at *Mand.* 8.3 [38.3] over which one must exercise self-control. For a survey of erotic overtones, see Antonius Hilhorst, "Erotic Elements in the Shepherd of Hermas," in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, ed. H. Hofmann and M. Zimmerman, vol. 9 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988), 193-204.

[80] Paul himself was particularly fond of using the verb κατεργάζεσθαι. See, e.g., Rom 1:27, 2:9, 4:15, 5:3, 7:8, 13, 15, 17-18, 20, 15:18; 1 Cor 5:3; 2 Cor 4:17, 5:5, 7:10-11, 9:11, 12:12; Phil 2:12. It also appears at Eph 6:13.

[81] Similarly, see 2 Cor 7:10, where "worldly grief produces death" (ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται).

keeps living with her, does the man sin?" The Shepherd replies that the man does not sin as long

as he is unaware of his wife's illicit activity. But he becomes guilty of sin and a partner in the

adultery if, after learning about it, he still lives with her even if she doesn't repent (29.5). In that

case, divorce is the proper response. Remarriage would result in the man himself committing

adultery, so he should remain single afterward in the hope that his former wife will repent and

want to be taken back (29.6-7).[82] "This course of action," the Shepherd tells Hermas, "is

established for a wife and a husband."[83] The Shepherd then describes adultery as polluting the

flesh, and he lumps "things like the outsiders (τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) do," presumably other sexual sins,

together with it.[84] In order not to become a participant in sin, he instructs Hermas to avoid and

not live with a person involved in such activity (29.9). "Because of this," according to the

Shepherd, "it was commanded (προσετάγη) to you (pl.) to remain by yourselves, whether

husband or wife. For in cases like this repentance is possible" (29.10).[85]

The Shepherd's description of the problem of adultery, the possibility of divorce, and the

need to remain single afterward in *Mand.* 4.1 [29] reveals Hermas's significant engagement with

traditions preserved in 1 Corinthians. This is initially apparent in the way that Hermas constructs

the characters in the example that he gives. Specifically, he imagines a husband having a wife

---

[82] On the related problems of sexual immorality (πορνεία), adultery (μοιχεία), and divorcing
(ἀπολύειν), see Matt 5:32, 19:9, Mark 10:11, and Luke 16:18. Hermas agrees with Matthew
against Mark and Luke in positing πορνεία as grounds for divorce. But none of the Gospels attest
the Shepherd's exhortation for both husband and wife to remain single afterward in the hope of a
former spouse's repentance and return.

[83] αὕτη ἡ πρᾶξις ἐπὶ γυναικὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ κεῖται, 29.8.

[84] οὐ μόνον, φησίν, μοιχεία ἐστίν, ἐάν τις τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ μιάνῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὃς ἂν τὰ ὁμοιώματα
ποιῇ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, μοιχᾶται, 29.9.

[85] διὰ τοῦτο προσετάγη ὑμῖν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς μένειν, εἴτε ἀνὴρ εἴτε γυνή· δύναται γὰρ ἐν τοῖς
τοιούτοις μετάνοια εἶναι, 29.10.

who is "faithful in the Lord" (πιστὴν ἐν κυρίῳ, 29.4). The designation of a spouse as "in the Lord" (ἐν κυρίῳ) is found elsewhere only in 1 Cor 7:39, and Hermas adopts it.[86] Furthermore, the phrase "faithful wife" (γυνὴ πιστή) itself is arguably derived from its antonym ("unfaithful wife," ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος), which the apostle created in 1 Cor 7:14. Pauline influence extends to the solution — singleness in the hope of reconciliation — that the Shepherd gives to the problem of adultery and divorce.[87] Paul's argument in 1 Cor 7:10-11 exhorts a separated wife to either remain unmarried or be reconciled to the husband.[88] This is precisely the argument found in *Mand.* 4.1.8 [29.8], adapted only slightly: Hermas has expanded it to refer to both partners.[89] Paul labels his instruction to remain single in the hope of reconciliation a command, indeed a command that is not his own but the Lord's (παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος, v. 10a). This command of God given through Paul must what be what the Shepherd had in mind at *Mand.*

---

[86] Cf. 1 Cor 4:17, where Paul refers to Timothy as "faithful in the Lord" (πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ); similar designations of Paul's (and later Paulinists') co-workers are found at Rom 16:2, 8, 11-13, Col 4:7, Eph 6:21. The coincidence of language between 1 Cor 7 and *Mand.* 4 was correctly observed by Osiek, *Shepherd*, 110-11, 110 n. 7 under the general category of "Christian usage elsewhere"; cf. 1 Cor 11:11, Col 3:18. On the basis of 1 Cor 7:39, Osiek rejected a translation based on 1 Cor 4:17, namely "wife faithful in the Lord" (i.e., Lord as the object of the wife's faith, not as the descriptor of the wife herself). That translation was adopted by Robert Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 1st ed., SC 53 (Paris: Cerf, 1958), 155; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 68; Juan José Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, FP 6 (Madrid: Editorial Ciudad Nueva, 1995), 131; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 197; Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:245; Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 509. Brox, *Hirt*, 202 curiously omitted any reference to "in the Lord," translating the reference simply as "eine gläubige Frau." Similarly, see Dibelius, *Hirt*, 505 ("…eine Frau… die Christin ist").

[87] Similarly, Joseph Verheyden, "The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 326.

[88] Τοῖς δὲ γεγαμηκόσιν παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος, γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι, — ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ, μενέτω ἄγαμος ἢ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγήτω — καὶ ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι, 1 Cor 7:10-11.

[89] Verheyden, "Shepherd of Hermas," 325-26. Cf. Paul's reference to proper actions by both partners in 1 Cor 7:2-4.

4.1.10 [29.10] when he tells Hermas that he and others too "have been commanded" (προσετάγη ὑμῖν) to remain single after divorce in order for repentance to be possible. The influence of 1 Corinthians is further visible in the Shepherd's attributing improper sexual activity to τὰ ἔθνη (29.9; 1 Cor 5:1; cf. 1 Thess 4:5). It can also be seen in the Shepherd's exhortation that Hermas utterly avoid those who participate in improper sexual activities. Even though this general exhortation does not use the label, it adapts the apostle's forbidding association by Christ-believers with sexually immoral persons (πόρνοι) in 1 Cor 5 (esp. vv. 2, 7, 9, 11, 13).

Later, in *Mand.* 4.4 [32], Hermas and the Shepherd return to discussing marriage. This time their conversation touches upon not divorce but remarriage after a spouse's death and the ideal of singleness. Again the need to avoid sexual immorality (esp. πορνεία) is stated. As is the case in *Mand.* 4.1 [29.1], this passage also reveals an encounter with 1 Cor 7, including a verbatim quotation and other agreements with that passage. Therefore, I present the relevant texts in full for careful comparison:

| TABLE 1: Remarriage After Death of a Spouse | |
| --- | --- |
| *Corpus Paulinum* | *Shepherd* of Hermas |
| 1 Cor 7:28, 38-40<br>[28]ἐὰν δὲ καὶ γαμήσῃς, οὐχ ἥμαρτες…<br>[28]And yet even if you marry, you do not sin…<br><br>[38]ὥστε καὶ ὁ γαμίζων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον καλῶς ποιεῖ καὶ ὁ μὴ γαμίζων κρεῖσσον ποιήσει. [39]Γυνὴ δέδεται ἐφ᾽ ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ ὁ ἀνήρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ. [40]μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν ἐὰν οὕτως μείνῃ, κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην·<br>[38]So then, the man who marries his fiancée | *Mand* 4.4.1-2 [32.1-2]<br>[1]…Ἐὰν γυνή, φημί, κύριε, ἢ πάλιν ἀνήρ τις κοιμηθῇ καὶ γαμήσῃ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, μήτι ἁμαρτάνει ὁ γαμῶν; [2]Οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει, φησίν· ἐὰν δὲ ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτῷ μείνῃ τις, περισσοτέραν ἑαυτῷ τιμὴν καὶ μεγάλην δόξαν περιποιεῖται πρὸς τὸν κύριον· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ γαμήσῃ, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει.<br>[1]…I said, "Sir, if a wife or in turn a certain husband dies and one of them marries, the one who marries does not sin, right?"<br>[2]"He does not sin," he said. "But if he remains single, he acquires greater honor |

| *Corpus Paulinum* | *Shepherd* of Hermas |
|---|---|
| 1 Cor 7:28, 38-40 (cont.)<br>does well, but the man who does not marry does <u>better</u>. <sup>39</sup>A wife is bound for as long as her husband is alive. But <u>if the husband dies</u>, she is free to be married to the one she wants, only <u>in (the) Lord</u>. <sup>40</sup>But <u>she is more blessed if she remains thus</u>, in my judgment. | *Mand* 4.4.1-2 [32.1-2]  (cont.)<br>and great glory <u>in the Lord's eyes</u>. But <u>even if he marries, he does not sin</u>." |

Here Hermas presents another plausible scenario concerning marriage for the Shepherd to consider in relation to post-marital singleness, as he did in *Mand.* 4.1.4 [29.4]. There the question concerned adultery and subsequent divorce. Now the topic is remarriage after the death of a spouse.

"Sir," Hermas asked, "if a wife or in turn a certain husband dies and one of them marries, the one who marries does not sin, right?" Hermas's question is introduced with μήτι and therefore expects a negative response. This is our first clue that Hermas is adopting a tradition — in this case, a Pauline one — that speaks specifically to the situation. The Shepherd replies affirmingly, "They do not sin." One sentence later, he will repeat himself, making the marriage concession explicit: "…even if [someone] marries, they do not sin." This is a verbatim quotation of 1 Cor 7:28, consisting of a full six words (ἐὰν δὲ καὶ γαμήσῃ, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει).[90] Hermas

---

[90] The correspondences between 1 Cor 7 and *Mand.* 4.4 are frequently noted in the scholarly literature. James Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 105 labeled the use highly probable (b). Massaux boldly determined, "We can… *easily* agree that in this particular case, [Hermas] drew his inspiration in chapter 7 from 1 Corinthians" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 144 [emphasis added]); similarly, Osiek, *Shepherd*, 116. Earlier on the same page, Massaux more explicitly claimed "Hermas is very probably inspired by the advice which Paul gives to the

makes only two minor morphological changes to the text he quotes, neither of which threatens

the integrity of the quotation or by extension the likelihood that it is in fact Pauline.[91] First, he

alters the second-person singular verbal forms to the more generic third-person singular in order

to make the teaching more broadly relevant. Second, he shifts the verb in the apodosis from the

aorist indicative (ἥμαρτες) to the present indicative (ἁμαρτάνει) in order to generalize the

condition further. Here, in his argument for the ideal of singleness in the specific case of the

death of spouse, Hermas has clearly drawn upon what Paul wrote about to the Corinthians in

discussing the general ideal of singleness in light of the looming eschaton.

But Hermas also knows that Paul himself discussed the specific question of remarriage

after a spouse's death (1 Cor 7:39-40), as can be determined from both the contents and the

argumentative form of *Mand*. 4.4.1-2 [32.1-2]. In asking whether remarriage in such a case is

---

Corinthians in 1 Cor. 7:8-9, 28, 38, 40. Almost all his expressions are found there." A few
scholars hardly dwell on the Pauline parallels, e.g., Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 163; Brox, *Hirt*,
203 n. 5; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 449 n. 88.

[91] Given these differences, many scholars deny influence while still claiming some sort of
(unspecified) connection between 1 Cor 7 and *Mand*. 4.4. For example, Dibelius stated that "the
Shepherd's position is that of Paul," but he did not explicitly say Hermas learned it from the
apostle (*Hirt*, 513). Snyder similarly concluded that "[l]ike Paul in 1 Corinthians 7:39f.,
[Hermas] urges the widow (or widower) to remain unmarried" (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 73). *Mand*.
4.4.2 is listed as containing an allusion to 1 Cor 7:35-40 on p. 163. Brox determined that Hermas
"joins Paul in the solution to the question [of remarriage], but without exhibiting a literary
relationship to 1 Cor 7:39-40," and he cited Barnett in support of his position (*Hirt*, 214: "sich…
in der Lösung der Frage mit Paulus trifft, ohne aber literarische Beziehung zu 1 Kor 7,39f…
aufzuweisen"). However, although Barnett himself could not grant that literary dependency is
certain, he actually had concluded that "[t]he agreement in thought between Hermas and Paul
and the considerable coincidence of language create the probability of literary relationship"
(*Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941], 199-200; the
quote is from p. 200).

sinful, both Paul and Hermas answer, No.[92] Neither author considers remarriage after death

ideal.[93] Both agree on a better way, namely to remain single afterward (even using forms of the

same verb μενεῖν), although each describes the alternative somewhat differently. Paul addresses

the issue from the perspective of a woman whose husband dies (cf. Rom 7:2). By contrast, in

*Mand.* 4.4.1 [32.1] Hermas has expanded Paul's example. The situation that he inquires about

concerns "a wife *or in turn a husband*" (γυνή… ἢ πάλιν ἀνήρ τις, 32.1). Thus Hermas has

extended the discussion about remarriage with a gender complementarity such as Paul himself

uses in 1 Cor 7:2-5 in order to explicitly include the situation of a hypothetical husband as well

as a wife.

Furthermore, for Hermas, as for Paul before him, it is important to emphasize that the

marital relationship gains its chief legitimacy from the divine. According to Paul in 1 Cor 7,

upon the death of her husband a wife is free to remarry, but "only in the Lord" (μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ,

v. 39).[94] But, "if she remains single" (ἐὰν οὕτως μείνῃ), she "is more blessed" (μακαριωτέρα, v.

40). Likewise, the Shepherd tells Hermas that one who remains single after a spouse's death

"obtains for himself (or herself) greater (περισσοτέραν) honor and great glory," which is said to

be "in the Lord's eyes" (πρὸς τὸν κύριον). These two statements are conceptually equivalent to

Paul's (cf. 7:34) and therefore represent Hermas's adaptation of apostle.

---

[92] For a bibliography on the problem and possibility of remarriage after a spouse's death, see Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 449 n. 88.
[93] Compare the relevant passages in 1 Timothy, where in most cases the maximum number of allowable marriages is one (3:2, 12, 5:9). Only in the case of young widows is remarriage allowed by the Pastor, albeit grudgingly (5:11-14).
[94] Similarly, see the reference to the proper relationship between husband and wife being "in the Lord" (ἐν κυρίῳ) at 1 Cor 11:11, Col 3:18.

In addition to the striking agreements in content between 1 Cor 7 and *Mand* 4.4 [39.4], Hermas also adopts the rhetorical form and structure of Paul's argument. First, Hermas incorporates the apostle's repeated use of conditional sentences within his own passage's question-and-answer format. Second, he also reproduces the paratactic structure of 1 Cor 7:39-40.[95] The δέ of 1 Cor 7:40 connects that verse with v. 39, to which v. 40 is subordinate in thought but independent in form.[96] The same syntactical structure appears in *Mand.* 4.4.2a, where the Shepherd's formally independent statement regarding a widowed spouse who remains single is introduced with δέ (ἐὰν δὲ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ μείνῃ τις), connecting it back to the preceding statement to which it is subordinate in thought (οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει). In addition to the verbal and conceptual evidence already discussed, these two pieces of evidence further support my argument for Pauline influence upon this passage in the *Shepherd*.

By employing expanded criteria for discovering influence, I have shown that Hermas's encounter with the emerging Pauline literary legacy in *Mand.* 4.1 [29] and 4.4 [32] extends beyond his verbatim quotation of 1 Cor 7:28 alone. Hermas adopts the apostle's position in granting that remarriage after a spouse's death is not sinful and in arguing, nevertheless, that singleness is preferable. But he moves beyond Paul by adapting this command from the Lord to refer explicitly to both partners. Like Paul, Hermas also diagnoses adultery and the more general

---

[95] The use of *parataxis* in *Mand.* 4.4.1 [32.1] was said to be in "une manière analogue" to 1 Cor 7:12-13, among other texts of the Greek Bible, by Antonius Hilhorst, *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, GCP fasc. 5 (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976), 121, 121 n. 7. But in my judgment the connection between vv. 39-40 is stronger. Verheyden correctly observed that Hilhorst made this observation "without explicitly arguing for literary dependence" ("Shepherd of Hermas," 324 n. 205). Nowhere else in his monograph did Hilhorst engage the matter.

[96] On *parataxis*, see Smyth 485-87.

sexual immorality as particularly problematic, employing the same logic as the apostle had in 1
Cor 7:2-4. Both are to be avoided, as are those who practice them, and Hermas constructs the
sexual practices of outsiders as a critical foil, likely because Paul did too. The influence of
Pauline material attested in the Corinthian correspondence upon Hermas is further evident in his
depiction of causing the deposited holy Spirit to grieve throughout the *Mandates*. As I shall now
show, Hermas learned this possibility from Ephesians, but he synthesized it with other relevant
parts of Pauline letters, particularly 2 Corinthians and Romans.

*Grieving the Deposited Holy Spirit* (*Mand.* 3 [28], 5 [33], 10.1-3 [40.1-3])

The next way that the *Mandates* reflect identifiable Pauline influence is in the Shepherd's
construal of the holy Spirit. According to him, the Spirit is a deposit given by God to the human
that must not be damaged by causing it to grieve. This construal is not limited to a single
*Mandate* but unfolds across three (*Mand.* 3, 5, 10). I shall argue that the discussion between
Hermas and the Shepherd on the indwelling Spirit reflects creative connections drawn between
— and interpretation of — relevant and related parts of what becomes the *corpus Paulinum*. The
synthesized Pauline literary traditions come from 2 Cor 1, 5 and 7, Rom 8, and Eph 1 and 4:

| TABLE 2: Grieving the Deposited Holy Spirit | |
|---|---|
| *Corpus Paulinum* | *Shepherd* of Hermas |
| 2 Cor 1:22<br>ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς <u>τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος</u> ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.<br>…the one who also seals us and places <u>the deposit of the Spirit</u> in our hearts. | *Mand.* 3.1-2 [28.1-2]<br>[1]Πάλιν μοι λέγει· Ἀλήθειαν ἀγάπα, καὶ πᾶσα ἀλήθεια ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου ἐκπορευέσθω, ἵνα <u>τὸ πνεῦμα, ὃ ὁ θεὸς κατῴκισεν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ταύτῃ</u>, ἀληθὲς εὑρεθῇ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ οὕτως δοξασθήσεται ὁ κύριος ὁ ἐν σοὶ |

156

| *Corpus Paulinum* | *Shepherd* of Hermas |
|---|---|

**2 Cor 5:5**
ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θεός, ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν <u>τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος</u>.
The one who prevails upon us for this purpose is God, the one who gives us <u>the deposit of the Spirit</u>.

**2 Cor 7:8-10**
⁸Ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, οὐ μεταμέλομαι· εἰ καὶ μετεμελόμην, βλέπω [γὰρ] ὅτι ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκείνη εἰ καὶ πρὸς ὥραν ἐλύπησεν ὑμᾶς, ⁹νῦν χαίρω, οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι <u>ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν</u>· ἐλυπήθητε γὰρ κατὰ θεόν, ἵνα ἐν μηδενὶ ζημιωθῆτε ἐξ ἡμῶν. ¹⁰ἡ γὰρ <u>κατὰ θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν</u> ἀμεταμέλητον <u>ἐργάζεται</u>· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται.
⁸But even if I grieved you (pl.) in the letter, I do not regret it, although I did regret it, for I see that that letter grieved you for a little while. ⁹Now I rejoice, not because you were grieved but because <u>you were grieved to repentance</u>. You were grieved in godly fashion, so that you might not be grieved at all by us. ¹⁰<u>Godly grief accomplishes repentance</u> without remorse <u>that leads to salvation</u>, but the world's grief effects death.

**Rom 8:26-27**
²⁶Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν· τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ <u>τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει</u> στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις· ²⁷ὁ δὲ ἐραυνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδεν τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι <u>κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων</u>.

**Mand. 3.1-2 [28.1-2] (cont.)**
κατοικῶν… ²οἱ οὖν ψευδόμενοι ἀθετοῦσι τὸν κύριον καὶ γίνονται ἀποστερηταὶ τοῦ κυρίου, μὴ παραδιδόντες αὐτῷ <u>τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἣν ἔλαβον</u>. <u>ἔλαβον</u> γὰρ <u>πνεῦμα</u> ἄψευστον.
¹Again he said to me, "Love truth, and let every truth go out from your mouth, so that <u>the Spirit, which God caused to reside in this flesh</u> might be found true in the eyes of all people, and thus the Lord who resides in you will be glorified…
²Therefore, those who lie reject the Lord and become defrauders of the Lord by not returning to him <u>the deposit that they received</u>. For <u>they received a spirit</u> free of deceit."

**Mand. 5.1.1-2 [33.1-2]**
¹Μακρόθυμος, φησί, γίνου καὶ συνετός, καὶ πάντων τῶν πονηρῶν ἔργων κατακυριεύσεις καὶ ἐργάσῃ πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην. ²ἐὰν γὰρ μακρόθυμος ἔσῃ, <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κατοικοῦν ἐν σοὶ</u> καθαρὸν ἔσται, μὴ ἐπισκοτούμενον ὑπὸ ἑτέρου πονηροῦ πνεύματος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ κατοικοῦν ἀγαλλιάσεται καὶ εὐφρανθήσεται μετὰ τοῦ σκεύους ἐν ᾧ κατοικεῖ, καὶ λειτουργήσει τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἱλαρότητι πολλῇ, ἔχον τὴν εὐθηνίαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.
¹"Be patient," he said, "and intelligent, and you will have mastery over all wicked deeds and you will do all righteousness. ²For if you are patient, <u>the holy Spirit that resides in you</u> will be clean, not overshadowed by another evil spirit, but by residing in a roomy place it will exult and be glad with the vessel in which it resides, and it will serve God with much

| *Corpus Paulinum* | *Shepherd* of Hermas |
|---|---|
| Rom 8:26-27 (cont.)<br>[26] Likewise the Spirit also helps in our weakness. For we do not know what it is necessary that we should pray, but <u>the Spirit</u> itself <u>intercedes</u> with unspeakable groanings. [27]The one who searches out hearts knows what the Spirit's mind is, because it <u>intercedes before God on behalf of (the) saints</u>. | *Mand.* 5.1.1-2 [33.1-2] (cont.)<br>cheerfulness, having good-rapport with itself. |
| | *Mand* 10.1.1-2 [40.1-2]<br>[1]Ἆρον ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ, φησί, τὴν λύπην· καὶ γὰρ αὕτη ἀδελφή ἐστι τῆς διψυχίας καὶ τῆς ὀξυχολίας… [2]οὐ νοεῖς ὅτι ἡ λύπη… ἐκτρίβει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ πάλιν σῴζει;<br>[1]"So… remove grief from yourself, because this is the sister of double-mindedness and sharp temper… [2]Do you not understand that <u>grief… crushes the holy Spirit</u>, and <u>again it saves</u>?" |
| Eph 1:13-14<br>[13]Ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε <u>τῷ πνεύματι</u> τῆς ἐπαγγελίας <u>τῷ ἁγίῳ</u>, [14]ὅ ἐστιν <u>ἀρραβὼν</u> τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως, εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.<br>[13]In him [i.e., Christ] you too, after you heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation in which you believed, you were sealed by <u>the holy Spirit</u> of the promise, [14]which is a <u>deposit</u> of our inheritance toward redemption of a possession for the praise of his glory. | *Mand* 10.2.1-2 [41.1-2]<br>[1]Ἄκουε οὖν, φησίν, ἀνόητε, πῶς <u>ἡ λύπη ἐκτρίβει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον</u> καὶ <u>πάλιν σῴζει</u>. [2]ὅταν ὁ δίψυχος ἐπιβάληται πρᾶξίν τινα, καὶ ταύτης ἀποτύχῃ διὰ τὴν διψυχίαν αὐτοῦ, ἡ λύπη αὕτη εἰσπορεύεται εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ <u>λυπεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἐκτρίβει αὐτό</u>.<br>[1]"So hear, you fool," he says, "how <u>grief crushes the holy Spirit</u> and <u>saves again</u>. [2]Whenever a double-minded person undertakes some business and fails at it because of their double-mindedness, this <u>grief</u> enters into the person and <u>grieves the holy Spirit and crushes it</u>." |
| Eph 4:30<br>καὶ <u>μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον</u> τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως.<br>And <u>do not grieve the holy Spirit</u> of God, in which you were sealed for (the) day of redemption. | *Mand* 10.2.4-5 [41.4-5]<br>[4]αὕτη οὖν <u>ἡ λύπη δοκεῖ σωτηρίαν ἔχειν</u>, ὅτι τὸ πονηρὸν πράξας <u>μετενόησεν</u>. ἀμφότεραι οὖν αἱ πράξεις <u>λυποῦσι τὸ πνεῦμα</u>· ἡ μὲν διψυχία, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπέτυχε τῆς πράξεως αὐτῆς, ἡ δὲ ὀξυχολία <u>λυπεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα</u>, ὅτι ἔπραξε τὸ πονηρόν. ἀμφότερα οὖν <u>λυπηρά ἐστι τῷ πνεύματι</u> |

| *Corpus Paulinum* | *Shepherd* of Hermas |
|---|---|
| TABLE 2, continued | |
| | *Mand* 10.2.4-5 [41.4-5] (cont.)<br>τῷ ἁγίῳ, ἡ διψυχία καὶ ἡ ὀξυχολία. ⁵ἆρον οὖν ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ τὴν λύπην καὶ μὴ θλῖβε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ ἐν σοὶ κατοικοῦν, μήποτε ἐντεύξηται κατὰ σοῦ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἀποστῇ ἀπὸ σοῦ.<br>⁴Therefore, this grief is reputed to bring salvation, because having done what was evil, he repented. So both matters grieve the Spirit: the double-mindedness, because it was not successful in its matter; and the sharp temper grieves the Spirit, because it did what was evil. Consequently, both are grievous to the holy Spirit — the double-mindedness and the sharp temper. ⁵So, remove grieve from yourself, and do not crush the holy Spirit that resides in you, lest it intercede against you to God and depart from you.<br><br>*Mand* 10.3.2 [42.2]<br>ὁ δὲ λυπηρὸς ἀνὴρ πάντοτε πονηρεύεται· πρῶτον μὲν πονηρεύεται, ὅτι λυπεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ δοθὲν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἱλαρόν· δεύτερον δὲ λυπῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀνομίαν ἐργάζεται, μὴ ἐντυγχάνων μηδὲ ἐξομολογούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ. πάντοτε γὰρ λυπηροῦ ἀνδρὸς ἡ ἔντευξις οὐκ ἔχει δύναμιν τοῦ ἀναβῆναι ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.<br>But a grief-filled man always does evil. First, he does evil because he grieves the holy Spirit that was given in a cheerful state to a person. And, second, after grieving the holy Spirit, he accomplishes lawlessness by neither praying or making confession to the Lord. For it always the case that the prayer of a grief-filled man does not have power to go up to the altar of God. |

These passages from *Mand.* 3, 5, and 10 clearly construe the human as a locus in which the Spirit resides.[97] If we were to test the hypothesis of Pauline influence upon them on the basis of quotation alone, we would have little material to assess. However, once one looks at the broader web of Hermas's theological anthropology, particularly as it relates to the problem of preserving the indwelling holy Spirit, we can see how it reflects adoption, adaptation, and synthesis of the specifics of letters ultimately collected in the *corpus Paulinum*, especially 2 Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians.

Hermas envisions the God-given Spirit in the same ways as do Paul and the Ephesian pseudepigrapher. Their first commonality is the idea that the holy Spirit inhabits the human. Paul repeatedly refers the Spirit's dwelling in the believer and being given by God. For example, in 1 Corinthians the apostle states that "the spirit of God dwells in you" (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, 3:16), and he repeats this idea verbatim in Romans (πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, 8:9). Paul also understands Christ to live in a believer. This is perhaps clearest at Gal 2:20, where the apostle argues, "I no longer live, but Christ lives in me" (ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός). But it is apparent elsewhere, for example at 2 Cor 13:5 (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν).[98] Hermas's *Mandates* evince a similar perspective. "God caused [the Spirit] to live *in this flesh*," the Shepherd states in *Mand.* 3.1 [28.1];[99] later, he says, only slightly differently, that this Spirit

---

[97] Elsewhere, Hermas describes the human as comprised of or inhabited by two opposing spirits (33.2, 34.5), one of righteousness and another of evil (36.1), which battle for the human's desire, will, and intention (cf. Rom 7:14-23).

[98] See also Rom 8:10; 2 Cor 12:9; Gal 4:6, 19; cf. Col 1:27.

[99] …τὸ πνεῦμα, ὃ ὁ θεὸς κατῴκισεν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ταύτῃ, *Mand.* 3.1 [28.1].

was "given by God *to* the flesh" (10.2.6 [41.6].[100] In a nutshell, for him, as for Paul, the Spirit

"lives in" the believer.[101] Like Paul, Hermas also links the God-given Spirit with the Lord who

lives in the human. In *Mand*. 3.1 [28.1], the Shepherd states that the "Lord who lives in you" will

be glorified if "the Spirit whom God caused to live in this flesh" is found to be true.[102] The

equivalency Hermas implies between Spirit and Lord is consistent with 2 Cor 3:17, where Paul

states that "The Lord is the Spirit" (ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν).[103]

The metaphors of the indwelling Spirit found in Paul, Ephesians, and the *Mandates* have

a second aspect in common — their construal of God's giving the Spirit in economic terms. The

Spirit that God gives is labeled a "deposit" (ἀρραβών) twice in 2 Corinthians (1:22, 5:5), and the

same image is employed in Eph (1:14).[104] For his part, Hermas understands the Spirit as a

---

[100] τὸ… πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ δοθὲν εἰς τὴν σάρκα, *Mand*. 10.2.6 [41.6]. In *Sim*. 5.6.5 [59.5], the Shepherd further explains that it is "the preexistent holy Spirit, which brought the whole creation into existence, [that] God caused to live in the flesh" (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ προόν, τὸ κτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν, κατῴκισεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς σάρκα ἣν ἠβούλετο). Similarly, in *Sim*. 5.7.1-2 [60.1-2] the Shepherd tells Hermas that the Spirit lives in the flesh and that defiling the flesh results in defiling the holy Spirit.

[101] *Mand*. 5.1.2 [33.2]; similarly, *Mand*. 5.2.5 [34.5] 10.2.5 [41.5].

[102] Ἀλήθειαν ἀγάπα, καὶ πᾶσα ἀλήθεια ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου ἐκπορευέσθω, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα, ὃ ὁ θεὸς κατῴκισεν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ταύτῃ, ἀληθὲς εὑρεθῇ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ οὕτως δοξασθήσεται ὁ κύριος ὁ ἐν σοὶ κατοικῶν, 28.1.

[103] The equivalency is repeated in shorter form at the end of v. 18: ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος. Similarly, at 1 Cor 6:17, Paul writes, "The who unites himself to the Lord is one spirit (with him)" (ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἓν πνεῦμά ἐστιν).

[104] For the various possible meanings of ἀρραβών, see BDAG 134 ("first installment, deposit, down payment, pledge"); and LSJ 246 ("earnest-money, caution-money"; "pledge, earnest"; "present, bribe"). Yon-Gyong Kwon has argued against the broad scholarly consensus, suggesting that ἀρραβών in 2 Cor 1:22 and 5:5 means "pledge" not "down payment" or "first installment" ("Ἀρραβων as Pledge in Second Corinthians," *NTS* 54 [2008]: 525-41). Kwon likewise denies that the "first fruit of the Spirit" (τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος) in Rom 8:23 refers to a down payment or deposit with a *pars pro toto* sense (540 n. 68). On translating

"deposit" received from the Lord too (παρακαταθήκη, 28.2). In referring to the symbolic transaction wherein God deposits the Spirit with the human, Hermas does not use the word that we find in the *corpus Paulinum*. Instead, he employs an atticizing compound form of the synonym παραθήκη.[105] As with all deposits, he imagines that this one is both "received" and later "returned" (*Mand*. 3.2 [28.2]). Other literature of the period attests the metaphor of divine deposit.[106] This is particularly the case with respect to the deposited human spirit or soul.[107] But

---

ἀρραβών as pledge in Eph 1:14 and the background of the term, see Barnabas M. Ahern, "The Indwelling Spirit, Pledge of Our Inheritance (Eph. 1:14)," *CBQ* 9 (1947): 179-89.

[105] The atticism was recognized by Dibelius, *Hirt*, 502; Brox, *Hirt*, 199; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 107. This word παραθήκη is attested in the Pastoral Epistles, where it refers to the "deposit" of Pauline teaching" (1 Tim 6:20, 2 Tim 1:12, 14). Interestingly, though, in 2 Tim 1:14 the indwelling holy Spirit is the means by which the "good deposit" is to be kept, which clearly indicates that the spirit is not the deposit (τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν).

[106] For a survey of the notion of "deposit" in antiquity, see Joseph Ranft, "Depositum," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*, ed. Theodor Klauser, vol. 3 (Leipzig: K. W. Hiersemann, 1957), 778-84, esp. 781-82 on its use in the Pauline letters. Lists of comparanda are given in Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 446 n. 41; Walter T. Wilson, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, CEJL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 146-47; idem, *The Sentences of Sextus*, WLAW 1 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 60-61. Daniel Völter, *Die apostolischen Väter, neu untersucht*: Vol. 1: *Clemens, Hermas, Barnabas* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904), 239-40 provided a number of parallels in early Judaism but did not mention the "deposit" specifically.

[107] According to Wilson, "[t]he observation that the human soul or spirit is only a 'loan' from the deity was a cliché" (*Sentences of Sextus*, 60-61; see also idem, *Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, 146). For example, in the first century B.C.E. psuedo-Phocylides labeled the human spirit a "loan (χρῆσις) from God to mortals (*Sentences* 106: πνεῦμα γάρ ἐστι θεοῦ χρῆσις θνητοῖσι καὶ εἰκών) Following ibid., 141, I translate χρῆσις as "loan," not "deposit"; cf. LSJ 2006. Similarly, the soul is labeled a debt demanded back (ἀπαιτηθεὶς χρέος) in Wis 15:8. More common, though, was the idea that the soul (ψυχή) was a *deposit* (παρακαταθήκη) from God. One of the *Sentences* of Sextus from the first century B.C.E. reads, "Consider your soul to be a deposit from God" (τὴν ψυχήν σοῦ νόμιζε παραθήκην ἔχειν παρὰ θεοῦ, 21). And at the turn of the Common Era Philo included the soul among the "sacred deposits" (παρακαταθῆκαι ἱεραί) entrusted by the Creator, which humans must guard and one day return (*Rer. div.* 105); previously, Philo invited the reader to consider all such things to be God the giver's possessions (θεοῦ τοῦ διδόντος κτήματα πάντα, 103), themselves a loan (δάνειον) or deposit (παρακαταθήκην, 104). This banking metaphor is

among surviving literature composed prior to the *Shepherd*, only Paul and the author of

Ephesians explicitly construe the giving of the in-dwelling *Spirit* of God in economic terms as

does Hermas.[108] Commentators frequently list the verbal parallel between Hermas's use of the

word "deposit" (παρακαταθήκη) in *Mand*. 3.2 [28.2] and the Pastorals.[109] But to my knowledge

none posits any sort of influence upon Hermas by the Pauline homologoumena or a later Pauline

pseudepigraphon here.[110] Such scholarly hesitancy to posit Pauline influence upon Hermas's

conception of the Spirit arguably reflects the fact that there is no quotation of 2 Cor 1:22, 5:5 and

Eph 1:14 at *Mand*. 3.2 [28.2]. However, even though the word that Hermas used

(παρακαταθήκη) is different from the one that Paul and the author of Ephesians did (ἀρραβών),

both can refer to the same thing, and so his is a recognizable synonym of the Pauline word. This

---

continued in texts written after the *Shepherd*. The *Apocalypse of Ezra* twice refers to the soul as a deposit given by God to Ezra (6.3, 17). The *Apocalypse of Sedrach* possibly refers to the soul as a deposit (παρακαταθήκη) placed by God the Father in Sedrach's mother's womb (9.2). However, the relevant reading (δός μοι τὴν παρακαταθήκην) is a conjectural emendation by M. R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Apocryphal Books and Fragments*, TS 2, no. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893), 133, based on the text of the Apocalypse of Ezra 6.17. The sole extant manuscript, Cod. Misc. Gr. 56 in the Bodleian Library of Oxford, does not attest it. James's reading is adopted by Otto Wahl, *Apocalypsis Esdrae, Apocalypsis Sedrach, Visio beati Esdrae*, PVTG 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 42, albeit in brackets to indicate uncertainty.

[108] The expanded medieval Hebrew text of the *Testament of Naphtali* mentions a "holy Spirit of God which has been put and breathed into [a person]," adding "blessed is he who returns it to its Creator as pure as it was on the day when he entrusted it (to him)" (10.9) (trans. A. van der Heide, "Appendix I: The Hebrew *Testament of Naphtali*," in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, SVTP 8 [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985], 450). See also Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr*. 3.243; Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div*. 42.8; Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. Phil*. 3.83; Athanasius, *Vita Ant*. 20.9.

[109] E.g., Dibelius, *Hirt*, 502; Brox, *Hirt*, 197 n. 3; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 446 n. 41; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 107.

[110] Some detect a different influence altogether, as in the case of Dibelius, who attributed Hermas's use of "deposit" to the general history of religions (*Hirt*, 502).

may be evidence of Hermas's adapting Pauline tradition. Further evidence is apparent too, as I shall now show.

Unlike Hermas, nowhere does Paul or the author of Ephesians suggest that the indwelling Spirit of God will be given back. As we have seen, the idea of the *human* spirit, itself a deposit from God that eventually would be given back, was well known in antiquity, but prior to the *Shepherd*, giving back *God's* Spirit was not. Hermas probably did not invent this idea, though. Instead, he likely took it to be the collective implication of various related parts of the Pauline corpus that he knew.[111] Hermas, I suggest, was led to this idea due to his understanding that the deposited holy Spirit that God caused to dwell in the human can be harmed.

The worst way that Hermas imagines the deposited holy Spirit being harmed is by causing it to grieve.[112] The Shepherd describes this possibility to Hermas in two different ways. In *Mand.* 3.4 [28.4], the Shepherd exhorts him not to "bring grief upon (ἐπάγειν) the holy and true Spirit."[113] And at various points in *Mand.* 10, a commandment that promotes cheerfulness (ἱλαρότης) and dissuades from grief (λύπη), we find a form of the very same phrase in Eph 4:30,

---

[111] This could possibly have happened by Hermas's misconstruing the referent of παραθήκη in 2 Tim 1:14. There the "deposit" corresponds to the "outline of sound (Pauline) teachings" (ὑποτύπωσις ὑγιαινόντων λόγων) in v. 13, which the author claims Timothy heard from him; see, among others, Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro, Herm (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 105. In other words, perhaps instead of understanding the Spirit to be the means *by which* some deposit is kept Hermas conflated the two, imagining the deposit to *be* the indwelling Spirit.

[112] Of the various ways that Hermas understands that the Spirit can be damaged besides by grieving, he names rendering it false and therefore defrauding the Lord (28.2), wearing it out (40.2, 41.1-2), distressing it (41.5), and causing it distress (41.6). In *Sim.* 9.32.2-4 [109.2-4], the Spirit is said to be given whole or unimpaired (*integrum*), and in such fashion it must be returned. Otherwise, its utility (*usus*) is threatened, and the Lord who owns it will punish with those who corrupt it (109.4).

[113] μηδὲ λύπην ἐπάγειν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ σεμνῷ καὶ ἀληθεῖ, *Mand.* 3.4 [28.4].

namely "grieving the holy Spirit" (λυπεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον).[114] The occurrence of this phrase

in the *Mandates* is only rarely labeled a quotation of Ephesians.[115] In fact, most scholars have

resisted attributing Pauline dependence here.[116] On the basis of my research, however, there is no

instance of the idea "grieving the holy Spirit" in extant Greek literature prior to Ephesians. The

fact that Hermas adopts not only the general idea throughout *Mand*. 10.2-3 but also the

identifiable five-word phrase from Eph 4:30 with only one minor change — he modifies the

form of the prohibition — means he must be quoting that letter.[117] But that is not the end of his

encounter with the Pauline corpus on this problem. Having learned the notion of grieving the

holy Spirit in Ephesians, Hermas expanded it by associating it with a cluster of related ones

across the Pauline corpus. Specifically, Hermas connected the idea in Ephesians that the holy

Spirit can be grieved with Paul's contention in 2 Cor 7:8-11 that grief can serve a positive

---

[114] The specific phrase λυπεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον is found at *Mand*. 10.2.1-2, 4-5 [41.1-2, 4-5] and 10.3.2 [42.2]. A strikingly similar phrase — to "irritate (παροξυνεῖν) the holy Spirit" — is found in LXX Isa 63:10.

[115] E.g., Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 106. But he only detected quotations in *Mand*. 10.2.1-2, 4-5. To these locations, I add *Mand*. 10.1.2 [40.2] and 10.3.2 [42.2]. Drummond noted the latter but did not list it as a quotation, even though he did list 10.2.2 [41.2], where the same phrase (ἐκτρίβειν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) appears. Drummond presented his probable quotation of Eph 4:30 in *Mand*. 10.2 without much comment. But he did write, "In view of the originality and boldness of the phrase in Ephesians, it seems likely that Hermas is developing in his own way a phrase that a lodged in his mind." Although Drummond did not explicitly state which original, bold phrase he meant, he appears to have been referring to "grieving the holy Spirit" (λυπεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), which is the only extensive verbal parallel between the two entries in his table. Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 144-46 also argued for literary dependence upon Eph 4:30.

[116] Dibelius, *Hirt*, 533-35; Molly Whittaker, *Die apostolischen Väter* Vol. 1: *Der Hirt des Hermas*, 2nd rev. ed., GCS (Berlin: Akademie, 1967), 39; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 84-85; Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 189-91; Brox, *Hirt*, 241; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 160; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 227; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 137 n. 10.

[117] The only difference is that Hermas does not use the prohibition in Eph 4:30 (μὴ λυπεῖτε) — he uses a different verbal form; cf. 41.5, though, where he does use the prohibition, albeit with a synonymous verb (μὴ θλῖβε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον).

outcome, as well as with his description of the Spirit as intercessor in Rom 8:26-27, thereby demonstrating a combinatory hermeneutic.[118]

Hermas engaged the ideas contained in these Pauline passages in five specific ways. First, he speaks not only of a generic "grieving" the Spirit but of grief itself. That is to say, Hermas focuses the idea of a damaging action (i.e., grieving) by extrapolating a damaging agent (i.e., grief), probably under the influence of 2 Cor 7:10. That text contrasts two types of grief, godly grief (ἡ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη) and worldly grief (ἡ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη). For Paul, the former works salvation, whereas the latter works death.[119] Hermas then expands this Pauline notion and gives grief a familial relation. Grief, the Shepherd tells him, "is the sister of double-mindedness and hot-headedness" (40.1).[120] This grief, Hermas indicates, can enter into a double-minded person and accomplish real harm.

Second, Hermas interprets what it means to say that the Spirit is grieved. Grief "crushes" (ἐκτρίβει) the holy Spirit (40.2, 3; 41.1, 2). But it harms the Spirit in other ways too. In *Mand.* 10.2.5 [41.5], the Shepherd exhorts Hermas, "Remove grief from yourself, and do not distress (μὴ θλῖβε) the holy Spirit that lives in you."[121] From these statements, we learn that Hermas understands grieving, crushing, and distressing the Spirit to be virtually synonymous. At the end of the section, Hermas again links grief and distress as unbearable to the Spirit, confirming this is the case (41.6).

---

[118] For the descriptor "combinatory hermeneutic," I am indebted to Mitchell, "James as a Document of Paulinism?," 91.

[119] See the discussion on p. 130 above.

[120] Ἆρον ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ, φησί, τὴν λύπην· καὶ γὰρ αὕτη ἀδελφή ἐστι τῆς διψυχίας καὶ τῆς ὀξυχολίας, 40.1.

[121] ἆρον οὖν ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ τὴν λύπην καὶ μὴ θλῖβε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ ἐν σοὶ κατοικοῦν, 41.5.

Third, Hermas articulates what causes the Spirit to be grieved in the first place. For him, there are multiple grief-inducing factors. He previously labeled two of them grief's sisters: double-mindedness (διψυχία) and hot-headedness (ὀξυχολία). "Both," he says, "are a source of grief (λυπηρά ἐστι) to the holy Spirit" (41.4).[122] In *Mand.* 10.3.2 [42.2], Hermas adds other factors that grieve the holy Spirit to his list, namely "doing evil" (πονηρεύεσθαι) and "doing lawlessness" (ἀνομίαν ἐργάζεσθαι), and he links the latter lawlessness with failing to make intercession or confession to the Lord (42.2).[123]

Fourth, Hermas explains what happens when the holy Spirit is grieved. If that happens, two things will follow. The Spirit will intercede *against* someone before God, and then it will depart (41.5).[124] On this point, the key passage from the *corpus Paulinum* is Rom 8:26-27.[125] There Paul speaks of the Spirit's interceding (ὑπερεντυγχάνει) to God for the saints (v. 27) when they are unable or do not know how to pray (v. 26). The idea of intercession in the divine courtroom on behalf of another was common in early Judaism.[126] But the idea that the *Spirit* so intercedes is "a Pauline novelty."[127] This novelty is adopted in *Mand.* 10, but Hermas gives it a

---

[122] ἀμφοτέρα οὖν λυπηρά ἐστι τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, ἡ διψυχία καὶ ἡ ὀξυχολία, 41.4.

[123] The logic of the linkage depends on how one construes the adverbial force two circumstantial participles at 42.2: μὴ ἐντυγχάνων μηδὲ ἐξομολογούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ. I understand them as participles of manner.

[124] Against Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 226, I follow the witness of Codex Athos, which attests the prepositional phrase κατὰ σοῦ τῷ between ἐντεύξηται and τῷ θεῷ. This is the *lectio difficilior*.

[125] Karl Reinhold Jachmann, *Der Hirte des Hermas: Ein Beitrag zur Patristik* (Königsberg: J. H. Bon, 1835), 63 listed *Mand.* 10.3 as an allusion to Rom 8:26-27, but did not engage it. Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 115 assigned it a "d" ranking (i.e., possible but uncertain).

[126] See Meira Z. Kensky, *Trying Man, Trying God: The Divine Courtroom in Early Jewish and Christian Literature*, WUNT II 289 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), esp. 13-61, 119-80.

[127] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 518. On the influences for Paul's development the motif, see E.

twist. There the Spirit is imagined potentially to intercede not *on behalf of* believers but *against* them.[128]

Finally, Hermas expands the idea in Ephesians that the Holy Spirit can be grieved by adding the possibility of grief's serving a salvific function too. He does so via connection with 2 Cor 7:8-11.[129] There Paul stated that he did not regret it if in a previous letter he grieved the Corinthians, because their being grieved in a godly fashion led them to repentance (v. 9). According to to the apostle, "…godly grief produces unregrettable repentance leading to salvation; but the grief of the world produces death" (v. 10). To be sure, Hermas does not refer specifically to grief being "in a godly fashion" (κατὰ θεόν) as Paul did. But Hermas adopted from 2 Cor 7 the pointed idea that grief produces salvation, which, like the Spirit's interceding on behalf of a person, is a Pauline theological invention. Hermas's conceptual debt to Paul on this idea is apparent in *Mand*. 10.1.2, 6 [40.2-6] and 10.2.1-4 [41.3-4].[130] In the former passage,

A. Obeng, "The Spirit Intercession Motif in Paul," *ExpTim* 95 (1984): 361; E. A. Obeng, "The Origins of the Spirit Intercession Motif in Romans 8.26," *NTS* 32 (1986): 621-32.

[128] The courtroom motif reappears at *Sim*. 5.7.1 [60.1], where the Shepherd tells Hermas, "Keep this flesh pure and undefiled, so that the Spirit that lives in it might testify on its behalf and your flesh might be justified" (τὴν σάρκα σου ταύτην φύλασσε καθαρὰν καὶ ἀμίαντον, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ κατοικῆσαν ἐν αὐτῇ μαρτυρήσῃ αὐτῇ καὶ δικαιωθῇ σου ἡ σάρξ).

[129] The possible connection with 2 Cor 7:10 was recognized at least as early as Jachmann, *Hirte des Hermas*, 63. He cited *Mand*. 10.1 but mistakenly paraphrased in Latin the text of *Mand*. 11.1. Oscar von Gebhardt and Adolf von Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e codice palatino,* PAO 3 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877), 22 noted the occurrence of the phrase θάνατον κατεργάζεσθαι at Rom 7:18, 2 Cor 7:10 but overlooked the salvific function of grief.

[130] According to Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 84, "[t]he source of [Hermas] teaching on grief *surely derives* from Paul's comment on the value of grief in his struggle with the Corinthians" (emphasis added). Similarly, Massaux suggested that "for Hermas, whose fervent desire is to see men saved, melancholy [i.e., grief] contains a salutary aspect which he finds expressed in another of Paul's texts, 2 Cor 7:10, which states that melancholy brings out repentance, thanks to which he who sinned is saved" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 145). Osiek was

the Shepherd speaks obliquely about how grief can accomplish salvation. But in the latter one, the Shepherd specifically states that a certain kind of grief, that is the grief that enters in to the heart of a hot-headed person grieved by his actions, "appears to bring about salvation," because grief has led to repentance.[131] In addition to adopting Paul's idea of grief leading to salvation, Hermas likewise affirms that grief can be deadly too. We see this in the Shepherd's command at *Mand*. 10.3.4 [42.4], where cleansing and casting off evil grief are conditions of "living to God" (ζῆν τῷ θεῷ).[132]

In dealing throughout the *Mandates* with the topic of the deposited holy Spirit that can be grieved, Hermas is performing the work of a Pauline interpreter. By this I mean that Hermas recalled related passages that he presumably had heard read or discussed on some prior occasion from across what becomes the *corpus Paulinum* and then used them as sources and catalysts for his own theological imagination. The foundational idea that he adopted from Paul is that God gives the holy Spirit to the human as a deposit. Paul and the pseudepigraphic author of Ephesians called this an ἀρραβών, but Hermas adapted it, employing the synonym παρακαταθήκη instead. Hermas also knew from the same letter to the Ephesians that this Spirit could be harmed by

_____

significantly less certain than Snyder and Massaux but still wondered if "perhaps because the idea of two kinds of sadness was so well known from 2 Cor 7:10… the author feels he cannot *not* include it" (*Shepherd*, 137; emphasis original). Other scholars reject influence by 2 Cor 7:8-11 outright. For example, Joly compared *Mand*. 10.2.1 with 2 Cor 7:10, but on the basis of alleged conceptual difference he implicitly denied any possible Pauline influence ("mais Paul distingue la tristesse selon Dieu et la tristesse selon le monde"; *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 189 n. 1). Likewise, Dibelius determined that Paul's distinction in v. 10 between the two kinds of grief "plays no foundational role in our text," arguing instead that Hermas "inserted non-Christian material... into a Jewish-Christian way of thinking" (*Hirt*, 531 and 533, respectively).

[131] αὕτη οὖν ἡ λύπη δοκεῖ σωτηρίαν ἔχειν, ὅτι τὸ πονηρὸν πράξας μετενόησεν, 41.4.

[132] καθάρισον οὖν σεαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης τῆς πονηρᾶς ταύτης, καὶ ζήσῃ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ πάντες ζήσονται τῷ θεῷ ὅσοι ἂν ἀποβάλωσιν ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν τὴν λύπην καὶ ἐνδύσωνται πᾶσαν ἱλαρότητα, 42.4.

causing it to grieve. And so he creatively connected the two related notions. He then posited a reason for the injunction in Ephesians against causing the deposited Spirit to grieve: the deposited Spirit would eventually have to be given back to God. Put differently, Hermas harmonizes the Pauline description of the Spirit as ἀρραβών and the command in Eph 4:30 not to grieve it. Although Paul himself might not have had this sort of ἀρραβών in mind (i.e., one that must be returned), a Greek-speaking writer like Hermas could plausibly have thought that he did, particularly if Hermas knew about and was influenced by the deposit (παραθήκη) described in the Pastoral Epistles.[133] Hermas also adapted the Pauline metaphor of the grieving holy Spirit by imagining what that Spirit will do when it is grieved. Under the influence of Rom 8, Hermas imagines that the Spirit will intercede not only for, but also against a believer. Grief, though, is not always a bad thing. By leading a person to repentance, it can bring about salvation, as Hermas learned from 2 Cor 7. In these ways, we can see Hermas offering a contextual reading of the pseudepigraphic letter to the Ephesians in light of related material elsewhere in the *corpus Paulinum*.[134]

*The (Im)Possibility of Second Repentance* (*Mand*. 4.3.1-2 [31.1-2])

Evidence of Hermas's encounter with a *corpus Paulinum* in his *Mandates* is further apparent at *Mand*. 4.3.1-2 [31.1-2]. Here Hermas offers a new and pastorally sensitive solution to a problem

---

[133] See p. 162 n. 106 above on the παραθήκη in 1 Tim 6:20, 2 Tim 1:12, 14.
[134] Ultimately, then, in my judgment both Drummond and Massaux were right, but in overlooking the influence of Rom 8:26-27 they did not go far in enough in determining the extent of Pauline influence upon Hermas on the topics of grief and grieving the (deposited) holy Spirit.

that Hebrews gives expression to and perhaps even generated.[135] That problem is the need for

repentance after post-baptismal sin. The relevant text is Heb 6:4-6, presented in full for

comparison:

| TABLE 3: The (Im)Possibility of Second Repentance | |
| --- | --- |
| *Corpus Paulinum* | *Shepherd* of Hermas |
| Heb 6:4-6<br>⁴ Ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου ⁵καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος ⁶καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.<br>So then, …it is impossible to renew again to repentance those who were once enlightened if they fall away after they have both tasted the heavenly gift and become sharers of the holy Spirit and tasted God's good word, because they are crucifying again and making a public spectacle of the Son of God for themselves."[136] | *Mand* 4.3.1-2 [31.1-2]<br>¹… Ἤκουσα, φημί, κύριε, παρά τινων διδασκάλων, ὅτι ἑτέρα μετάνοια οὐκ ἔστιν εἰ μὴ ἐκείνη, ὅτε εἰς ὕδωρ κατέβημεν καὶ ἐλάβομεν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν τῶν προτέρων. ²λέγει μοι· Καλῶς ἤκουσας· οὕτω γὰρ ἔχει.<br>"……I heard from certain teachers that there is no other repentance except that one when we went down into water and received forgiveness of our former sins."<br>"You heard it well said," [the Shepherd] says, "for so it is". |

---

[135] Zahn was perhaps the first to argue for Hermas's (literary) dependence on Hebrews. In his view, Hermas is "an authority on Hebrews… [and] shows himself to be strongly influenced by it" (*Der Hirt des Hermas* [Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1868], 439-52; the quote is from p. 449). Somewhat less confident are Kirsopp Lake, "The Shepherd of Hermas and Christian Life in Rome in the Second Century," *HTR* 4 (1911): 30 n. 2; Leonhard Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert: Ein Aufriss der Urgeschichte der Kirche*, BFCT 2. Reihe 55 (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954), 272 n. 1; Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 36 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 23; Patrick Gray, "The Early Reception of Hebrews 6:4-6," in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, NovTSup 129 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 327-33.

[136] My translation of ἑαυτοῖς as an ethical dative follows Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Herm (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989), 171 n. 65. Attridge, though, does not

There are insufficient verbal correspondences between these two texts to justify a claim that one

contains a *quotation* of the other.[137] This lack of substantial verbal agreement explains the wide-

ranging disagreement in the scholarly literature regarding this parallel.[138] The only word both

texts have in common is repentance (μετάνοια), one of Hermas's favorite terms.[139] This is a if

not the key theme of his writing, as scholars have long recognized.[140] Specifically, what links

<hr />

translate the verbal form ἀνασταυροῦντας with a compound sense as I do (i.e., crucifying vs. crucifying *again*); see 171 n. 63.

[137] Hermas does use the verb "renew again" (ἀνακαινίζειν) that appears in Heb 6:6 and nowhere else in prior Christian literature twice later in the *Sim*. (8.6.3 [72.3], 9.14.3 [91.3]) (Gray, "Early Reception," 329 n. 21). This is arguably evidence that he is working with tradition ultimately attributable to Hebrews.

[138] Some scholars ignore it altogether (e.g., Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 159). Likewise, the passage is not included in the list of scriptural allusions in Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 164, nor do Snyder's translation and commentary on p. 72 refer to it. Other scholars prefer simply to note the similarities between Hermas and Hebrews, thereby remaining open but not committed to some sort of influence of the latter upon the former, or of their independently reflecting common or competing tradition(s); e.g., Dibelius, *Hirt*, 511; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 168; Massaux, *Influence: Book 2: Later Christian Writings*, 148; Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, ed. Marshall D. Johnson, trans. Michael Steinhauser (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003), 94 n. 17; Vemund Blomkvist, "The Teaching on Baptism in the Shepherd of Hermas," in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. David Hellholm et al., vol. 2, 3 vols., BZNW 176 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 854.

[139] A distribution of the word μετάνοια and its Latin equivalent *paenitentia* in the *Shepherd* is provided by Ingrid Goldhahn-Müller, *Die Grenze der Gemeinde: Studien zum Problem der Zweiten Busse in Neuen Testament unter Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung im 2. Jh. bis Tertullian*, GTA 39 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 245. The data are represented in tabular form in Osiek, *Shepherd*, 28 n. 218.

[140] On repentance in Hermas's thought, see Dibelius, *Hirt*, 510-13; Bernhard Poschmann, "Die Bußlehre des Hermas," in Paenitentia secunda*: Die kirchliche Busse im ältesten Christentum bis Cyprian und Origenes: Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Theoph 1 (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1940), 134-205; Franklin W. Young, "The Shepherd of Hermas: A Study of His Concepts of Repentance and of the Church" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1946); Robert Joly, "La doctrine pénitentielle de Pasteur d'Hermas et l'exégèse récente," *RHR* 147 (1955): 32-49; Karl Rahner, "Die Bußlehre im Hirten des Hermas," *ZKT* 77 (1955): 385-431; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 69-71; Hans A. Frei, "Metanoia im 'Hirten' des Hermas," *IKZ* 64 (1974): 118-39, 189-202;

this passage from Hebrews closely with the one from Hermas is the former's statement on the impossibility of renewal after falling away. The Shepherd's confirmation of the (unnamed) teachers' denial of a second, post-baptismal repentance is conceptually equivalent to the statement in Hebrews. The conceptual similarity between these two texts is, in my judgment, too specific to be attributed to merely oral or common tradition.[141] Hermas might have learned the position on post-baptismal sin and the impossibility of repentance articulated by the author of Hebrews without reading that text himself (i.e., apart from literary influence as traditionally construed). But the problem to which he responds must be one that runs back through Hebrews, because it appears nowhere else in prior Christian literature.

Hermas himself obliquely mentions the source(s) of his information, saying he heard it from "certain teachers" (τινων διδασκάλων, 31.1).[142] Was the author of Hebrews among them?[143] Or were the teachers talking about Hebrews? Hermas does not explicitly state that either is the case. So hesitancy regarding quotation is warranted.[144] Whatever the relationship(s) between

---

idem, "Metanoia im 'Hirten' des Hermas," *IKZ* 65 (1975): 120-38, 176-204; Goldhahn-Müller, *Grenze der Gemeinde*, 240-86; Brox, *Hirt*, 476-85; Philippe Henne, "La pénitence et la rédaction du Pasteur d'Hermas," *RB* 98 (1991): 358-97; G. Alves de Sousa, "A penitência no Pastor de Hermas, mensagem de esperança," *AT* 15.2 (2001): 551-66; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 28-30; Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 94-97.

[141] According to Osiek, "[the] teaching that there is no possibility of forgiveness after baptism *echoes* Heb 6:4-6, though the terminology is *completely different*; it is not a case of textual influence but of common teaching" (*Shepherd*, 114; emphasis added).

[142] Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 94 n. 17 listed sources composed prior to and shortly after the *Shepherd* that also attest a similarly rigorist position.

[143] Patrick Gray astutely observed, "The commentary tradition on Hebrews tends to answer this question in the affirmative while scholarship on Hermas is more divided" ("Early Reception," 328).

[144] This hesitancy is implied by the (d) label (i.e., possible but uncertain) that Drummond ascribed to the parallel between Heb 6:4-6 and *Mand.* 4.3.1-2 [31.1-2]. According to him, "The

*Mand*. 4.3 and Hebrews, it is not one of quotation, let alone citation in the technical sense. And yet if we work with a broader set of criteria, we can see that Hermas still squarely situated his text within a debate reflected in — if not precipitated by — one frequently linked in antiquity with Paul. Hermas contributes to that debate by constructively navigating with pastoral concern the tension between the moral ideals and realities of the Christian's earthly life, as Paul himself and the Paulinists who followed him (like the author of Heb) frequently did.

At first glance, it would seem that the Shepherd's affirmation of the teachers' position on impossibility of a second repentance could not be clearer. "You heard it well said," he says, "for so it is" (31.2). But this is not his final word on the matter. It is only an *apparent* denial, indeed one that that actually serves as a "springboard" for further reflections on repentance.[145] The Shepherd actually goes on to admit the possibility of precisely such repentance shortly thereafter. He tells Hermas, "If after this great and holy call someone, having been tempted by the devil, should sin, there is a single (additional) repentance."[146] How, then, can the apparent discrepancy between these two views — one additional repentance or none at all — be explained?[147]

---

allusion to teachers, showing that the question was a subject of discussion, and the want of verbal correspondence, make the reference to Hebrews doubtful" ("Shepherd of Hermas," 107-08).

[145] Brox, *Hirt*, 211("Ausgangspunkt").

[146] μετὰ τὴν κλῆσιν ἐκείνην τὴν μεγάλην καὶ σεμνὴν ἐάν τις ἐκπειρασθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου ἁμαρτήσῃ, μίαν μετάνοιαν ἔχει, *Mand*. 4.3.6 [31.6]. This claim is consistent with what Hermas finds written in the Lady's little book in *Vis*. 2.2.4-5 [6.4-5] — one additional repentance is in fact possible for those saints who repent upon hearing Hermas's teaching. An alternative understanding appears at the end of the *Similitudes*, where Hermas learns that repentance is possible, at least for some who are "short in faith," as long as it occurs before the Tower is completely built (*Sim*. 9.26.5-8 [103.5-8]).

[147] Craig Koester detected in these three views — (1) no second repentance, as in Hebrews; (2) a second repentance only upon hearing Hermas's message; and (3) second repentance possible until the last day — a chronological development, in which the strictest statement in *Mand*. 4.3.1-2 is the earliest. "Later," in Koester's view, "this rigorism was modified" (i.e., *Vis*. 2.2),

On the recognized problem of laxity versus rigorism, Hermas adopts an "intermediate position."[148] That is to say he recognizes and rejects both ends of a theological spectrum — the idea, proffered by rigorists and reflected in Hebrews, that only a *single* baptismal repentance is possible, as well as its conceptual opposite, the notion that *multiple* (i.e., *unlimited*) opportunities for repentance exist. Strictly speaking, Hermas's aim is not to directly refute the idea preserved in Heb 6:4-6.[149] Hermas accepts something like what we find taught in Heb 6:4-6 and by the "certain teachers" that he heard. But he accepts it as an ideal in need of expansion. This expansion is required by what Hermas takes to be the reality of the sinful human condition.

The Shepherd states, "one who has received forgiveness of sins must no longer sin but live in purity" (*Mand*. 4.3.2 [31.2]).[150] Here the command could not be stated any clearer —

---

and "[a] final statement seems to modify the rigor even further" (i.e., *Sim*. 9.26) (*Hebrews*, 23). Despite the ingenuity and explanatory power of this hypothesis, it presumes a particular theory of the chronology of the *Shepherd*'s composition that the history of scholarship on Hermas, particularly since the mid-1960s, has roundly rejected (see pp. 20-24 in Chapter 1). It also overlooks the fact the supposedly modified rigorism of *Vis*. 2.2 is already present in the allegedly earliest layer (i.e., *Mand*. 4.3.6).

[148] Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 216.

[149] This is the argument of Clare K. Rothschild, *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*, WUNT I 235 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 30, 33 n. 83; compare the weaker statement on p. 141 ("the Shepherd of Hermas [*Mand*. 4.3.1-2]… betray[s] knowledge of Hebrews"). Herbert Braun, *An die Hebräer*, HNT 14 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1984), 172, was more restrained: "Hermas modifiziert den Hb-Rigorismus, vielleicht bewußt antithetisch, ausdrücklich." Hans-Friedrich Weiß, "Zur Frage der Ablehnung einer zweiten μετάνοια im Hebräerbrief (zu 6,1 ff)," in *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 15. Aufl., KEKNT 19 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 347-51, adopted both stances and referred to *Mand*. 4.3 as a correction to (350) and a development of (351) the rigorist position of Hebrews. Similarly, Goodspeed argued that "[t]he book that had most definitely stirred [Hermas] to write is the so-called Letter to the Hebrews… by its stern doctrine of no forgiveness for apostasy, which he understood to mean no forgiveness for sin after baptism" (*The Apostolic Fathers, an American Translation* [New York: Harper, 1950], 97).

[150] ἔδει γὰρ τὸν εἰληφότα ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν μηκέτι ἁμαρτάνειν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγνείᾳ κατοικεῖν, 31.2.

those offered forgiveness in baptism *must not sin* afterward. And yet, in contrast to Hebrews and the teachers whom he had heard, Hermas recognizes that this expectation is utterly unattainable, an ideal that no one can live up to even if baptized. This unattainability is due, at least in part, to humans' weakness and the devil's craftiness (*Mand*. 4.3.4 [31.4]). So Hermas posits the possibility of post-baptismal repentance, not in contradiction to the rigorism of Hebrews and the teachers but as a complement to it.[151] Hermas's pragmatic response to the problem of post-baptismal sin acknowledges "the tension between the ideal of the moral life and reality that is less than ideal, a tension already dealt with by Paul."[152] But the solution of a subsequent repentance is itself not the end of the story, for Hermas recognizes that some will still sin and repent incessantly.

The Shepherd rails against this reality, stating that "it is of no advantage to such a person" (*Mand*. 4.3.6 [31.6]). Those who repent must do so with the conviction that forgiveness requires perfection.[153] But, crucially, the Shepherd does not say that in instances of repeated sinning and repentance salvation will be *impossible*.[154] Rather, such a repeatedly sinning person "will attain life *with difficulty*" (δυσκόλως ζήσεται);[155] or as Osiek paraphrases, "they will barely sneak through."[156] Similar statements on the difficulty but not impossibility of obtaining (or not

---

[151] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 29, 114.

[152] Ibid., 115. Osiek followed Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 69-71, who construed the matter in terms of "the dialectic between the perfection of man in the kingdom (church, tower) and God's mercy for man caught between the kingdom and the world" (71). Among those places in Paul's letters where he engages this tension or dialectic are 1 Cor 7 and Rom 7.

[153] Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 70-71.

[154] Dibelius, *Hirt*, 510; Brox, *Hirt*, 213; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 115.

[155] This translation follows Dibelius, *Hirt*, 509-10: "…er wird schwerlich zum Leben gelangen."

[156] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 115.

obtaining) salvation are found elsewhere in the *Shepherd*.[157] Together they indicate that what

concerns Hermas most is not the technical question of whether there is one repentance for post-

baptismal sin, or more than one, or none at all. His aim is not simply for his hearers to repent

before it is too late.[158] He hopes that they will continually repent and aim for perfection, amend

their ways, and live to God in Christian community until the age to come. Hermas focuses not on

the question of whether obtaining forgiveness for post-baptismal sin is possible, which Heb 6

denied. Instead, in a way that upholds the tension between the ideal and reality of moral life in

this age apparent in Pauline letters themselves, Hermas softens the rigorism of Hebrews by

conceding the obvious fact that, even though they are called to live rightly, believers do sin after

baptism, and so repentance necessarily must still be possible. Here again we see Hermas

engaging parts of the Pauline literary corpus in a knowledgeable, thoughtful, and creative

manner, in this case by expanding a tradition attested in Hebrews in order for it to address the

reality of post-baptismal sin..


*Proper Prophecy in the Community* (*Mand*. 11 [43])

Hermas's influence by religious practices attested in the *corpus Paulinum* and common in

particular Pauline communities can also be seen in his description of properly oriented prophecy

---

[157] *Mand*. 8.10.2 [76.2], 9.6 [39.6], *Sim*. 9.20.2 [97.2], 9.23.3 [100.3]. Hermas also uses the adverb δυσκόλως at *Mand*. 12.1.2 [44.2] with the same sense (i.e., "with difficulty"), albeit in a different context; cf. the similar use of the adjective δύσκολος at *Mand*. 12.4.6 [47.6] and *Sim*. 9.20.3 [97.3].

[158] The chronological limit to repentance is, of course, the completion of the building of the Tower, the metaphorical church (e.g., *Vis*. 3.5.5 [13.5], *Sim*. 9.32.1 [109.1]). After that point, repentance is utterly impossible.

in *Mand.* 11.[159] This *Mandate* has correctly been recognized as "the longest discussion in all of

early Christian literature, prior to the middle of the second century, of the problem of true and

false prophets."[160] Among the Pauline letters, the topic of prophecy is most prominent in 1

Corinthians and Ephesians, the two letters that scholars have long suggested Hermas most likely

knew. Admittedly, *Mand.* 11 does not contain a recognizable Pauline quotation.[161] Nevertheless,

I argue that when other evidence is considered, *Mand.* 11 can be seen to reflect Hermas's

adoption of particular aspects of Paul's distinctive treatment of prophecy in 1 Cor 12 and 14, as

well as images associated with the practice from Ephesians.[162]

Hermas and the Shepherd discuss prophecy occurring in two settings. The first setting,

described in *Mand.* 11.1-3 [43.1-3], is a private one.[163] There Christians consult a diviner

(μάντις, 43.2), who upon payment tells them what they want to hear.[164] Such a practice,

condemned by the Shepherd, is widely attested in the ancient sources and was not limited to

---

[159] For an extended commentary on this mandate in its broader historical context, see J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*, NovTSup 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1973). A more focused study of particular parts of the *Shepherd* dealing with oracular prophecy was offered by David Edward Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983), 299-310.

[160] Aune, *Prophecy*, 226.

[161] No parallels of any strength in *Mand.* 11 between 1 Cor or Eph are listed in Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 105-17.

[162] This claim regarding Pauline influence upon the description of prophecy in *Mand.* 11 stands at odds with the implication drawn from most commentaries and editions of the *Shepherd*, which rarely (if ever) connect it with the Pauline corpus. See, e.g., Dibelius, *Hirt*, 536-43, esp. 538 on Hermas's alleged difference from Paul; Whittaker, *Hirt*, 40-42; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 86-89; Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 192-99; Brox, *Hirt*, 249-68; Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 144-50; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 163-67; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 462-64, esp. 462 n. 246 on idolatry and 463 n. 256 on Spirit-possession; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 140-47, esp. 144 n. 32 and 145 n. 42 where passing comparisons with Paul are made.

[163] Aune, *Prophecy*, 227. Aune was followed by Osiek, *Shepherd*, 142 n. 11.

[164] For a careful treatment of the relevant scribal variant (μάντις vs. μάγος), see Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 34.

Judaism or Christianity.[165] Sometimes, though, the Shepherd suggests that a diviner (who he denies is a prophet of God [43.12]) attempts to ply his prophecy in a second setting. This second setting is a presumably public gathering of the broader Christian community, as imagined in *Mand*. 11.7-14 [43.7-14].[166] It is the Shepherd's depiction of prophecy properly pursued in this second setting that most strongly coheres with what becomes the Pauline corpus.

The Shepherd's description of Christian prophecy within a gathering of the community mirrors the Spirit-filled practice attested in particular Pauline letters, especially 1 Corinthians, in four specific ways.[167] First, for Hermas, as for Paul, the capacity for prophecy is something given

---

[165] David E. Aune, "Herm. Mand. 11.2: Christian False Prophets Who Say What People Wish to Hear," *JBL* 97 (1978): 103-4. Aune made this corrective claim and cited relevant sources in response to Reiling's assertion that "Hermas' remark that the false prophet speaks καθὼς αὐτοὶ βούλονται is more in line with the Hebrew-Christian judgment on divination" (*Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 37).

[166] Hermas labels this second setting a *synagogue* (συναγωγή), typically one of "righteous men," three times. The explicit phrase συναγωγὴν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων appears at 43.9, 13, 14; the first location also contains a reference to "the assembly of those men" (τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων), obviously the same group. Following Erik Peterson, "Kritische Analyse der V. Vision des Hermas," *HJGG* 77 (1957): 369, Snyder thought that the setting envisioned by the *Shepherd* reflected "an actual synagogue… or Jewish type house of worship"; see *Shepherd of Hermas*, 86. This position was explicitly rejected by Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 31, 122. Furthermore, Osiek correctly observed that this label need not imply that the community was Jewish (or Jewish-Christian), because on occasion in other texts it was used to refer to Christian gatherings (*Shepherd*, 144 and n. 37 for a list of primary sources). It is simply "a congregational setting" (Aune, *Prophecy*, 227).

[167] Influence by 1 Cor 12-14 was rejected by Helmut Opitz, *Ursprünge frühkatholischer Pneumatologie: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist in der römischen Gemeinde unter Zugrundelegung des I. Clemens-Briefes und des "Hirten" des Hermas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960), 111-15, who claimed Hermas did not know that letter. Opitz was challenged specifically at points by Reiling, but Reiling still concluded that *Mand.* 11 and 1 Cor 14 "are… vastly different and represent two different worlds." Despite the (alleged) differences, Reiling went on to say, "Yet in both documents prophecy functions fundamentally in the same way… There are no other documents from the same period which state the interdependence of the church and its prophets, and their common dependence on the Spirit with the same clarity" (*Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 148; for Reiling's broader survey of the

by God (i.e., a gift) to the believer. At *Mand.* 11.9 [43.9], the Shepherd describes how a person is filled with a prophetic spirit by a divine intermediary, which then enables the person to speak.[168] This prophetic spirit is not one's own; it is from above (ἄνωθεν, 43.5, 8, 20). Likewise, for Paul, prophecy is one of the spiritual gifts presented in 1 Cor 12:1-11 (esp. v. 10; cf. Rom 12:6).[169] Ephesians preserves the same idea, namely that the role of prophet is a gift (Eph 4:11).

Second, according to both Paul and Hermas, prophets and prophecy are centrally important to the flourishing of the believing community. The importance of prophets for Paul is obvious from 1 Cor 12:28, where the apostle presents them as second only to apostles like him in the list of those whom God has appointed in the church.[170] Their centrality is also taken up by the author of Ephesians, in whose imagination believers are "constructed upon the foundation of the apostles *and prophets*, Jesus Christ himself being the church cornerstone."[171] The foundational

---

Spirit in early Christianity, see pp. 136-51). Similarly, according to Josephine Massingberd Ford, "A Possible Liturgical Background to the Shepherd of Hermas," *RevQ* 6 (1969): 531, "the liturgical gatherings of the Christian community [where Hermas performed the Shepherd]… show a resemblance to 1 Cor. 11-14 with respect to prophecy, interpretation, revelation and teaching." As discussed in Chapter 2, the similarity between ecstatic prophecy in Paul and the *Shepherd* was recognized as early as Heinrich W. J. Thiersch, *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter und die Entstehung der neutestamentlichen Schriften* (Frankfurt am Main: Heyder und Zimmer, 1852), 353, but scholars rarely pursue any meaningful relationship between the two on this issue.

[168] τότε ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ προφητικοῦ ὁ κείμενος ἐπ' αὐτῷ πληροῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ πλησθεὶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ λαλεῖ εἰς τὸ πλῆθος καθὼς ὁ κύριος βούλεται, 43.9.

[169] Compare 1 Cor 14:1, where Paul exhorts the Corinthians to "Pursue love, and seek the spiritual gifts much more in order that you might prophesy" (Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε). See also 1 Cor 14:39, which enjoins prophesying and forbids inhibiting speaking in tongues.

[170] Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους…, 1 Cor 12:28.

[171] ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Eph 2:20; cf. 4:11, where the same order — apostles, then prophets — appears.

importance of prophets is explicitly described by the Shepherd elsewhere in Hermas's tripartite

work. In *Sim*. 9.2.4 [92.4], prophets are among those whose depicted by stones brought up from

the deep and incorporated into the foundation of the Tower (i.e., the church).

Third, and similarly to number two, Paul and Hermas agree that the believing community

is prophecy's proper locus. Here in *Mand*. 11.9 [43.9], the Shepherd describes a prophet

fulfilling the Lord's wish by speaking in the assembly "by means of the holy Spirit *to the*

*multitude*."[172] For Paul in 1 Cor 14, the community is likewise the proper locus of prophecy.

True prophets, Paul says, do not speak selfishly to themselves or for the entertainment of

outsiders. Rather, "the one who prophesies," Paul says, "speaks upbuilding and encouragement

and comfort to (other) people" (v. 3).[173] The apostle later adds that "prophecy is not for

unbelievers but for those who believe" (v. 22).[174] And he describes prophecy as one of various

things that occur for edification when brothers and sisters come together (vv. 26, 29).

Finally, because they understand that true prophecy is fundamentally important to the

flourishing of Christian community, Paul and Hermas both recognize that it must be tested in

order to distinguish it from its antithesis, false prophecy. The designation ψευδοπροφήτης is used

a total of five times here in *Mand*. 11 (43.1, 2, 4, 7 [*bis*]). In the Pauline letters that survive,

neither Paul nor any of his pseudepigraphers ever refers to a "false prophet" (ψευδοπροφήτης) as

such like Hermas does. However, Paul does refer to false witnesses (ψευδομάρτυρες, 1 Cor

15:15); false apostles (ψευδαπόστολοι, 2 Cor 11:13); and false brothers (ψευδάδελφοι, 2 Cor

---

[172] *Mand*. 11.9 [43.9]: καὶ πλησθεὶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ λαλεῖ εἰς τὸ πλῆθος καθὼς ὁ κύριος βούλεται.
[173] 1 Cor 14:3: ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν.
[174] 1 Cor 14:22: ἡ δὲ προφητεία οὐ τοῖς ἀπίστοις ἀλλὰ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.

11:26, Gal 2:4). At 1 Cor 14:29, the apostle exhorts those who listen to prophets to evaluate

(διακρίνειν) what they say.[175] Similarly, he included determination between spirits (διακρίσεις

πνευμάτων) in his list of spiritual gifts, immediately following prophecy (12:10).[176] This

indicates that Paul knew false prophecy was a real possibility. Hermas himself understands

determining between true and false prophets to be an urgent priority.[177] And so he agrees

completely with Paul's call to carefully consider the origin and character of prophecy, as can be

seen from the Shepherd's extended teaching on determining true prophets from false ones. There

is a straightforward way, he suggests, to evaluate (δοκιμάζειν) them.[178] That way is to evaluate a

prophet — and by extension to decide whether to heed his prophecy — on his way of life (ἀπὸ

τῆς ζωῆς δοκίμαζε τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἔχοντα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον, 43.7; cf. 43.16).[179] Here we see

---

[175] 1 Cor 14:29: προφῆται δὲ δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείτωσαν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν. Compare 1 Thess 5:20-21, where at the conclusion of his letter Paul implores his Thessalonian audience, "Do not despise prophecies, but evaluate everything (and) hold fast to the good" (προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε, πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε).

[176] A connection with 1 Cor 12:10 is explicitly rejected without reason by Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 44: "There is no reason to think of ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων (1 Cor. 12:10) or similar events."

[177] Ibid., 27.

[178] Such evaluation is necessary, according to the Shepherd, because of the devil's ability to fill a person with the devil's own spirit in order for that person to potentially break one of the righteous apart (ὁ γὰρ διάβολος πληροῖ αὐτὸν τῷ αὐτοῦ πνεύματι, εἴ τινα δυνήσεται ῥῆξαι τῶν δικαίων, 43.3). Previously, the Shepherd had introduced *Mand.* 11 with a warning against false prophecy by telling Hermas that the false prophet whom he sees "ruins the mind of the servants of God" (ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τὴν καθέδραν ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστὶν ἀπολλύων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν δούλων τοῦ θεοῦ, 43.1). He immediately corrected himself, acknowledging that the false prophet ruins the mind of the double-minded, not the faithful.

[179] On this criterion, see Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 29, 48-50; and Aune, *Prophecy*, 227-28. The *Didache* similarly requires prophecy to be evaluated by a prophet's way of life (ἀπὸ οὖν τῶν τρόπων γνωσθήσεται ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης καὶ ὁ προφήτης, *Did* 11.8; cf. Matt 7:15-20). The text of the *Didache* quoted throughout this study is that of Andreas Lindemann and Henning Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992).

the Shepherd employing a synonym (δοκιμάζειν) of the word Paul uses (διακρίνειν) in his call to

evaluate prophets.[180]

The manifold marked similarities between the practice of prophecy in Hermas's imagined

Christian community and the communities that Paul previously instructed suggest that what we

see in the *Shepherd* is more than merely "the ongoing importance of prophecy in at least some

churches in the early second century."[181] Rather, in describing prophecy as a gift from God that

is foundational for the flourishing of a community of Christ-followers, wherein utterances by a

Spirit-filled prophet are to be centered, spoken to others, and properly tested for authenticity,

*Mand.* 11 reveals that Hermas has adopted Paul's perspective on appropriate prophecy,

particularly as apparent in 1 Cor 12-14.[182]

---

[180] For a brief study of the way-of-life criterion for determining true prophecy in Paul, the *Didache*, and the *Shepherd*, see Ferdinand Hahn, "Prophetie und Lebenswandel: Bemerkungen zu Paulus und zu zwei Texten der Apostolischen Vater," in *Neues Testament und Ethik: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg*, ed. Helmut Merklein (Freiburg: Herder, 1989), 527-37, esp. 534-36 on Hermas. By commanding his audience to evaluate a prophet, here the Shepherd's teaching disagrees with the tradition attested in the *Didache*, which explicitly forbids testing or evaluating a prophet and argues that doing so is a sin that will not be forgiven (καὶ πάντα προφήτην λαλοῦντα ἐν πνεύματι οὐ πειράσετε οὐδὲ διακρινεῖτε· πᾶσα γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφεθήσεται, αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἁμαρτία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται, *Did*. 11.7). A different criterion for evaluating (δοκιμάζειν) a prophetic spirit is stated in 1 John 4:1-3, namely whether it confesses Jesus. Therefore, it is possible, although in my judgment unlikely, that the understanding of the importance of properly adjudicating Christian prophecy originates somewhere else besides the apostle's writings. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 48 summarizes the terminology surrounding the testing of prophets in early Christianity.

[181] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 140.

[182] Ibid., 145 stated the congruence between these authors more loosely: "…there are persons recognized as having the gift of prophecy, though the exercise of that gift resides in the community and may not be limited to such persons, any more than it is in 1 Cor 12-14." According to Aune, the kind of prophecy apparent in *Mand.* 11 "has twin roots in the tradition of Christian prophecy within a congregational setting and the private revelatory experience of the apocalyptic seer" (*Prophecy*, 227). My argument has focused on the first of the twin roots

*Clothing Metaphors* (*Mand*. 1.2 [26.2] *et passim*)

Hermas's frequent adoption of a Pauline metaphor commonly associated with baptism, as well as

his description of the effects of doing so, offer additional evidence of influence by what becomes

the *corpus Paulinum* in his *Mandates*. That Pauline metaphor is a person's "putting on" (ἐνδύειν,

ἐνδιδύσκω) something like clothing, typically a virtue. Hermas himself speaks of virtue itself as

a "garment" (ἔνδυμα).[183] He uses the clothing metaphor over two dozen times across the

*Shepherd*'s three sections, most frequently in the *Mandates*. The clothing metaphor is, of course,

not Hermas's literary creation;[184] it was particularly prominent among the philosophers, mystery

---

identified by Aune. But Paul's letters in general and his visionary experience in particular could
also have been the so-called second root (e.g., 2 Cor 12:1-4, Gal 1:15-16).

[183] See *Mand*. 12.1.2 [44.2]), where he mentions a "garment of good desire" (ἔνδυμα τῆς
ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀγαθῆς). The conceptual opposites of "putting on" (ἐνδύειν) that Hermas employs
are "casting off" (ἀποβάλλειν, *Vis*. 4.3.4 [24.4], *Mand*. 1.2 [26.2], 10.3.4 [42.4], *Sim*. 6.1.4
[61.4], 9.14.1-2 [91.1-2]) and "stripping off" (ἀποδύειν, *Sim* 9.13.8 [90.8]). The connection
between putting on and taking off is explicit at *Mand*. 1.2 [26.2], 10.3.4 [42.4], and *Sim*. 6.1.4
[61.4]. Robert Jewett astutely observed a parallel between Paul's call to "put off (ἀποθώμεθα)
the works of darkness" at Rom 13:12 and Hermas's call to cast off (ἀποβάλλειν) certain desires
and activities in *Sim*. 9.14.1-2 [91.1-2] and grief in *Mand*. 10.3.4 [42.4], but he refrained from
arguing for or against Pauline influence upon Hermas on this point (*Romans*, ed. Eldon J. Epp,
Herm [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007], 822).

[184] As Dahl and Hellholm rightly noted, "[m]etaphorical discourse about the laying aside of
vices and the putting on of virtue was common in early Christianity as well as its environment"
("Garment-Metaphors: The Old and the New Human Being," in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays
on Ancient Religion and Philosophy: Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*, ed.
Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 139). An
extensive survey of the clothing metaphor is provided by Alois Kehl, "Gewand (der Seele)," in
*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 10 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1978), 945-1025, esp.
954-73 on pre-Christian use; and Chŏng-hun Kim, *The Significance of Clothing Imagery in the
Pauline Corpus*, JSNTSup 268 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 8-103. See also the list of sources in
Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 141-42; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 431 n. 461; Rosemary Canavan, *Clothing
the Body of Christ at Colossae: A Visual Construction of Identity*, WUNT II 334 (Tübingen:

cults, and gnostic sources. Crucially for my argument, though, the metaphor is also frequently

employed throughout the Pauline corpus by both the apostle and his pseudepigraphers.[185] Using

forms of ἐνδύειν and its compound ἐπενδύειν, they deploy the metaphor to describe putting on

Christ in baptism (Gal 3:27, Rom 13:14); the imperishable resurrection body (1 Cor 15:49-54; 2

Cor 5:1-4); various virtues (Col 3:12); spiritual armor (1 Thess 5:8, Rom 13:12, and Eph 6:11,

14); and a new person (Eph 4:22-24, Col 3:9-10).[186] Of these Pauline possibilities, across the

*Shepherd*'s three sections, Hermas reflects the latter three metaphors: putting on virtues, armor,

and the new person.[187] In the *Mandates*, he focuses on putting on virtue.[188] Hermas's use of this

metaphor, I argue, is evidence of Pauline influence upon his thinking.[189]

---

Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 201-12. Among the other Apostolic Fathers to use the clothing metaphor, see *1 Clem* 30.3, Ignatius, *Poly.* 1.2.

[185] A study of clothing metaphors in the Pauline corpus was offered by Kim, *Significance of Clothing Imagery*, 108-223. The three relevant chapters in Kim's study focus on the metaphors of clothing a person with Christ (ch. 8), the new person (ch. 9), and the imperishable body (ch. 10), but Kim hardly engages the Pauline metaphor of clothing a person with armor, arguing that it is "a different metaphor" (1; see also 106 n. 2).

[186] Forms of ἐνδύειν appear at 1 Thess 5:8, 1 Cor 15:53-54, Gal 3:27, Rom 13:12, 14, Col 3:10, 12, and Eph 4:24, 6:11, 14. A compound verb (ἐπενδύεσθαι) is used in 2 Cor 5:2, 4. Rom 13:12, Col 3:8, and Eph 4:22, 25, 31 employ forms of ἀποτίθημι in an equivalent sense. Similarly, forms of ἐκδύειν appear at 2 Cor 5:3. At Col 2:11, 15, and 3:9, ἀπεκδύεσθαι is used.

[187] Notably, despite his penchant for the metaphor of "putting on" a virtue, Hermas nowhere mentions the idea of "putting on Christ" in baptism that we find in in Paul's letters (e.g., Gal 3:27, Rom 13:14). This is somewhat peculiar, given that, as I shall show in Chapter 4, Hermas's theology of baptism was strongly influenced by Paul's, particularly as reflected in Rom 6. Then again, nowhere does Hermas mention Christ (see p. 65 n. 233 above). So perhaps one should not expect him to break that pattern in order to make his debt to Paul's idea of "putting on Christ" explicit.

[188] For a discussion of Hermas's use of the metaphors of putting on (spiritual) armor, see pp. 277-79 in Chapter 5.

[189] On a few occasions, Hermas uses the verb ἐνδύειν in ways not directly relevant to my investigation of Pauline influence. For example, sometimes he describes a person's simply being dressed (e.g., a young shepherd wearing yellow, virgins dressed in linen tunics, and an apparently wild woman wearing black; *Sim.* 6.1.5 [61.5], 9.2.4 [79.4], 9.9.5 [86.5]). Once an old

Particularly significant for my comparison with the Pauline corpus are those places where Hermas metaphorically describes someone's "putting on" a virtue or exhorts his audience to do so. These virtues include faith;[190] reverence;[191] patience;[192] cheerfulness;[193] truth;[194] desire for something good;[195] and a more general "every virtue of righteousness" (πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν δικαιοσύνης).[196] The only place in the Pauline corpus where a clear call to put on virtue(s) appears is Col 3:12, where the author, writing in Paul's name, exhorts his audience as follows: "Therefore, as God's elect, holy and beloved, clothe yourselves with heartfelt compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, patience."[197]

The Shepherd specifically enjoins Hermas to clothe himself with patience in *Mand*. 5.2.8 [34.8]. "So, avoid sharp temper, the most wicked spirit," he says. "And put on patience (ἔνδυσαι… τὴν μακροθυμίαν), and resist sharp temper and bitterness, and you will be found in

---

man clothes himself with strength (*Vis*. 3.12.2 [20.2]); the idiom ἰσχὺν ἐνδύειν appears in the LXX (e.g., Prov 31:26; Isa 51:9, 52:1; Sir 17:3), but to my knowledge not in other extant Greek literature prior to the *Shepherd*. Twice those who live in luxury are said to put on a vice, having "clothed themselves with (great) foolishness" (*Sim*. 6.5.3 [65.3] [*bis*]); to my knowledge, the phrase ἀφροσύνην ἐνδύειν is not attested in extant Greek literature prior to the *Shepherd*. Pride is another vice put on (*Sim*. 8.9.1 [75.1]).

[190] *Mand*. 9.2.7 [39.7], 9.2.10 [39.10]. Osiek described this as "[a] frequent metaphor with Pauline connotations" (*Shepherd*, 133 n. 14).

[191] *Mand*. 2.4 [27.4]; cf. Clementine Homilies 13.16.1, ἡ σώφρων γυνὴ ὡς νυμφίῳ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ κοσμεῖται, ἐνδεδυμένη τὸ σεμνὸν φῶς (ed. J. Irmscher, F. Paschke, and B. Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen I. Homilien*, 2nd ed., GCS 42 [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969]).

[192] *Mand*. 5.2.8 [34.8].

[193] *Mand*. 10.3.1, 4 [42.1, 4]. To my knowledge, the phrase ἱλαρότητα ἐνδύειν is not attested in extant Greek literature prior to the *Shepherd*.

[194] *Mand*. 11.4 [43.4]; cf. 1 Esdras 5:40; Philo, *De ebrietate* 86.5.

[195] *Mand*. 12.1.1 [44.1] *bis*; 12.2.4 [45.4].

[196] *Mand*. 1.2 [26.2], *Sim*. 6.1.4 [61.4].

[197] Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι, σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ χρηστότητα ταπεινοφροσύνην πραΰτητα μακροθυμίαν, Col 3:12. I follow BDAG 700 in translating σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ as "heartfelt compassion."

company with the reverence beloved by the Lord."[198] The phrase "put on patience" (μακροθυμίαν ἐνδύειν) is not attested in any other extant Greek literature besides Colossians prior to the *Shepherd*. Of course, this does not by itself prove that Hermas is briefly quoting a Pauline letter. But the likelihood of influence in some manner is compounded when we recognize that here Hermas has linked the idea of "putting on patience" with what is even more firmly identifiable as an element of Pauline thought. Specifically, Hermas describes how he is instructed by the Shepherd to clothe himself with patience in order to "*resist* (ἀντίστα) *sharp temper and bitterness*." The same idea of metaphorically putting something on as clothing in order to enable resistance of an implied evil appears in Eph 6:13, as I shall now show.

*Arming Oneself for Resistance* (*Mand.* 12.2.4-5 [45.4-5])

Closely connected to Hermas's use of clothing metaphors is his incorporation of multiple military images within his argument against evil desire in *Mand.* 12.2.4-5 [45.4-5].[199] The

---

[198] ἀπέχου οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς ὀξυχολίας, τοῦ πονηροτάτου πνεύματος· ἔνδυσαι δὲ τὴν μακροθυμίαν καὶ ἀντίστα τῇ ὀξυχολίᾳ καὶ τῇ πικρίᾳ, καὶ ἔσῃ εὑρισκόμενος μετὰ τῆς σεμνότητος τῆς ἠγαπημένης ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, 34.8.

[199] On the Pauline use of military imagery and metaphors, especially that of clothing oneself in armor, see, e.g., Adolf von Harnack, *Militia Christi: Die christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1905), 12-14; Abraham J. Malherbe, "Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War," *HTR* 76 (1983): 143-73; Michael Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13*, JSNTSup 59 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 141-60; Thomas R. Yoder Neufeld, *Put on the Armour of God: The Divine Warrior from Isaiah to Ephesians*, JSNTSup 140 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 73-153; Edgar Krentz, "Paul, Games, and the Military," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003), 344-83; David Janssen, "The Roman Cuirass Breastplate Statue and Paul's Use of Armour Language in Romans 13:12 and 1 Thessalonians 5:8," *Colloq* 46 (2014): 55-85. On athletic images, see V. C. Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif: Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature*, NovTSup 16 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967). Brox, *Hirt*, 274

images are fully arming oneself (καθοπλίζειν) and employing weapons (τὰ ὅπλα) in order to

resist and subdue wicked desire. Such use, I argue, reflects Hermas's adoption of material

attested in the Pauline letters. The Shepherd says to him:

> So, put on the desire for righteousness, and after fully arming yourself
> (καθοπλισάμενος) with the fear of the Lord, resist them [i.e., evil desires]. For the
> fear of God resides in the good desire. The wicked desire, if it should see you
> fully armed (καθωπλισμένον) with the fear of God and resisting it, will flee far
> away from, and because it fears your weapons (τὰ ὅπλα σου) it will not appear to
> you. So, having taken the victory and been crowned victorious over it, come to
> the desire for righteousness, and handing over to it the victory that you received,
> serve (δούλευσον) it just as it wishes. If you serve the good desire (δουλεύσῃς τῇ
> ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῇ ἀγαθῇ) and are obedient to it, you will be able to master the wicked
> desire and to make it submit (ὑποτάξαι) as you wish.[200]

In this passage, via the figure of the Shepherd, Hermas twice calls his audience to fully arm itself

with fear. The proper fear that Hermas has in mind is, in the first instance, fear of the *Lord*; in the

second, it is fear of *God*. But in these cases the two objects obviously refer to the same divine

being. Hermas contends that such fear of the divine corresponds to a weapon, of which he

suggests wicked desire is afraid. And properly arming oneself with that fear ensures that a person

obtains victory over that wicked desire by making it submit. Such military descriptions of arming

oneself, weapons, and obtaining victory and thus the crown are, of course, ubiquitous in the

---

asserted without explanation that the imagery at *Mand*. 12.2.5 [45.4] originates with the military
not the arena.

[200] σὺ οὖν ἔνδυσαι τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, καὶ καθοπλισάμενος τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου
ἀντίστηθι αὐταῖς. ὁ γὰρ φόβος τοῦ θεοῦ κατοικεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῇ ἀγαθῇ. ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἡ πονηρὰ
ἐὰν ἴδῃ σε καθωπλισμένον τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθεστηκότα αὐτῇ, φεύξεται ἀπὸ σοῦ μακράν,
καὶ οὐκέτι σοι ὀφθήσεται φοβουμένη τὰ ὅπλα σου. σὺ οὖν νῖκος λαβὼν καὶ στεφανωθεὶς κατ᾽
αὐτῆς ἐλθὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτῇ τὸ νῖκος ὃ ἔλαβες,
δούλευσον αὐτῇ καθὼς αὐτὴ βούλεται. ἐὰν δουλεύσῃς τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῇ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ὑποταγῇς αὐτῇ,
δυνήσῃ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς πονηρᾶς κατακυριεῦσαι καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτὴν καθὼς βούλει, *Mand*.
12.2.4-5 [45.4-5].

literature of the period prior to the *Shepherd*'s composition.[201] However, Hermas employs that imagery in ways strikingly similar to Paul and his pseudepigraphers.

In particular, Hermas's discussion of arming and weaponry evokes those Pauline depictions of eschatological battle in which a believer fights against an evil or wicked entity or power. In his description in 1 Thess 5:8 of preparations for the day of the Lord that will come suddenly, Paul does not mention the category of weaponry explicitly (i.e., τὰ ὅπλα), but he does list two specific elements of a soldier's armor. These are the breastplate (θώραξ) and helmet (περικεφαλαία). By contrast, the apostle explicitly mentions generic weapons three times in Romans and twice in 2 Corinthians. In Rom 6:13, he exhorts his audience not to "present your members to sin as weapons of wickedness (ὅπλα ἀδικίας)" but to "present… your members as weapons of righteousness (ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης) to God." The latter phrase also appears in 2 Cor 6:7. In 2 Cor 10:4, Paul similarly speaks of "the weapons of our warfare" (τὰ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν), arguing that "they are not fleshly but by God are capable of destroying fortresses."[202] Rom 13:12 likewise refers to "putting on the armor of light" (τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός ἐνδοῦσθαι).[203]

---

[201] As Malherbe noted, "Paul and other early Christians were not unique in using martial imagery. It was used in a transferred sense by all kinds of persons, including philosophers, adherents of the mystery cults, and orators" ("Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War," 148; for supporting bibliography, see nn. 19, 20). For a brief introduction to the weapons and armor of the Roman military, consult Jonathan C. N. Coulston, "Arms and Armour," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 3rd rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). A comprehensive investigation is M. C. Bishop and J. C. Coulston, *Roman Military Equipment: From the Punic Wars to the Fall of Rome*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006).

[202] τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων…, 2 Cor 10:4.

[203] On the importance of translating τὰ ὅπλα here with a form of the verb ἐνδύειν as "armor" but elsewhere in Paul as "weapons," see Jewett, *Romans*, 822-23.

Eph 6:10-17 is even more relevant for my argument. There the Pauline pseudepigrapher

expands the notion of arming oneself for the eschatological battle that the apostle articulated in 1

Thess 5:8 and Rom 13:12.[204] The author of Ephesians exhorts his audience to "put on the full

armor of God" (ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 11a). Here we find a compound form

(πανοπλία) of the noun that Paul uses in Rom and 2 Cor (ὅπλον). The purpose for putting on

armor from God immediately follows: "in order that you might be able to stand against (στῆναι

πρός) the devil's crafty attacks" (v. 11b). The same imperative appears again in v. 13, albeit with

a slightly different verb (a form of ἀναλαμβάνειν, not ἐνδύειν): "Take up (ἀναλάβετε) the full

armor of God." As in v. 11b, again in v. 13 the author's aim in taking up the full armor is

resistance. Having done so, he hopes that the Ephesians "might be able to resist (ἀντιστῆναι) on

the wicked day and having done everything to stand." A list of protective apparel, armor, and

weaponry follows in vv. 14-17.

Neither Paul nor the author of Ephesians attests the specific image of arming oneself with

fear of God.[205] Even so, I argue that at *Mand.* 12.2.4-5 [45.4-5] Hermas adopts broader Pauline

---

[204] Drawing upon comparative material in Josephus and Polybius, Nils Neumann, "Die πανοπλία Gottes: Eph 6,11-17 als Reflexion der Belagerung einer Stadt," *ZNW* 106 (2015): 43-45 argued that the author of Ephesians adds elements of a Roman legionary's armor and weaponry to traditional elements drawn from Isaiah and Paul in order to construct the battle scene of the siege of a town wall. By contrast, Michael E. Gudorf argued on the basis of the word πάλη in v. 12 that the constructed scene is a close-combat struggle with devil, implicitly described as a ὁπλιτοπάλας, "a heavy, fully armored solider who also happens to be an accomplished wrestler" ("The Use of ΠΑΛΗ in Ephesians 6:12," *JBL* 117 [1998]: 331-35; the quote is from p. 334). Jeffrey R. Asher, "An Unworthy Foe: Heroic Ἔθη, Trickery, and an Insult in Ephesians 6:11," *JBL* 130 (2011): 729-48 instead situated this passage in the Greek heroic tradition.
[205] The absence of such a reference at Eph 6:13 in particular was crucial to Massaux's explicit denial of Pauline influence, unusual for him, at *Mand.* 12.2.4. He concluded that "[t]his parallel is most likely due only to the metaphor of the armor common to both Hermas and Paul" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 149-50; the quote is from p. 150). Among those

construals of arming oneself with spiritual weapons for resistance of evil.[206] As in the case of the

Shepherd's call for Hermas to clothe himself with patience in *Mand*. 5.2.8 [34.8], so too here in

*Mand*. 12 the purpose for arming oneself is resistance. There sharp temper and bitterness were to

be resisted, and the former is explicitly labeled a "most evil spirit" (πονηροτάτου πνεύματος).

Here it is evil desires (αὐταῖς, whose antecedent is τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν πονηρῶν in 45.2), which

are deadly (θανατώδεις). To my knowledge, only in the Pauline corpus do we find a logical link

between the believer's putting on spiritual armor and resisting evil. This link is explicit at Eph 6,

as seen in the reference to "spiritual forces of evil" (τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, v. 12) and the

"wicked day" (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ, v. 13). It is also arguably implicit at 1 Thess 5:1-11 (e.g., the

references to a thief [κλέπτης] at vv. 2 and 4).

Furthermore, Hermas might have even adopted the importance of putting on divine fear

in order for it to serve an instrumental function from Paul's letters. That function is enabling

holiness. In his letters to Rome and Corinth, the apostle mentions "fear of God" or "fear of the

Lord" three times (Rom 3:18, 2 Cor 7:1; 2 Cor 5:11). Both kinds of fear are commonly attested

in the LXX, particularly the wisdom literature.[207] Consequently, it would be impossible to prove

---

other scholars who imply no influence is to be detected are Lelong, *Pasteur*, 128; Dibelius, *Hirt*, 545; Brox, *Hirt*, 268 n. 3; Andreas Lindemann and Henning Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), 418; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 465 nn. 290-91; and Osiek, *Shepherd*, 149 nn. 7-8.

[206] Only a few entertain scholars indicate Pauline influence at *Mand*. 12.2.4 [45.4], e.g., Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 201; and especially Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 90, 163, who categorizes the intertextual relation as an allusion.

[207] Among the scriptures of Israel, the fear of God (φόβος θεοῦ) is attested at LXX Gen 35:5, 2 Kgs 23:3, Neh 5:9, 15, Psa 13:3, 35:2, Prov 1:7, 15:33, Sol 6:5, 17:40, 18:7-9, 11, Isa 11:3. Likewise, fear of the Lord (φόβος κυρίου) appears at LXX 2 Chr 19:9, 26:5, Psa 18:10, 33:12, 110:10, Prov 1:29, 2:5, 8:13, 9:10, 10:26, 29, 14:26, 15:16, 27, 19:23, 22:4, 23:17, 31:30, Job

that Hermas learned of divine fear from Paul and not from Israel's scriptures. At 2 Cor 7:1,

though, Paul conceptually links cleansing oneself from "every defilement of flesh and spirit"

with "bringing holiness to completion," and he states that the means by which ones does so is

fear of God (ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ).[208] According to Paul, in other words, fear of God leads to holiness.

Similarly, for Hermas, being armed with fear of God as a weapon causes evil desire to flee,

which — to use Paul's language — enables the believer to cleanse herself from a defilement of

spirit and then to move toward completion of holiness by clothing herself with desire that is good

and holy (44.1). Therefore, it is possible that Hermas learned from the apostle that fear of God

can serve as an effective catalyst in the struggle to make evil desires submit to holy ones. This

possibility of Pauline influence is confirmed when one recognizes that the tension that Hermas

constructs between good and evil desires is essentially the same tension that Paul constructs

between the desires of flesh and Spirit in Gal 5:16-17. In both authors, the key is to be properly

enslaved, not to evil or fleshly desires but to good ones and to the community marked by them

(*Mand.* 12.2.5 [45.5]; Gal 5:13; cf. Rom 8:7).[209]

In this section, I have argued for influence by both Paul and one of his later

pseudepigraphers upon Hermas's description of arming oneself with metaphorical weapons for

resistance of evil. In this instance, Hermas adopted the most influential points from 2

Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians. To be sure, he does not formally quote any of these letters.

---

3:23, Sir 1:11-12, 18, 27-28, 30, 9:16, 10:22, 16:2, 19:20, 21:11, 23:27, 25:6, 11, 27:3, 40:26-27, 45:23, Isa 2:10, 19, 21.

[208] ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀγαπητοί, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ, 2 Cor 7:1. My translation construes the concluding prepositional phrase instrumentally; see Smyth 377.

[209] The phrase "be a slave of desire" that Hermas uses is attested at Tit 3:3 (δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις), where it is a marker of a person's pre-baptismal state.

But when one expands the criteria for Pauline influence beyond quotation alone, it becomes apparent that, in engaging the topic at hand, Hermas is doing what he frequently does elsewhere — he has synthesized related material from across the Pauline corpus in support of his arguments.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have focused on evidence in the *Mandates* supporting my claim that Hermas adopted, adapted, and synthesized material in letters attributed to or associated with the apostle Paul. By expanding the criteria for detecting influence, my analysis has revealed that in composing his *Mandates*, Hermas engaged material in both the authentic and disputed Pauline epistles in meaningful ways. I have shown that Hermas knew 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans; and among the Pauline pseudepigrapha, he certainly knew Ephesians. Furthermore, his discussion of the possibility of opportunities for post-baptismal repentance responds to an alternative posited by the author of Hebrews. Such a wide-ranging encounter by Hermas with Pauline letters in the *Mandates* section should come as no surprise, given that they focus on "living to God," a distinctly Pauline phrase. In his letters, the apostle was deeply concerned by and for the particular moral shape of his audiences' individual and corporate lives. That concern was picked up by his pseudepigraphers at specific points. Consequently, it is possible, perhaps even probable, that in presenting his new divine commandments for properly faithful living, Hermas not only found the Pauline letters to be a suitable conceptual and theological source from which to draw but also, given their influence elsewhere in emerging Christianity, an unavoidable one. Regardless, Hermas did not simply integrate isolated or free-floating Pauline words or ideas

that had somehow acquired common currency in his community. Instead, as I have shown, at various points he made sense of traditions attested in the authentic Pauline letters by means of those in the pseudepigraphic ones and vice versa, thereby tying together thematic and terminological threads running throughout the fabric of the *corpus Paulinum*. This is a centrally important aspect of I mean when I say that Hermas had access to and engaged a Pauline corpus in some shape. But the *Mandates* do not exhaust the scope of Hermas's encounter with Pauline letters. As I shall now show, that encounter also extends to his *Similitudes*.

CHAPTER 4: THE *SIMILITUDES* AND THE PAULINE LEGACY


INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I will argue that the longest and most theologically pregnant section of the

*Shepherd* of Hermas, that is the *Similitudes*, evinces encounter with letters that were ultimately

collected in the *corpus Paulinum*. Initially, I shall paint a broad picture of various topics on

which the *Similitudes* cohere with the Pauline letters. Doing so will establish the likelihood that

Hermas was working with those literary traditions elsewhere and in a deeper, more substantive

manner in the *Shepherd*'s third major section. My argument for an influential encounter between

Hermas and Pauline letters follows, focusing on *Sim*. 1, 5, and 9. Specifically, I shall argue that

Hermas's encounter with a *corpus Paulinum* is apparent in the specific ways. First, under the

influence of Philippians, Ephesians, and Hebrews, in *Sim*. 1 Hermas depicts Christians as

citizens in a foreign, heavenly city on sojourn in an earthly city to whose laws they remain

subject. Second, broad Pauline influence, probably from Romans and Philippians but potentially

other letters too, is apparent throughout the Parable of the Vineyard in *Sim*. 5, where the salvific

activity of God's Son, is described. Finally, in *Sim*. 9 Hermas reveals an encounter with the

letters in three primary ways — his depiction of the Tower itself, the meaning and function of

baptism, and believers' being metaphorically clothed and unified for proper living in that ritual.

There Hermas was apparently working with traditions attested in 1-2 Corinthians, Romans,

Ephesians, and Colossians. By adopting, adapting, and synthesizing material from what became

the *corpus* of apostolic letters — and sometimes even mediating Paul with "Paul" — across his

*Similitudes*, Hermas reveals himself to be an informed, engaged Pauline interpreter.

THE *SIMILITUDES*' COHERENCE WITH PAULINE WORLDVIEWS

As in the previous chapter on the *Mandates*, in outlining instances of coherence between the

*Similitudes* and the *corpus Paulinum*, here I shall focus the discussion on three broad categories:

Hermas's description of (1) the divine nature and activity; (2) individual believers; and (3) the

wider Christian community. A fundamental conviction about God that Hermas conveys in the

*Similitudes* is the belief that God created and empowered all things.[1] Specifically, the Shepherd

tells him that it is God's Son who supports creation.[2] Certain persons are "called" by God, and

this call is understood to happen to salvific effect "through God's Son," whose name they bear.[3]

Only those who bear the Son's name are able to enter God kingdom (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ).[4] God

justifies such persons, an act the Shepherd describes as justification of *flesh*.[5] That divine act is a

conceptual underpinning of the possibility that a person can "live" or "die to God."[6] Crucially for

our comparison with the *corpus Paulinum*, Hermas knows and affirms the Gentile mission,

construed at least in part as the giving of God's law "to the whole world."[7] "This law," the

Shepherd tells Hermas, "is God's Son, who is proclaimed to the ends of the earth."[8] Hermas

---

[1] 58.2, 66.4; see also 100.4; cf. Rom 1:20, 25, 8:19-22, Eph 2:10, 3:9, 1 Tim 4:4.

[2] 91.5; cf. Col 1:15-16.

[3] 67.1, 72.4, 77.1 (ὁ κύριος θέλει τὴν κλῆσιν τὴν γενομένην διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ σωθῆναι), 89.4-5, 8, 90.2-3, 7, 91.5, 92.2, 93.3, 5, 7, 94.4, 96.2, 105.2-3, 5-6; cf. 1 Thess 2:12, 4:7, 5:24; 1 Cor 1:1-2, 9, 24, 26, 7:15, 17-18, 20-22, 24, 27, 15:9; Gal 1:6, 15, 5:8, 13; Phil 3:14; Rom 1:1, 6, 7, 8:28, 30, 9:12, 24, 11:29; Eph 1:11 4:1, 4; Col 3:15; 2 Thess 1:11, 2:14; 1 Tim 2:4, 6:12; 2 Tim 1:9; Heb 3:1, 5:4.

[4] 89.3-6, 8, 90.2, 92.2-3, 93.2-4, 97.2-3, 106.2; cf. Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 4:20, 6:9, 15:24, 50; Gal 5:21; Eph 5:5; Col 1:13, 4:11; 1 Thess 2:12; 2 Thess 1:5; 2 Tim 4:1, 18; Heb 1:8, 11:33, 12:28.

[5] …καὶ δικαιωθῇ σου ἡ σάρξ, 60.1; cf. Gal 2:16, Rom 3:20.

[6] See the discussion of this pairing on pp. 132-47 in Chapter 3.

[7] εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, 69.2.

[8] εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς, 69.2; see also 94.1-5. Philippe Henne, *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*, CA (Paris: Cerf, 2011), 77 reads *Sim.* 9.17.1 [94.1] as "clear and simple affirmation" ("l'affirmation claire et

---

himself is commanded by the Shepherd to participate in this universal mission: "Go, speak to everyone," the Shepherd enjoins him, "so that they might repent and live to God [cf. Gal 2:19], because the Lord, being compassionate, sent me to give repentance to all people… and wants the calling that occurred through his Son to be preserved."[9] Hermas believes that this Son one day will come "all of a sudden" (ἐψάπινα), and those tasked with building the Tower-Church and taking care of it must be ready for that day.[10]

Individually, Hermas describes church members as "servants of God."[11] A primary means of identifying them is their faith *in* God's Son or, depending on how one construes the underlying syntax, their engagement with the faith *of* God's Son.[12] Such faithful persons stand in contradistinction to "the outsiders" (τὰ ἔθνη), who, according to the Shepherd, "will be burned up because they did not know the one who created them."[13] Hermas imagines God's servants as a locus of God's spirit, which the Shepherd tells him must not be defiled once given.[14] God's spirit must also be returned to the Lord whole, the state in which it was

---

simple") of Paul's success in establishing the Gentile mission. Cf. Gal 1:16, 2:2, 8-9; Rom 15:16, Eph 3:1, 8, 1 Tim 2:7, 2 Tim 4:17.

[9] Ὕπαγε καὶ πᾶσι λέγε ἵνα μετανοήσωσι καὶ ζήσωσι τῷ θεῷ· ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐσπλαγχνίσθη καὶ ἔπεμψέ με δοῦναι πᾶσι τὴν μετάνοιαν, καίπερ τινῶν μὴ ὄντων ἀξίων σωθῆναι διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν· ἀλλὰ μακρόθυμος ὢν ὁ κύριος θέλει τὴν κλῆσιν τὴν γενομένην διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ σωθῆναι, 77.1.

[10] 84.6; cf. 1 Thess 4:15-16.

[11] 50.1 *et passim*; cf. Rom 1:1, Eph 6:6, Phil 1:1, Col 4:12, Tit 1:1.

[12] In the *Similitudes*, Hermas employs phrases equivalent to the multivalent πίστις τοῦ Χριστοῦ first attested in Pauline letters, such as πίστις τοῦ κυρίου (61.2, 63.6) and πίστις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (93.5; cf. Gal 2:16 [*bis*], 3:22; Phil 3:9; Rom 3:22; Eph 3:12). As in the Pauline corpus, the genitive construction in the *Shepherd* is ambiguous. But in both corpora, πίστις τοῦ Χριστοῦ or its equivalent represents both a foundational criterion of salvation and marker of the moral life.

[13] 53.4; cf. Rom 1:18-32.

[14] 60.2-4; cf. 1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:16-20.

received.[15] This indwelling spirit is one element in an antithetical pairing that Hermas learns

from the Shepherd: the antithesis between a person's flesh and her spirit.[16] Both flesh and spirit

must be kept pure.[17] This is challenging for a host of reasons, not least because one can be "weak

in flesh."[18] One aspect of properly maintaining God's Spirit is to respond faithfully to the divine

call by bearing fruit, specifically the "fruits of the righteous" or the "fruit of righteousness."[19]

Persons are likewise summoned to do "the works of faith" and, similarly, "to engage in good

works, which is useful for them."[20] The "desires and pastimes of this age" can dissuade one from

that pursuit;[21] so too can particular passions, particularly a passion for luxury.[22] Another threat to

such good works is corruption of mind (διάνοια), which can occur through excess involvement in

multiple business affairs that turn one away from the Lord, and so a clean one is needed.[23]

---

[15] *Reddite igitur ei spiritum integrum, sicut accepistis*, 109.2; see also the discussion of the deposit of the Spirit in the *Mandates* on pp. 156-70 in Chapter 3; cf. 2 Cor 1:22, 5:5; Eph 1:14.

[16] 59.4-7; cf. 1 Cor 5:5, Gal 3:3, 4:29, 5:16-17, 6:8, Phil 3:3; Rom 8:4-6, 9, 13; Col 2:5; 1 Tim 3:16.

[17] 60.1, 4; cf. 2 Cor 7:1.

[18] ἀσθενέστερος τῇ σαρκὶ ᾖς, 78.2; cf. Rom 6:19, 8:3; Gal 4:13.

[19] τῶν δικαίων οἱ καρποί, 53.3; καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης, 96.2. See also 51 [*passim*], 53.5, 8, 67.18, 68.1-2, 69.7, 70.6, 71.6, 78.10, 105.1, 3-4. Cf. Gal 5:22 (ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός); Phil 1:11 (πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης), 22 (τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου); Rom 7:4 (καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ); Col 1:6 (ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν καρποφορούμενον), 10 (ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες); Eph 5:9 (ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς); Heb 12:11 (καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν… δικαιοσύνης). The Pauline parallel was noted by Auguste Lelong, *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*, TDEHC 4 (Paris: A. Picard, 1912), 278-79.

[20] τὰ ἔργα τῆς πίστεως, 75.1; cf. 1 Thess 1:13; 2 Thess 1:11. …*bona opera exercere; utile est illis*, 114.2; see also the forms of ἔργον ἀγαθόν at 2 Cor 9:8, Eph 2:10, Phil 1:6, Col 1:10, 2 Thess 2:17, 1 Tim 2:10, 5:10, 2 Tim 2:21, 3:17, Tit 1:16, 3:1.

[21] 63.3; see also 62.1-4, 64.4, 65.1, 3-4, 6; cf. Tit 2:12.

[22] 65.5; cf. 1 Thess 4:5; Rom 1:26; Col 3:5.

[23] 53.5-7; cf. Eph 2:3, 4:18; Col 1:21.

One of Hermas's most frequent labels for Christian community is ἐκκλησία, sometimes further delineated as the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ.[24] Another is "those who have come to believe" or simply "believers" (οἱ πιστεύσαντες).[25] People from every nation who hear and believe the proclamation of God's Son "come together and become one body" — a particular emphasis of Paul(ine letters) — thereby constituting a new people, whom the Shepherd labels a "race of the righteous."[26] The Shepherd refers to members of this new body as "infant children" (νήπια βρέφη), who by remaining in a state of such innocence he says will come to reside in God's kingdom.[27] And yet this community can become divided, perhaps even being prone to that possibility, and so the Shepherd tells Hermas and his audience to "become one in spirit and heal and remove these wicked rendings (*scissuras*) from you."[28] Hermas's community is,

---

[24] The simple descriptor ἐκκλησία is found at 72.4, 90.1, as well as throughout the *Visions* section. The specific label ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ appears three times at 95.2-4 (although the reading at 95.2 is not attested in Codex Athos). Cf. 1 Thess 1:1 *et passim*.

[25] 69.2-3, 72.3, 76.3, 90.5, 94.4, 96.1-2, 97.1, 98.1, 99.1, 100.1, 101.1, 102.1, 103.1, 104.1, 105.1, 106.1, 107.2-3; cf. 1 Thess 1:7, 2:10, 13; 1 Cor 1:21, 14:22; Gal 3:22; Rom 1:16, 3:22, 4:5, 11, 24, 10:4; Eph 1:13, 19; 2 Thess 1:10; Tit 3:8; Heb 4:3.

[26] μετὰ δὲ τὸ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ γενέσθαι ἓν σῶμα, τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐμίαναν ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἐξεβλήθησαν ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν δικαίων, 94.5. Cf. 1 Cor 6:16, 10:17, 12:12-14, 18-20; Rom 12:4; Eph 4:4, 16; Col 3:15. My translation of τοῦ γένους τῶν δικαίων as "race of the righteous" follows Joseph Barber Lightfoot, John Reginald Harmer, and Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1992), 655.

[27] 106.1-3; See also 101.3, and note the reference to *infantes* in the surviving Latin text of 108.4. Cf. 1 Thess 2:7; 1 Cor 3:1, 13:11, 14:20; Eph 4:14; 2 Tim 3:15; Heb 5:13.

[28] *...in unum quemque spiritum fieri et has malas scissuras permediare ac tollere a vobis*, 108.4. On *permediare*, which is apparently a *hapax legomenon*, as functionally equivalent to *remediare*, see Christian Tornau and Paolo Cecconi, eds., *The Shepherd of Hermas in Latin: Critical Edition of the Oldest Translation Vulgata*, TUGAL 173 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 23. Cf. 1 Cor 1:10-17, 3:3, 11:18-19, 12:25; 2 Cor 12:20; Tit 3:9.

consequently, summoned to peace and concord.[29] Other virtues and vices that this body of

believers is to pursue or avoid are presented in lists.[30] The chief of these virtues is faith (πίστις),

which supports a corner of the Tower, and, by contrast, unbelief (ἀπιστία) is the chief vice.[31]

This vice is found even in Hermas's household itself, whose members comprise a disbelieving or

otherwise sinful, unruly family.[32] Among the particular practices of constructed "outsiders" (τὰ

ἔθνη) to the community that Hermas's audience is to carefully avoid is "extravagance"

(πολυτέλεια).[33] A primary conflict threatening the community's health is the division between

rich and poor.[34] This community can also be harmed by teachers who introduce "different

teachings" (διδαχὰς ἐτέρας) or even "foolish teachings" (ταῖς διδαχαῖς ταῖς μωραῖς) by denying

God's servants the opportunity to repent.[35] Instead of being divided, these factious groups are

---

[29] 73.2, 109.2; cf. 1 Thess 5:13, 23; 1 Cor 7:15, 14:33; 2 Cor 13:11; Gal 5:22, 6:16; Phil 4:7, 9; Rom 8:6, 12:18, 14:17, 19, 15:13, 33; Col 3:15; Eph 2:17, 4:3, 6:15, 23; 2 Thess 3:16; 2 Tim 2:22; Heb 12:11, 14.

[30] 92.1-6. Among the various Pauline lists of virtues and vices, compare, e.g., Gal 5:19-23, Col 3:5-15.

[31] 92.2-3.

[32] 66.2-7; cf. Col 3:18-21; 1 Tim 3:4-5, 12; Tit 1:6, 2:5.

[33] τὴν οὖν πολυτέλειαν τῶν ἐθνῶν μὴ πράσσετε, 50.10. The ἔθνη are also named at 53.4 [*bis*], 75.1 [*bis*], 3 [*bis*], 94.2, 4, 105.8. Compare the description of Gentiles as critical foil in 1 Thess 4:5; 1 Cor 5:1; Eph 4:17. Compare also the reference to "extravagant clothing" (ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ) in 1 Tim 2:9.

[34] 51.5-10; cf. 1 Cor 11:20-22. On this recurring theme, see Carolyn Osiek, *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*, CBQMS 15 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983).

[35] ἦσαν γὰρ ὑποκριταὶ καὶ διδαχὰς ἐτέρας εἰσφέροντες καὶ ἐκστρέφοντες τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ, μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας, μὴ ἀφίοντες αὐτοὺς μετανοεῖν, ἀλλὰ ταῖς διδαχαῖς ταῖς μωραῖς πείθοντες αὐτούς, 72.5; cf. Rom 16:1; Eph 4:14; Col 2:22; 1 Tim 1:3, 10, 4:1, 6, 16, 6:3, 2 Tim 4:3; Tit 1:9, 2:1, 10.

summoned to "become partners" (γίνονται… κοινωνοί) in what the Shepherd calls "righteous activity" (τοῦ ἔργου τοῦ δικαίου).[36]

Taken together, these pieces of evidence establish the claim that Hermas's *Similitudes* cohere broadly with the *corpus Paulinum* in terms of anthropology, soteriology, ecclesiology, and ethics. We see this, for example, in Hermas's discussions with the Shepherd on the antithesis between flesh and spirit, God's justification of flesh, the primacy of faith, the representation of the church as unified body and constructed edifice, and the necessity of believers' bearing the "fruit of righteousness" and doing "the works of faith." Some of these are points of enduring debate within Paulinism in the second century and beyond within which the *Shepherd* participates. But Pauline influence upon the *Similitudes* extends to an even deeper level. In the following section, I shall attened to passages in three specific *Similitudes* (*Sim.* 1, 5, and 9), where Hermas's encounter with Pauline letters can be examined in greater detail.


HERMAS, A PAULINE INTERPRETER

Residents in a Foreign City (*Sim.* 1 [50])

The Shepherd's initial parable spoken to Hermas depicts Christians, termed "servants of God" (δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ), as inhabitants of a foreign land whose true city is far off (*Sim.* 1 [50.1-11]).[37] The parable focuses on the problem of which law a Christian must obey — the law of their native or their inhabited city. Thus it offers "the author's clearest articulation of his view of the

---

[36] 51.9; cf. Rom 12:13, 15:26-27; 2 Cor 8:4, 9:13; Phil 1:5; 1 Tim 6:18; Heb 13:16.

[37] This locale is primarily construed as a city in this parable, but the Shepherd explicitly refers to it as a country (χώρα) twice in 50.4. That noun is also presumably the one to be supplied at 50.1 to be construed with the adjective ξένης.

Christian's place in society."[38] I shall demonstrate that the Pauline letters have influenced

Hermas's articulation of that view in discernible ways. Here we see him not only adopting

discrete ideas from the *corpus Paulinum* but also participating in Paulinist debates on where

Christ-believers hold their citizenship and what implications follow, using many of those

debates' own terms.[39]

The parable begins with the Shepherd's direct statement to Hermas. "'You know,' he

says, 'that you servants of God reside in a foreign country (ἐπὶ ξένης κατοικεῖτε). For your city is

far off (μακράν) from this city'" (1.1 [50.1]).[40] That far off city, he adds, is the one in which

Hermas and others "are destined to live" (μέλλετε κατοικεῖν); likewise, it is a city to which

God's servants will eventually return (ἐπανακάμπτειν, 50.2, 5) or, put somewhat differently,

travel home (ἐπιδημεῖν, 50.9). It is that city's laws to which they are subject (50.5). At present,

though, God's servants find themselves living in another city, a city that has its own ruler who

establishes his own laws (50.3).[41] The proper action in such a scenario might be to utterly disown

(ἀπαρνεῖσθαι) the far off city's laws, to which Hermas remains subject, and to conform to those

of the present city (50.5). Not doing so certainly risks expulsion by the ruler of the present city

(50.3-4). But, the Shepherd says, disowning the far off city's laws would be short-sighted. If

Hermas does so, when he returns to that city, his true one, he will be shut out from it (50.5). And

---

[38] Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Herm (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999), 158.

[39] Scholarly recognition of the conceptual similarities between *Sim.* 1 and parts of the *corpus Paulinum* goes at least as far back as Theodor Zahn, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1868), 443 n. 3, although he did not engage them to any significant degree.

[40] Λέγει μοι· Οἴδατε, φησίν, ὅτι ἐπὶ ξένης κατοικεῖτε ὑμεῖς οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ· ἡ γὰρ πόλις ὑμῶν μακράν ἐστιν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης, 50.1; similarly, see 50.6.

[41] The Shepherd usually describes the present city's leader as a lord (κύριος), but he also labels him a master (δεσπότης) in 50.6. He is not to be confused with the Master, who at 50.9 and elsewhere in the *Shepherd* clearly refers to the Lord God.

so, according to the Shepherd, Hermas's manner of life must specifically reflect the far off city's laws, in order that, after inevitably being kicked out of the present city by its master because of his opposition to its laws, Hermas might come to his true city and submit himself to its law (50.6). That way of life includes, among other things, using wealth to buy afflicted souls and to look after widows and orphans, instead of acquiring physical fields and houses (50.8). The limiting principle is "being content with what you have" (τὴν αὐτάρκειαν τὴν ἀρκετήν σοι, 50.6).[42]

The Shepherd's depiction of Christians as foreigners from a far off city who currently inhabit and must live properly within an earthly one in light of their really belonging to a far off one to which they will one day go coheres strongly with the *corpus Paulinum*. Of course, similar ideas were well known in the philosophical traditions of Platonism and Stoicism, as well as earlier Jewish sources.[43] But due to some telling shared details, in engaging these topics, it is more likely that Hermas has adopted traditions attested in 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Ephesians, and Hebrews.

In 2 Corinthians 5, Paul constructs a tension between "being at home in the body" while at the same time "being away from the Lord on a journey" (ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, v. 6). This spatial and temporal contrast is repeated twice more in short succession. In v. 8, the apostle states what he would prefer to be away from and whom he

---

[42] In *Mand.* 6.2.3 [36.3], αὐτάρκεια is listed among the works of the angel of righteousness.
[43] The typical comparanda are cited in Martin Dibelius, *Die apostolischen Väter: Der Hirt des Hermas*, vol. 4, HNT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), 550-51; Robert Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 1st ed., SC 53 (Paris: Cerf, 1958), 211; Norbert Brox, *Hirt des Hermas*, KAV 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 284; Martin Leutzsch, *Schriften des Urchristentums* Vol. 3*: Hirt des Hermas*, SUC 3 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), 467 n. 2; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 158 n. 6.

would prefer to be at home with, thereby implying what will eventually come to pass. "We would be even more well pleased," he writes, "to be away from (ἐκδημῆσαι) the body and to be at home (ἐνδημῆσαι) with the Lord."[44] And then, in v. 9, he immediately adds, "Therefore, whether at home or away (εἴτε ἐνδημοῦντες εἴτε ἐκδημοῦντες), we aspire to be pleasing to him."[45] Paul's description of some day "being at home with the Lord" and still "being pleasing to him" in the present that we find in 2 Cor 5:6-9 anticipates the Shepherd's statements to Hermas that he will some day go home (ἐπιδημεῖν, 51.9) to his own true city in heaven but must still live in a certain manner in the meantime.

A more mature construal of the Pauline tension between the believer's being at home and away and the priority of one over the other is found in Paul's letter to Philippi.[46] There Paul postulated that believers held citizenship in another realm beyond the earthly one. According to him, the believer's "commonwealth (πολίτευμα) exists in heaven, from where we also eagerly await a savior, (the) Lord Jesus Christ (3:20)."[47] This construal represents a development of the apostle's earlier view stated in 2 Cor 5:6-9. For Paul, the notion of holding citizenship elsewhere does not allow the believer to avoid the burden of ethical responsibility in the present, earthly city. To the contrary, earlier in the same letter, the apostle exhorted his audience at Philippi to

---

[44] εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον, 2 Cor 5:8.

[45] διὸ καὶ φιλοτιμούμεθα, εἴτε ἐνδημοῦντες εἴτε ἐκδημοῦντες, εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι, 2 Cor 5:9.

[46] The chronology of 2 Corinthians relative to Philippians is, of course, contested in the literature. For a concise presentation of four scholarly chronologies, most of which date Philippians after 2 Corinthians, see Calvin J. Roetzel, *Paul, the Man and the Myth*, SPNT (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 178-83.

[47] Ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, Phil 3:20. I follow BDAG 845 in translating πολίτευμα as "commonwealth."

"live as citizens (πολιτεύεσθε) in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ" (1:27).[48] In other

words, Paul suggests, there is an inherent tension between being a citizen of heaven and living as

a citizen of an earthly city, but God's law (i.e., the gospel) governs. This idea is essentially what

we find in *Sim*. 1, where the Shepherd reminds Hermas that, even as he inhabits a foreign one, he

remains subject to the laws of his true city (ἔχων νόμον ἐν τῇ σῇ πόλει, 50.5), and he should

serve the Lord (and others too) in accordance with them (50.6-8). For Paul, one of the many

markers of properly living in such a manner was contentment (αὐτάρκεια), indeed, contentment

that causes one to "overflow in every good work," presumably work on behalf of others.[49] We

find this same Pauline idea of contentment oriented toward the needs of others in *Sim*. 1.6, 8

---

[48] Μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε…, Phil 1:27. My translation of the verb πολιτεύεσθαι follows LSJ 1434 A(1); cf. BDAG 846. The particular ethical behavior that Paul had in mind when employing this verb has been contested in the literature. According to Raymond R. Brewer, it was the Philippians' potential participation in the imperial cult; see "The Meaning of *Politeuesthe* in Philippians 1:27," *JBL* 73 (1954): 76-83. In response, Ernest C. Miller argued that Paul used the verb in line with prior Jewish literature, where he contended it functioned in reference to those living within the covenant, that is Jews, but in the case of the Philippians, Christians ("Πολιτεύεσθε in Philippians 1:27: Some Philological and Thematic Observations," *JSNT* 15 [1982]: 86-96). By contrast, Bradley H. McLean, ed., "Military Language and Metaphors in Philippians," in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*, JSNTSup 86 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 105-27, esp. 114-17, construed it in terms of "a speech given during [military] battle" (115).

[49] δυνατεῖ δὲ ὁ θεὸς πᾶσαν χάριν περισσεῦσαι εἰς ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν παντὶ πάντοτε πᾶσαν αὐτάρκειαν ἔχοντες περισσεύητε εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν, 2 Cor 9:8. In translating περισσεύητε here as "overflow," I follow BDAG 805. The only other occurrences of αὐταρκεία and the related adjective αὐτάρκης in the NT are in other Pauline letters, namely 1 Tim 6:6 and Phil 4:11, respectively. Forms of ἀρκεῖσθαι appear at 1 Tim 6:8, Heb 13:5. On the notion's philosophical background, see Audrey N. M. Rich, "The Cynic Conception of Αγταρκεια," *Mnem* 9 (1956): 23-29.

[50.6, 8], where the Shepherd enjoins Hermas to an αὐτάρκεια marked by possessing only the

bare minimum required and spending the rest on those in need.[50]

The author Ephesians picked up the Pauline notion of Christ-believers' possessing

citizenship in another realm and articulated it somewhat differently. In chapter two, he argues

that, as Gentiles, members of his audience formerly "were alienated from citizenship

(ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας) in Israel and strangers (ξένοι) from the covenants of the

promise" (v. 12). But, as believers, they are no longer "*without* Christ" (χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, v. 12).

They are "now *in* Christ Jesus" (νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), because "they have been brought

near by [his] blood."[51] Through him, both those who were once far off and those who were close

"have access (προσαγωγή) to the Father" (v. 18)."[52] Consequently, the author contended, they

are "no longer strangers or aliens (ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι) but… fellow citizens (συμπολῖται) with

the saints and members of God's household."[53] Previously, they lacked citizenship in Israel; now

they possess citizenship with the saints. Furthermore, they belong to what the author terms God's

household, which, taking up Paul's metaphor from 1 Cor 3:10-17, he describes as an edifice

constructed upon an apostolic-prophetic foundation within which Christ is cornerstone (v. 20).

Hermas adopts this metaphor of the Christian communal body as an edifice constructed upon a

foundation of apostles and prophets elsewhere in the *Shepherd*, namely in *Sim*. 9's depiction of

---

[50] Martin Leutzsch, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas,"* FRLANT 150 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 204 n. 93 adopted a slightly less confident position, arguing that the sense of αὐτάρκεια in *Sim*. 1 was closer to 2 Cor 9:8 than 1 Tim 6:6.
[51] νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἵ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Eph 2:13.
[52] καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς· ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Eph 2:17-18.
[53] Ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ, Eph. 2:19.

the Tower that I shall discuss below.[54] That adoption suggests that Hermas might have known

the wider context of Eph 2 as well and, given its lexical and conceptual similarities, had it in

view here in *Sim*. 1. The conceptual similarities include: the parallelism of foreignness or

alienation, on the one hand, and residence or belonging, on the other (*Sim*. 1.1, 6 [50.1, 6] / Eph

2:12-13); Christ-believers collectively comprising an identifiable social order framed in terms of

the ancient city (*Sim*. 1.1, 6 [50.1, 6] / Eph 2:19); and a tensive construal of law and the

believer's relationship to it, together with an emphasis on enduring fidelity to particular "works"

or modes of ethical behavior (*Sim*. 1.3-6, 7-8, 11 [50.3-6, 7-8, 11] / Eph 2:10, 15). Perhaps the

most prominent lexical similarities are found in the semantic field of the word πόλις (e.g.,

πολιτεία in Eph 2:12, συμπολῖται in Eph 2:19, and the word πόλις itself, which appears over a

dozen times in this *Similitude*).

Another key text associated with Paul that has influenced Hermas's depiction of

Christians as persons belonging to another realm is found in the Letter to the Hebrews. The

strongest instance of coherence between *Sim*. 1 and Hebrews are with three parts of chapters 11

and 13:[55]

---

[54] See pp. 223-34 below.

[55] James Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 107 assigned a (c) rating to *Sim*. 1 / Heb 11, 13. Despite determining that the probability of use was low, he still concluded that "[b]oth the ideas and the words in these passages seem to indicate dependence" (ibid.). Joly was much more certain: "La source immédiate est sans doute ici Hébr., XI" (*Hermas Le Pasteur*, 210 n. 2). In Snyder's judgment, "[t]he city analogy arises from the 'diaspora' language of the early church," and he cited Heb 13:14 as one example of such language (*The Shepherd of Hermas*, ed. Robert M. Grant, AF 6 [Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1968], 95). Osiek simply included portions of Heb 11-13 among various texts cited to support her claim that "[t]he idea that Christians live in the world as if in a foreign land is already a traditional eschatological motif" (*Shepherd*, 158). Similarly, Leutzsch noted "the presupposed tradition of Christians being strangers in the world" ("Die hier

By faith, he [Abraham] *sojourned* (παρῴκησεν) in the Promised Land as if it were a foreign one… For he anticipated the *city* that has foundations, whose builder and fashioner is God (11:9-10).[56]

By faith, all of these people died, not receiving the promises but seeing and welcoming them *from far away* (πόρρωθεν) and confessing that they were *foreigners and sojourners* (ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί) in the land. For the ones who say such things indicate that they are *seeking a homeland* (πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσιν). But if they were recalling that land from which they went out, they would have had an opportunity to return. To the contrary, *they were yearning for a better place, that is to say a heavenly one* (κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐπουρανίου). Therefore, God was not ashamed to be called their God. For he prepared a *city* (πόλιν) for them (11:13-16).[57]

For we do not have here a city that endures, but *we seek after the one that is to come* (τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν) (13:14).[58]

The first two of these three texts describe the yearning that Abraham and his descendants,

respectively, had for the city yet to come, which is built by God (vv. 10, 16). Those who

---

vorausgesetzte Tradition von der Fremdlingschaft der Christen in der Welt"), but he did not cite Hebrews (*Wahrnehmung*, 194). Leutzsch attributed Hermas's knowledge of the underlying idea of foreignness, as well as the eschatological conception of two cities, to Jewish sources (194; a list appears on 197). His position was less open to Hermas's influence by Platonic and Stoic sources than Dibelius, *Hirt*, 550-51. Brox adopted a position similar to Leutzsch's (*Hirt*, 284). Juan José Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, FP 6 (Madrid: Editorial Ciudad Nueva, 1995), 177 cited a few of these primary texts but did not engage the relevant parts of the Pauline letters themselves. A brief comparison between *Sim.* 1 and Heb 11, 13 is also given by Patrick Gray, "The Early Reception of Hebrews 6:4-6," in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, NovTSup 129 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 330-31 n. 25.

[56] Πίστει παρῴκησεν εἰς γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ τῶν συγκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς· ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός, Heb 11:9-10.

[57] Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες ὅτι εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες ἐμφανίζουσιν ὅτι πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσιν. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευον ἀφ' ἧς ἐξέβησαν, εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι· νῦν δὲ κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐπουρανίου. διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν· ἡτοίμασεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν, Heb 11:13-16.

[58] οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν, Heb 13:14.

anticipate or yearn for it are pictured as sojourning (v. 9) or as being sojourners (v. 13). In the third text, the author of Hebrews transfers this idea from Abraham and his descendants to his present-day audience.

*Sim.* 1 reflects an image of two cities, an earthly one in the present and a heavenly one to come, that is strikingly similar to the image that we find in Hebrews. Like Abraham and those others of faith in Hebrews who spent time in a foreign location but anticipated residing in another city built by God, the Shepherd tells Hermas that he presently resides in a strange locale but will one day travel with God's other servants to the city in which they are destined to reside (*Sim.* 1.1 [50.1]). Hermas's image of the earthly city is rooted in the present, as in Heb 13:14, which might suggest that this text is the one he had in view. Hermas he also could easily have generalized the text of Heb 11:16, as the author of Hebrews himself seems to have done in chapter 13. As Hebrews does, Hermas employs the idea of a sojourn and return. Here we even have lexical parallels, in addition to the obvious one of "city" (πόλις). The first is the language of "sojourn" itself. In Heb 11:13-16, the faithful were "sojourners" (παρεπίδημοί, v. 13) who desired the heavenly city (v. 16). Likewise in *Sim.* 1.9 [50.9], the Shepherd tells Hermas that he will eventually "sojourn home" (ἐπιδημεῖν) to his true city. The second lexical parallel lies in the notion of "return." We find the aorist infinitive form of ἀνακάμπτειν in Heb 11:15 and that of its compound ἐπανακάμπτειν in *Sim.* 1.2, 5 [50.2, 5].

In composing *Sim.* 1, Hermas has creatively synthesized multiple related theological concepts attested across the *corpus Paulinum* and developed within it through time. He adopts the Pauline tension between home and away, which the apostle expressed in 2 Cor 5 and later in slightly different terms in Phil 1 and 3 and which was also worked out by the author of

Ephesians. Hermas seems to have been further influenced by the Pauline description of believers as remaining subject to the laws of their true city, which necessarily determine the shape of their moral life in the present. Here the catalyzing texts could only be from Philippians, where the apostle exhorts his audience to presently "live as citizens in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ" (1:27), even though he believes their "commonwealth exists in heaven" (3:20). For Paul in Philippians, as for Hermas, a primary marker of such proper moral living is contentment that leads to sharing with others in need. Hermas's conception of the two cities, one earthly, one heavenly, can be attributed to Hebrews. With the author of that text, he depicts life between these two cities using the specific metaphor of sojourning, which is well attested in early Christian literature composed by authors writing within the broad Pauline tradition.[59] This idea is clearly behind the Shepherd's assertion that Hermas and his audience now live in a foreign country (or city) but are destined to inhabit a far off one to which he and they should plan to go. Thus we see the *corpus Paulinum* has exerted strong influence upon Hermas's description of his encounter with the Shepherd in *Sim.* 1 [50], even though he did not quote any particular letter in it directly.

---

[59] For example, the inscriptions of numerous early Christian texts similarly label their sending and receiving communities as sojourning ones. The author of *1 Clement* identifies the community from which his letter is sent as "the church of God sojourning (παροικοῦσα) at Rome" (cf. 2 Clem 5:1, where the audience is exhorted to "leave behind the sojourn of this world" [καταλείψαντες τὴν παροικίαν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου]). The author of the Polycarp's *Philippians* likewise addresses his audience as "the church of God sojourning (παροικούσῃ) at Philippi." The inscription of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* accomplishes both feats. It reads, "The church of God sojourning (παροικοῦσα) at Smyrna to the church of God sojourning (παροικούσῃ) in Philomelium and all the sojourning communities (παροικίαις) of the holy and catholic church in every place." The author of 1 Peter imagines his audience as "sojourners and strangers" (παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους, 2:11) who are to appropriately live out the "period of [their] sojourn" (τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον, 1:17). On the enduring question in the scholarly literature regarding possible Pauline influence upon the author of 1 Peter, see p. 271 in Chapter 5.

The discussion between Hermas and the Shepherd on the topic of civic identity and belonging and the attendant issue of determining which laws are binding upon those who sojourn in the earthly city but will one day go home to the heavenly one can be seen as Hermas's attempt to respond anew to the enduring problem of negotiating the tension between holding earthly and heavenly citizenship that was constructed by the apostle himself and then engaged by those who composed texts attributed to or associated with him.

The Salvific Activity of the Son of God (*Sim.* 5.2-7 [55-60])

In *Sim.* 5.2.1-11 and 5.4.1-5.7.4 [55.1-11, 57.1-60.4], the Shepherd presents the Parable of the Vineyard and discusses it with Hermas. I contend that this parable, which metaphorically describes the salvific activity of the Son of God, betrays engagement with material preserved in what becomes the *corpus Paulinum*.

The Parable of the Vineyard has many characters.[60] But its primary aim is to describe the activity of a certain slave (i.e., the Son of God) who is tasked with the care of a vineyard (i.e., the world) that is filled with vines (i.e., God's people) and weeds (i.e., lawless deeds) while his master (i.e., the Lord) is away on a journey. Here Hermas is adoptiong and adapting traditions attested in the Synoptic Gospels, especially Matthew.[61] But a significant amount of this adapting occurs in creative connection with material and patterns of thought drawn from the *corpus*

---

[60] The Shepherd presents the parable proper in *Sim.* 5.2 [55] and explains it in *Sim.* 5.4-6 [57-59]. His explanation of the parable's characters is found at *Sim.* 5.5.1-5 [58.1-5].

[61] By contrast, long ago Zahn, *Hirt*, 448 focused on the passage's similarities with Heb 1-2, rhetorically asking, "Und ist nicht das ganze fünfte Gleichnis, sofern es die Geschichte Christi darstellt, eine Reproduction der beiden ersten Kapitel des Hebräerbriefs, sofern diese ein Gleiches thun?"

*Paulinum*, which scholars have long overlooked.[62] In order to demonstrate the influence of

Pauline letters upon the Shepherd's explanation of this parable, I quote the text of it in full:

> The field is this world. The master of the field is the one who created all things
> and completed and gave them power. The son is the holy Spirit. The slave is the
> *Son of God* (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ). The vine is the people whom he planted. The fence
> stakes are the Lord's holy angels who surround and protect his people. The weeds
> that have been pulled out of the vineyard are the lawless deeds of God's servants.
> The foods that he sent to him from the banquet are *the commandments that he
> gave to his people through his Son* (αἱ ἐντολαί εἰσιν, ἃς ἔδωκε τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ διὰ
> τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ). The friends and counselors are the holy angels that were created
> first. The master's absence is the time that remains until *his appearing* (τὴν
> παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ).[63]

The Shepherd's explanation of the parable follows shortly thereafter:

> God planted the vineyard, that is he created the people and entrusted it to his Son.
> And the Son appointed the angels over them in order to protect each of them. *And,
> by struggling very hard and patiently enduring many sufferings, he himself
> cleansed their sins* (καὶ αὐτὸς τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἐκαθάρισε πολλὰ κοπιάσας καὶ
> πολλοὺς κόπους ἀνηντληκώς). For no vineyard is able to be cultivated without
> suffering or hardship. So, having cleansed the sins of the people, he himself
> showed the paths of life to them, by giving the Law that he received from his

---

[62] For example, Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 105-17 contains no references to *Sim.* 5 at
all. Zahn, *Hirt*, 411 argued that Hermas probably was not really working with Phil 2:5-11, apart
from one catch-word found therein (i.e., slave). Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 191 n. 248 observed that
"Hermas's parable is full of biblical reminiscences" ("La comparación de Hermas está repleta de
reminiscencias bíblicas") and listed, among others, Matt 21:35-38 and parallels but not Pauline
letters. The only reference to the *corpus Paulinum* in the entire discussion of *Sim.* 5 by Snyder,
*Shepherd of Hermas*, 100-09 is on p. 107, where the mention of the name of Christ in 1 Cor 1:10
is cited for comparison.

[63] ὁ ἀγρὸς ὁ κόσμος οὗτός ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ κύριος τοῦ ἀγροῦ ὁ κτίσας τὰ πάντα καὶ ἀπαρτίσας αὐτὰ
καὶ δυναμώσας. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ δοῦλος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ
ἀμπελὼν ὁ λαὸς οὗτός ἐστιν, ὃν αὐτὸς ἐφύτευσεν· οἱ δὲ χάρακες οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοί εἰσι τοῦ κυρίου
οἱ συγκρατοῦντες τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ· αἱ δὲ βοτάναι αἱ ἐκτετιλμέναι ἐκ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἀνομίαι εἰσὶ
τῶν δούλων τοῦ θεοῦ· τὰ δὲ ἐδέσματα, ἃ ἔπεμψεν αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, αἱ ἐντολαί εἰσιν, ἃς
ἔδωκε τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· οἱ δὲ φίλοι καὶ σύμβουλοι οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι οἱ πρῶτοι
κτισθέντες· ἡ δὲ ἀποδημία τοῦ δεσπότου ὁ χρόνος ὁ περισσεύων εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ, *Sim.*
5.5.2-3 [58.2-3].

Father to them. You see, then… that he himself is Lord of the people, having received every authority from his Father.[64]

This parable is replete with material also attested in Matthew.[65] The extent of it is so great that one might reasonably say with Massaux that Hermas was "inspired" by it.[66] For example, the setting of the *Similitude* in a vineyard could be adopted from the parable in Matt 21:33-44. Matthew also repeatedly ascribes divine sonship to Jesus, as the Shepherd does in *Sim.* 5.2, 5-6

---

[64] ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτευσε, τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸν λαὸν ἔκτισε καὶ παρέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ υἱὸς κατέστησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τοῦ συντηρεῖν ἑκάστους· καὶ αὐτὸς τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἐκαθάρισε πολλὰ κοπιάσας καὶ πολλοὺς κόπους ἀνηντληκώς· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀμπελὼν δύναται σκαφῆναι ἄτερ κόπου ἢ μόχθου. αὐτὸς οὖν καθαρίσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς τρίβους τῆς ζωῆς, δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸν νόμον, ὃν ἔλαβεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. βλέπεις οὖν, φησίν, ὅτι αὐτὸς κύριός ἐστι τοῦ λαοῦ, ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, *Sim.* 5.6.2-4 [59.2-4].

[65] The most extensive exploration of Matthean parallels in the *Shepherd* as a whole is that of É. Massaux, N. J. Belval, and S. Hecht, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus. Vol. 2: The Later Christian Writings*, New Gospel Studies 5/2 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992), 111-29, who argues for possible or even probable influence upon *Sim.* 5 on 116-19, 124-25. See also Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 119-22. Lists of potentially relevant Matthean parallels are also given to varying degrees in Dibelius, *Hirt*, 562-63; Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 227 n. 1 (see also the various allusions listed in the French translation on pp. 225-41); Molly Whittaker, *Die apostolischen Väter* Vol. 1: *Der Hirt des Hermas*, 2nd rev. ed., GCS (Berlin: Akademie, 1967), 56, 58; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 105; Brox, *Hirt*, 304 n. 5; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 191 n. 248; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 473 nn. 102, 106; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 171, 177 n. 11.

[66] Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 2: *The Later Christian Writings*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, NGS 5/2 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992), 117 explicitly asserts wide influence by Synoptic vineyard parables. Shortly thereafter, he concludes, "When Mt. is compared with the other synoptics, the odds are, as a whole, very much in his favor. It follows then that Hermas drew his inspiration from the Matthew parables which he freely developed, influenced as well by expressions taken from Isaiah, Lk. or Mk. The author does not slavishly follow the text of Mt.; it is rather the foundation upon which he builds his own parable" (118). Similarly, on the setting of the parable in a vineyard, Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 122 concluded, "This may possibly have been suggested by the Gospels, and the whole parable seems framed on the model of evangelical parables."

[55, 58-59].[67] Jesus is a law-giver like Moses in Matt 5-7, just as he gives a law received from his Father to the people in *Sim*. 5.6.3 [59.3]. He is also given authority (ἐξουσία) from his Father in the First Gospel.[68] The same is the case at *Sim*. 5.6.4 [59.4].

For his part, Paul employs the image of planting a vineyard when defending his claim on community support in 1 Cor 9.[69] He also refers to Christ using the title "Son of God" throughout his authentic letters, a practice continued in later pseudepigraphic ones, such as Ephesians, and Hebrews too.[70] Like the Shepherd, Paul implicitly describes Christ as law-giver.[71] At various places in 1 Corinthians, he claims to transmit a "command" (ἐντολή) from the Lord" (ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν ὅτι κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή, 14:37; cf. 7:10, 19, 9:14). In Galatians, the apostle mentions "the law of Christ" (τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and exhorts his readers to fulfill it, at least in part, by

---

[67] E.g., Matt 3:17, 4:3, 8:29, 11:27, 16:16, 17:5, 26:63, 27:40, 43, 54. Although God is not explicitly mentioned in the Parable of the Vineyard at Matt 21:33-39, the landowner (οἰκοδεσπότης, v. 33) or lord (κύριος, v. 40) of a vineyard in it eventually sends his son, who is killed by tenant farmers (vv. 37-39).

[68] Matt 28:18; cf. 11:27. See also Matt 7:29, 9:6, 8, 21:24, 27. According to Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 119, "The words are sufficiently related to suggest dependence, but are too few to admit of a confident inference"; he assigned a (c) [i.e., possible] ranking. The parallel is noted by Whittaker, *Hirt*, 58; and Brox, *Hirt*, 305 n. 10.

[69] τίς φυτεύει ἀμπελῶνα καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐσθίει; 1 Cor 9:7b.

[70] The "Son of God" is named at Rom 1:4, 2 Cor 1:19, Gal 2:20, Eph 4:13, Heb *passim*. A shorter version of the title, simply "Son," is even more common. See Rom 1:3, 9, 5:10, 8:3, 29, 32, 1 Cor 1:9, 15:28, Gal 1:16, 4:4, 6, Col 1:13, 1 Thess 1:10, Heb *passim*.

[71] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 179 argues that "[t]he relationship of the son to the law (and what law?) is confusing." She adds, "Later (*Sim*. 8.3.2), the Son of God will be identified with the law as the one preached throughout the world. The new *law of Christ* is undoubtedly meant, but in continuity with Torah" (179; emphasis added). In support of the latter claim, Osiek cited Matt 28:20 and other texts too but did not include Gal 6:2 or any other references to the Pauline corpus. On Christ as law-giver Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 474 n. 116 cited *Barn*. 2.6 not the Pauline corpus. In listing comparanda on the "law of Christ," Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 198 n. 264 also did not include Gal 6:2. According to Brox, *Hirt*, 319, "Der Sohn Gottes als Gesetzbringer ist nicht nur jüdisch in der Pointe, sondern frühchristlich verbreitet."

bearing one another's burdens (Gal 6:2).[72] Furthermore, like Matthew and later Hermas, together

with later authors writing in his name, Paul also understood Christ to have been given authority

from his Father.[73]

Perhaps the tightest conceptual and even lexical connections between Pauline letters and

the Shepherd in *Sim.* 5 can be discerned in the ways that Hermas and Paul describe the Son's

death and its effects. Here Hermas has arguably moved beyond the Matthean parable. The most

direct statement on this topic in all of the *Shepherd* is found at *Sim.* 5.6.2-3 [59.2-3]. According

to the Shepherd, "by struggling very hard and patiently enduring many sufferings, [the Son]

himself cleansed… sins." This reference to the Son's struggling and its implication of suffering

surely must be an allusion to Christ's crucifixion.[74] Furthermore, the Shepherd adds, "having

cleansed the sins of the people, he himself showed the paths of life to them." So too, for Paul,

Jesus's suffering and death are believed to effect a positive outcome with respect to sin and the

possibility of future life. Among the many statements on this point found across the Pauline

---

[72] Ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Gal 6:2. See the discussion of this verse as it relates to the *Mandates* section on p. 146 in Chapter 3. Note also the reference to "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus " at Rom 8:2, which according to Paul frees a person from "the law of sin and death" (τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου); cf. Rom 7:25.

[73] For example, although the word ἐξουσία is not explicitly mentioned in the Christ-hymn of Phil 2:5-11, it is arguably in view. Authority is, however, named in Eph 1:20-23, where Christ is said to sit "above every ruler and authority and power and dominion and every named name, not only in this age but in the coming one" (ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι). The allusion to this passage at *Sim.* 5.6.3 [59.3] is noted by Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 239.

[74] *Pace* Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 109, according to whom "…there is no death and resurrection in the Christology of Hermas." Osiek, *Shepherd*, 178-79 correctly observes that "[i]n keeping with the terms of the parable about the vineyard, however, it is called not suffering but labor."

corpus, a few are particularly close to what the Shepherd says in *Sim*. 5.[75] Christ's crucifixion is

a if not the foundational element of the Pauline kerygma (e.g., 1 Cor 1:23).[76] As did Matthew

and other Gospel writers, Paul knew that the kind of death Christ endured at the hands of the

Romans was a particularly difficult one. This is the obvious implication of Phil 2:8, particularly

its final clause. There the apostle recalls how Jesus "humbled himself, being obedient until death,

*even death on a cross*."[77] Furthermore, a fundamentally important effect of that crucifixion —

the notion that "Christ died *for our sins*" — is one of the elemental traditions that Paul himself

had received and then passed on to the Corinthians (1 Cor 15:3).[78] The Shepherd likewise

construes Christ's suffering death as the cleansing of (i.e., making redemptive atonement for)

sin.[79] Neither Matthew nor the historical-epistolary Paul describes it in precisely those cleansing

terms, but later authors writing in Paul's name certainly do.[80]

---

[75] E.g., Rom 5:6, 8, 15, 21, 6:8, 23, 8:34, Rom 8:3, 14:9, 1 Cor 8:11, 15:3, 22, 2 Cor 5:14, 1 Thess 4:14.

[76] On the primal importance of the cross within Paul's proclamation, see also 1 Cor 1:23, 2:2, Gal 3:1, 6:14.

[77] ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, Phil 2:8. See also the mention of Christ's sufferings at 2 Cor 1:5, Phil 3:10, Col 1:24, Heb 2:9-10, 18, 5:8, 13:12; cf. Heb 5:7.

[78] παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, 1 Cor 15:3. See also Rom 5:6-8, 10, 1 Cor 8:11, 2 Cor 5:14-15, 1 Thess 5:10.

[79] Similarly, Dibelius, *Hirt*, 570-71.

 Dibelius is followed by Osiek, *Shepherd*, 178. *Pace* Lage Pernveden, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, STL (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966), 76-79, in whose view the "cleansing" at *Sim*. 5.6.2-3 [59.2-3] is eschatological not atoning. Pernveden is followed by Lars Hartman, "Baptism in the *Didache* and in the *Shepherd of Hermas*," in *"Into the Name of the Lord Jesus": Baptism in the Early Church*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 183 n. 33. The Son's cleansing of sin is passed over entirely by Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 107; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 197-99; and Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 265.

[80] E.g., Eph 5:25-27, Tit 2:14; cf. Heb 1:3, 9:14.

As it is in the Pauline corpus, so too in the *Shepherd* an important aspect of salvation is being justified (δικαιοῦσθαι), which Hermas mentions three times. The first instance is in the *Visions* section.[81] The second is in the *Mandates*.[82] The third is at *Sim*. 5.7.1 [60.1]. Here, after explaining the parable to Hermas, the Shepherd exhorts him in the following way:

> "Keep this flesh of yours unsoiled and undefiled, *so that the Spirit that resides in it might testify to it* and s*o that your flesh might be justified* (ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ κατοικῆσαν ἐν αὐτῇ μαρτυρήσῃ αὐτῇ καὶ δικαιωθῇ σου ἡ σάρξ). Make sure that the notion does not enter into your heart that this flesh of yours is perishable, lest you misuse it in some defiling act. If you defile your flesh, you defile the holy Spirit too. And if you defile your flesh, you shall not live."[83]

---

[81] In *Vis*. 3.9.1 [17.1], the elderly Lady gives to Hermas all the words that she wishes him to "speak into the ears of the holy ones" (16.11). She begins her message with a description of how she raised her spiritual children. "I reared you," she says, "with much sincerity and innocence and holiness on account of the mercy of the Lord who trickled righteousness on you." The purpose of the Lord's doing so appears in the immediately following ἵνα clause: "…so that you might be justified and sanctified from all wickedness and all crookedness" (Ἀκούσατέ μου, τέκνα· ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐξέθρεψα ἐν πολλῇ ἁπλότητι καὶ ἀκακίᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς στάξαντος τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ἵνα δικαιωθῆτε καὶ ἁγιασθῆτε ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης σκολιότητος, 17.1; cf. 1 Cor 6:11). On the sense of the verb στάζειν, cf. LSJ 1632; BDAG 940. By translating this sentence's form of δικαιοσύνη as "justice" and not "righteousness," Osiek masks any possible Pauline parallel: "…the Lord who gave you *justice* [δικαιοσύνην] drop by drop, that you might be justified [δικαιωθῆτε]" (*Shepherd*, 80; emphasis added). Snyder's translation of the subjunctive verb δικαιωθῆτε as "you might be *righteous*," not "you might be *justified*," has the same effect (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 51; emphasis added).

[82] In *Mand*. 5.1.7 [33.7], justification is mentioned again. There the Shepherd tells Hermas that those who repent "were all justified (ἐδικαιώθησαν) by the most holy angel." According to Osiek, this phrase "*is not to be understood in the Pauline way*. Rather, it is the reward to all who are faithful in deeds of justice, beginning with the elimination of bad temper" (*Shepherd*, 120; emphasis added). But, as Adolf von Harnack, "Geschichte der Lehre von der Seligkeit allein durch den Glauben in der alten Kirche," *ZThK* 1 (1891): 86-87 long ago rightly recognized, Hermas stands squarely with the stream of post-apostolic Christian thinkers according to whom "a person becomes justified and blessed through faith and exercise of love" ("…der Mensch durch Glaube und Liebesübung gerecht und selig werde") (the quote is from p. 86). For Hermas, as for Paul, justification and the process of sanctification, itself demonstrated in proper action, are not only linked but inseparably intertwined (*Vis*. 3.9.1 [17.1]; cf. 1 Cor 6:11).

[83] …τὴν σάρκα σου ταύτην φύλασσε καθαρὰν καὶ ἀμίαντον, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ κατοικῆσαν ἐν αὐτῇ μαρτυρήσῃ αὐτῇ καὶ δικαιωθῇ σου ἡ σάρξ. βλέπε, μήποτέ σου ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν ἀναβῇ τὴν

The Shepherd nowhere explicitly says that it is the Son who justifies flesh (τὴν σάρκα δικαιοῦν), either through his death on the cross or some other means; likewise neither does Paul. Instead, the Shepherd variously attributes the act of justification to "the most holy angel" (*Mand.* 5.1.7 [33.7]) or some other unnamed agent, presumably God (*Sim.* 5.7.1 [60.1]; cf. *Vis.* 3.9.1 [17.1]).[84] The basis of justification explicitly named here is the maintenance of clean flesh. Similarly, at *Mand.* 5.1.7 [33.7] the basis appears to be proper repentance.[85]

Since Hermas nowhere explicitly attests the putatively Pauline idea of justification *by faith*, the question of whether he affirmed it has long been debated in scholarship.[86] Nevertheless, justification of *flesh*, precisely what we find in *Sim.* 5.7.1 [60.1], is unattested elsewhere in early Christian literature composed prior to the *Shepherd* with one exception — the Pauline corpus. In fact, before Hermas the explicit notion appears exclusively in the authentic letters of Paul himself. There it appears only twice, and on both occasions Paul employs it in precisely the same form, as a denial: "…from works of the law *all flesh shall not be justified*" (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ, Gal 2:16, Rom 3:20).[87] Paul's mention of "all flesh" (πᾶσα σὰρξ) in

---

σάρκα σου ταύτην φθαρτὴν εἶναι καὶ παραχρήσῃ αὐτῇ ἐν μιασμῷ τινι. ἐὰν μιάνῃς τὴν σάρκα σου, μιανεῖς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· κἂν μιάνῃς τὴν σάρκα σου, οὐ ζήσῃ, 60.1-2.

[84] Similarly, according to Osiek, at *Sim.* 5.7.1 [60.1] "the action of God is meant" (*Shepherd*, 182).

[85] The only clear reference to justification in Matthew is to that on Judgment Day, when Jesus says that one will be justified (δικαιωθήσῃ) or condemned (καταδικασθήσῃ) on the basis of their words (ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ, Matt 12:37). Note also the only other instance of the verb δικαιοῦν in Matthew at 11:19, which has the different sense of vindication, since it refers to wisdom (σοφία).

[86] Among the earliest (and most influential) disputants were Zahn, *Hirt*, 189-90; R. A. Lipsius, "Die Polemik eines Apologeten," *ZWT* 12 (1869): 258, esp. n. 1; and Harnack, "Seligkeit allein durch den Glauben," 86-87.

[87] Rom. 3:20 διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας / Gal. 2:16 εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ

these two verses is commonly assumed to be a quotation of Gen 6:12. However, the technical

notion of the flesh's justification (τὴν σάρκα δικαιοῦν) is unattested in the LXX. It is thus

apparently a Pauline theological innovation. Consequently, Hermas's use of the idea should be

recognized as the adoption of an element of Pauline literary tradition and thus an indicator of

apostolic influence. Earlier I have shown evidence that Hermas probably knew parts of Romans

and possibly Galatians too.[88] So he could have adopted the idea of the flesh's justification from

one or maybe even both of those letters. However, the possibility that he has tradition from

Romans in view here in the parable is strengthened by the mention of the Spirit's witnessing to

the flesh's cleanliness (*Sim*. 5.7.1 [60.1]); the only other source predating the *Shepherd* that

describes the Spirit's testifying to the character of Christ's followers is Rom 8:16.[89] But even if

Romans is not the specific source of that idea, Paul still seems to have been the catalyst for

Hermas's depiction of the justification for the flesh at *Sim*. 5.7.1.

Further evidence that a creative synthesis of literary traditions attested in Matthew and

the Pauline corpus underlies the Parable of the Vineyard is apparent in a discussion between

Hermas and the Shepherd on the question of the character of God's Son. Previously, Hermas

heard the Shepherd state in the parable that "the slave is the Son of God" (ὁ δὲ δοῦλος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

θεοῦ ἐστιν, 58.2). Hermas might have adopted this label from Matthew; but he works out its

implications and inherent tensions in Pauline terms. This becomes apparent in an important

---

διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ.
[88] See, e.g., pp. 139-42.
[89] αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ, Rom. 8:16. This text is cited for comparison but without engagement by Osiek, *Shepherd*, 182 n. 4. The Spirit is also described as witnessing or testifying at John 15:26, Acts 20:23, Heb 10:15, 1 Pet 1:11, 1 John 5:6, Rev 19:10.

exchange between him and the Shepherd. Hermas asks, "*Why* is the Son of God presented in the parable in the guise of a slave (εἰς δούλου τρόπον, 58.5)?"[90] In reply, the Shepherd rejects Hermas's construal. He argues, "The Son of God is *not* presented in the guise of a slave, but he is presented in great authority and lordship (εἰς ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην κεῖται καὶ κυριότητα, 59.1)."[91] This passing disagreement between Hermas and the Shepherd over the question of whether the Son of God is presented "in the guise of a slave" may reflect the legacy of Paul's letter the Philippians.[92] It evinces the same tension between Jesus as both "existing in the form of God" (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων) and yet "taking the form of a slave" (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών) found in

---

[90] Διατί, φημί, κύριε, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς δούλου τρόπον κεῖται ἐν τῇ παραβολῇ; *Sim*. 5.5.5 [58.5].

[91] εἰς δούλου τρόπον οὐ κεῖται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην κεῖται καὶ κυριότητα, *Sim*. 5.6.1 [59.1]. Here I follow the conjectural emendation of Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Novum testamentum extra canonem receptum* Vol. 3: *Hermae Pastor* (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1866), 90. Hilgenfeld inserted the negative particle οὐ, which is not attested in Codex Athos, before the main verb in the first clause. His emendation is followed by most modern editors: Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 236; Whittaker, *Hirt*, 57; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 196; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 264; Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 578; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols., LCL 24-25 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003) 2:332. See the brief discussion by Brox, *Hirt*, 318.

[92] Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 197 n. 262 noted the reference to δοῦλος at Phil 2:7 for comparison at *Sim*. 5.5.5 [58.5] but did not engage it. Philippe Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, Par 33 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1992), 190 argued that the identification of Christ as slave in Phil 2:7 "has a totally different quality" ("a une toute autre valeur") than that of slave as Son at *Sim*. 5.5.2 [58.2]. This claim is quoted and rejected by Osiek, *Shepherd*, 177 n. 17. Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 237 n. 5 admitted that Paul referred to Christ as slave but implied that because he does not do so in a parable, influence is lacking. Brox, *Hirt*, 319 likewise recognized the use of what he termed "der biblische δουλος-Titel" at *Sim*. 5.6 [59] and cited Phil 2:7, but he asserted that Hermas finds it "unfamiliar and intolerable" ("ungeläufig und unerträglich"). Dibelius, *Hirt*, 569 implies that the Shepherd is employing material from the Philippian Christ-hymn but does not say so explicitly. According to him, "…the Shepherd here is also speaking cultically and identifies Jesus with the name that is assigned to the Exalted One" ("…der Hirt redet auch hier kultisch und bezeichnet Jesus mit dem Namen, der dem Erhöhten zukommt").

vv. 6-7 of the so-called Christ hymn in Phil 2. The Shepherd's counter-claim that the Son is

presented "in great authority and lordship" challenges the first part of the hymn, which concerns

Christ's self-emptying and humility. In so doing, it coheres with the hymn's second part, which

emphasizes the elevation of Christ by God and his consequent authority over all people. Such a

depiction by the Shepherd adopts the Pauline idea, attested in texts like 1 Cor 1:24 and Rom 1:4,

wherein Jesus Christ is intimately connected with and reflective of divine powers.[93] As

mentioned above, at *Sim*. 5.6.4 [59.4], the Shepherd even employs a synonym of "power,"

explicitly stating that the Son "is Lord of the people, having received every authority (ἐξουσίαν)

from his Father."[94] In constructing this exchange, Hermas signals his awareness of the tension

named within early Pauline Christianity over the confession of God's Son as a humble figure

endowed with divine power whose endurance and faithfulness in suffering is rewarded with

elevation by God.[95] And yet, even though in this parable that Son is characterized as a slave,

Hermas ascribes ultimate importance not to the Son's identity as a humble servant but to his

possessing God-given authority. Ultimately, Hermas is trying to harmonize what appear to him

---

[93] Paul describes Christ as the "power of God" at 1 Cor 1:24: αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν, Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν. And at Rom 1:4, he claims that Christ "was marked out as Son of God with power" by his resurrection (τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν). For similar associations of Christ the Son with divine power, cf. 1 Cor 1:18, 2 Cor 13:4.

[94] αὐτὸς κύριός ἐστι τοῦ λαοῦ, ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, 59.4. The text from ἐστι through the end of the sentence is a conjectural emendation by Gebhardt and Harnack on the basis of the surviving Latin text (Oscar von Gebhardt and Adolf von Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e codice palatino*, PAO 3 [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877], 154). The reading is omitted in Codex Athos (and the Ethiopic tradition), but in their view that is explainable by the scribal error of homoioteleuton. This emendation is accepted by modern editors. See, e.g., Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 238; Whittaker, *Hirt*, 57; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 264; Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:334; Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 580.

[95] Similarly, Osiek, *Shepherd*, 177 n. 17.

to be competing aspects of the earthly career of God's Son, known from the Matthean parable(s), and the Son's subsequent exaltation with authority found as sung in the Philippian hymn.

Still more, admittedly weaker, evidence of Hermas's possible adoption of Matthean and Pauline tradition in *Sim*. 5 is found in the Shepherd's eschatological references to the central figure's "going on a journey" (ἀποδημῶν, 55.2; cf. ἐξῆλθε δὲ ὁ δεσπότης… εἰς τὴν ἀποδημίαν, *idem*) and "the time that remains until his coming" (ὁ χρόνος ὁ περισσεύων εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ, 58.3). The period between this going (ἀποδημία) and coming (παρουσία), he says, is simply "some time" (μετὰ χρόνον τινά, 55.5). Strikingly, in the Shepherd's parable, the παρουσία is that of the one whom he variously describes as merely "a certain person" (τις, 55.2), the lord of the field (ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀγροῦ, 58.2, 4) and the master (ὁ δεσπότης, 55.5, 58.3). In other words, the παρουσία is not that of the slave, i.e., God's Son. Were that the case, then Hermas could have directly applied the Pauline notion of Christ's παρουσία to the slave-Son.[96] Instead, he seems possibly to have adapted the return's referent, shifting it from the character of the Son to that of his implied Father, the master of the field. Perhaps he has done so under the influence of the description of a master or landowner's going on a journey in two Synoptic parables.[97] However, in these parables a παρουσία per se is never explicitly mentioned.[98] Nowhere in the Pauline theological imagination is this precise notion found, since for the apostle

---

[96] The earliest explicit references to Christ's παρουσία to have survived are found in the Pauline letters. See, e.g., 1 Thess 2:19, 3:13, 4:15, 5:23, 1 Cor 15:23, 2 Thess 2:1, 8. Christ's coming again, although not described as παρουσία, constitutes an element of the kerygma that Paul claimed to have received from the Lord himself and handed on to the Corinthians (1 Cor 11:26); similarly, note the awaited return God's Son from heaven at 1 Thess 1:10. The παρουσία is also named at Matt 24:3, 27, 37, 39; Jas 5:7-8, 2 Pet 1:16, 3:4, 12; 1 John 2:28.

[97] Matt 21:33 / Mark 12:1 / Luke 20:9; Matt 25:14-15 /Mark 13:34.

[98] Even so, they are offered for comparison on this point by Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 473 n. 109.

it is not the Father but the Son who has died, risen, and will come again. Thus it seems that Hermas has possibly adapted the Pauline notion of the Son's παρουσία by applying it to the Son's implied Father, the lord of the field in which the Son toils.

The Tower, The Constructed Church (*Sim*. 9 [78-110])

This parable is by far the longest in the *Similitudes*, running to a full thirty-three sections in the modern editions. It is in some ways a definitive statement of Hermas's ecclesiology, particularly the regarding the church's construction and maintenance, the means by which one is incorporated into it, and the character and contours of life required of those who comprise it. Hermas's treatment of these themes, I argue, represents a meaningful encounter with material preserved the Pauline corpus.

*Constructing the Tower*

Partway through *Sim*. 9, Hermas again picks up the metaphor of the church as Tower. This metaphor is the most prominent one in all of the *Shepherd*.[99] It appears first in *Vis*. 3, where the elderly Lady showed Hermas a "large tower constructed upon the waters with bright square stones" (πύργον μέγαν οἰκοδομούμενον ἐπὶ ὑδάτων λίθοις τετραγώνοις λαμπροῖς, 10.4). She then explained the image to him at length. Now, in *Sim*. 9.1, the Shepherd takes his own turn doing so: "…[the Shepherd] came to me," Hermas writes, "and he says to me, 'I want to explain

---

[99] The centrality of this metaphor to the *Shepherd* is recognized by Osiek, according to whom "[t]he vision of the tower… is the central image of the book, incorporating the eschatological, paraenetic, and ecclesiological content that will be gradually unfolded in the form of verbal instruction" (*Shepherd*, 64).

to you the things that the holy spirit that was speaking with you in the form of the Church pointed out to you'" (78.1).[100] In fact, the Shepherd claims that his explanation will enable Hermas to understand things "more precisely" (ἀκριβέστερον, 78.3) than the one who earlier appeared as Church.

Hermas initially sees an enormous white rock in the middle of a plain. "The rock (πέτρα)," he tells the reader, "was ancient, with a gate (πύλη) cut into it." "But," he adds, "the chiseling out of the gate seemed to me to be very recent."[101] Hermas later asks the Shepherd about the meaning of these two features. "First of all, sir," Hermas says, "explain this to me — who is the rock and the gate?" The Shepherd replies, "This rock and the gate is the Son of God" (*Sim*. 9.12.1 [89.1]).[102] The Shepherd's identification of the rock with God's Son coheres with Paul's metaphorical description of Christ in the same manner in 1 Cor 10. There Paul allegorically interpreted the stone that Moses struck with his staff and caused to give water to the Israelites in Num 20 as Christ. "And everyone drank the same spiritual drink," the apostle wrote. "For they drank from the spiritual rock that followed (them), and the rock was Christ" (ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός, v. 4)."[103] The correspondence between Hermas's construal of Christ as rock and that of Paul might be dismissed as merely a coincidence.[104] However, the fact that Hermas's

---

[100] ἦλθε πρός με καὶ λέγει μοι· Θέλω σοι δεῖξαι, ὅσα σοί ἔδειξε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ λαλῆσαν μετὰ σοῦ ἐν μορφῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *Sim*. 9.1.1 [78.1].

[101] παλαιὰ δὲ ἦν ἡ πέτρα ἐκείνη πύλην ἐκκεκομμένην ἔχουσα· ὡς πρόσφατος δὲ ἐδόκει μοι εἶναι ἡ ἐκκόλαψις τῆς πύλης, *Sim*. 9.2.2 [79.2].

[102] Πρῶτον, φημί, πάντων, κύριε, τοῦτό μοι δήλωσον· ἡ πέτρα καὶ ἡ πύλη τίς ἐστιν; Ἡ πέτρα, φησίν, αὕτη καὶ ἡ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστι, *Sim*. 9.12.1 [89.1].

[103] καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα· ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός, 1 Cor 10:4.

[104] This is the argument of Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 105: "The resemblance here seems purely accidental, the rock being quite different in the two cases." According to Osiek,

224

broader depiction of the constructed Tower adopts and adapts material from the Pauline corpus

in other ways too, as I shall show, suggests this is not the case.

Construction imagery is found throughout the *corpus Paulinum*, particularly in the

apostle's authentic letters.[105] Occasionally, it represents the individual, as in 2 Cor 5:1, where

Paul imagines the heavenly "building from God" (οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ) that will supersede the

body, which he calls an "earthly tent-house" (ἡ ἐπίγειος οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους), when it is

eventually destroyed. However, in the Pauline corpus, construction imagery more frequently

refers to the Christian community itself, where it functions to depict believers as being built up

together. Such development and figurative application of building language (e.g., θεμέλιος,

οἰκοδομή, οἰκοδομεῖν) to the ἐκκλησία of Christ-believers represents a "Pauline innovation."[106]

---

"Rock and door have already established christological correspondences" prior to the *Shepherd*, and in the case of "rock" she cites 1 Cor 10:4 for comparison, together with Wis 11:4, Rom 9:33, 1 Pet 2:6-8, Justin, *Dial*. 113.6, *Barn*. 11.5, and Ignatius, *Poly*. 1.1 (*Shepherd*, 233 n. 2; the quote is from 233). In Osiek's judgment, "No direct dependence on 1 Cor 10:4… can be demonstrated," since the idea of Christ as rock "must have had wider circulation in Christian spirituality."

[105] For a survey of this image in early Christian literature, see Philipp Vielhauer, "Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus," in *Oikodome: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Günter Klein, TBNT 65 (München: C. Kaiser, 1979), 1-168. On its function in the Pauline corpus in particular, see, among others, Josef Pfammatter, *Die Kirche als Bau: eine exegetisch-theologische Studie zur Ekklesiologie der Paulusbriefe*, AnGreg 110 (Roma: Libreria Editrice dell'Università Gregoriana, 1960); Ingrid R. Kitzberger, *Bau der Gemeinde: Das paulinische Wortfeld oikodomē, (ep)oikodomein*, FzB 53 (Würzburg: Echter, 1986); J. Shanor, "Paul as Master Builder: Construction Terms in First Corinthians," *NTS* 34.3 (1988): 461-71; and Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, HUT 28 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991), 99-11, which discusses other ancient sources that deploy the building metaphor in discussions of civic polity.

[106] G. H. R. Horsley, "Novatian Christians at Nikaia?," in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1979*, vol. 4 (North Ryde, N.S.W.: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1987), 260. In making this observation, Horsley follows H. Pohlmann, "Erbauung," *RAC* 5 (1962):

For example, Paul exhorts the recipients of his earliest extant letter to "encourage each other and build one another up" (παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε εἷς τὸν ἕνα, 1 Thess 5:11). But, for Paul, such construction imagery holds not just exhortative importance; it is crucial to how he understands himself and his mission. Paul believes his own authority as an apostle to be oriented "toward building up" (εἰς οἰκοδομὴν), not "toward pulling down" (εἰς καθαίρεσιν).[107] He explicitly tells his Corinthian audience that they are "God's building" (θεοῦ οἰκοδομή, 1 Cor 3:9). And he imagines himself to be the "wise master-builder" (σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων) who laid the very foundation (θεμέλιον) of the building that they are, a foundation upon which others who come after him build (1 Cor 3:10).[108] That singular foundation, Paul says, to which no one else can add, is Christ himself (1 Cor 3:11).[109] In the same letter, the apostle describes prophecy as intended for the "building up" (οἰκοδομή) of others (14:3). All such spiritual gifts, Paul argues, are properly oriented "toward the building up of the assembly" (πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, 14:12).[110] This implied criterion of up-building, itself more stringent than legality (i.e., compatibility with Torah), determines whether any action should be taken (10:23; cf. 14:17,

---

1043-70; and E. A. Judge, "Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents," *TynBul* 35 (1984): 23.

[107] See, e.g., 2 Cor 10:8, 13:10; similarly, 2 Cor 12:19. Paul arguably got this idea from the prophet Jeremiah; cf. Jer 1:10, 24:6. For a recent exploration of Jeremiah's influence upon Paul's sense of his own identity and mission, see Lutz Doering, "The Commissioning of Paul: Light from the Prophet Jeremiah on the Self-Understanding of the Apostle?," in *Jeremiah's Scriptures: Production, Reception, Interaction, and Transformation*, ed. Hindy Najman and Konrad Schmid, JSJSup 173 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 544-65, esp. 556-58 on 2 Cor 10-13.

[108] Similarly, at Rom 15:20 Paul states that he prefers to make his proclamation in new places "so as not to construct upon another's foundation" (ἵνα μὴ ἐπ᾿ ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ).

[109] θεμέλιον γὰρ ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, 1 Cor 3:11.

[110] Similarly, at 1 Cor 8:1 the apostle says that, unlike knowledge (γνῶσις), "love builds up" (ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ).

26). Paul's implication becomes explicit in his letter to the Romans, where he exhorts his audience to "pursue the things that pertain to peace and the up-building of each other."[111] There, as in 1 Corinthians, a guiding emphasis for the apostle in his use of the building metaphor is the Christ-believing community's unity and concord.

The construction imagery previously used by Paul is picked up and developed in the pseudepigraphic letters attributed to him. This practice is clearest in Ephesians.[112] The criterion of up-building so prominent in the Corinthian correspondence appears again at Eph 4:29, where rotten speech (λόγος σαπρός) is forbidden in favor of "some good (word) useful for up-building" (τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν). Even more common in Ephesians, as in Corinthians, though, is the Pauline image of the Christian community as an actual building. This is apparent in both chapter 2 and 4. At the end of chapter 2, the author describes his audience as "constructed upon the foundation (ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ) of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the corner foundation-stone (ἀκρογωνιαίου), in whom the entire building, being fitted together, grows into a temple holy in the Lord, in whom you too are built together as God's dwelling place in the Spirit" (vv. 20-22).[113] Later in chapter 4, the author again describes the community as an edifice. The "up-building of the body of Christ" (οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, v. 12) is presented as the second of two reasons that various ministries are given. The ultimate aim, he says, is the body's growing and building itself together into Christ in love (vv. 15-16). Thus we

---

[111] Ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους, Rom 14:19. Likewise, Paul later names "the noble aim of upbuilding" (τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν, 15:2).

[112] Elsewhere, see Col 2:7.

[113] ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὔξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι, Eph 2:20-22.

227

see the construction and unity τόποι from 1-2 Corinthians enhanced by the Pauline

pseudepigrapher in Ephesians, who adds love as an orienting, unifying concern.

Ignatius's letter to the Ephesians attests a similar transformation of the originally Pauline

notion of the Christian community as a building comprised of stones that cohere together.[114]

Ignatius described the recipients of his letter as "stones (λίθοι) of God's temple, prepared for

God the Father's building (ἡτοιμασμένοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν θεοῦ πατρός, 9.1)." Ignatius further

states that they are "…lifted to the heights by the crane of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, using

the holy Spirit as a rope. Your faith is your upward guide, and love is the path that carries you up

to God."[115] Just as Hermas imagines believers to be stone's in God's *tower*, so too Ignatius

imagines them to be stones in God's *temple*.[116] Both conceptions are expansions, and in the case

of Ignatius also a brief quotation, of Paul's idea, attested in 1 Cor 3:9, that believers are "God's

building" (θεοῦ οἰκοδομή).[117] Ignatius's adaptation of a key Pauline building metaphor in

correspondence composed prior to his death at Rome in the mid-110s C.E. — that is, at a point

---

[114] This is also observed by Pohlmann, "Erbauung," 1059; and Osiek, *Shepherd*, 64 n. 22. Osiek mistakenly cites Ignatius, *Magn.* 9.1-2 instead of *Eph.* 9.1-2.

[115] ἀναφερόμενοι εἰς τὰ ὕψη διὰ τῆς μηχανῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν σταυρός, σχοινίῳ χρώμενοι τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ· ἡ δὲ πίστις ὑμῶν ἀναγωγεὺς ὑμῶν, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη ὁδὸς ἡ ἀναφέρουσα εἰς θεόν, *Eph.* 9.1. Hermas also assigns faith and love places of prime importance in the logic of salvation. See, e.g., *Sim.* 9.15.2 [92.2]; cf. *Sim.* 9.15.3 [92.3].

[116] According to William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, ed. Helmut Koester, Herm (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 66, "…Ignatius may be read in light of the allegory of the stones and the tower in Hermas (Vis. 3; Sim. 9) which clearly owes much to the apocalyptic vision of the heavenly city." Ultimately, though, Schoedel concludes that "[Ignatius's] allegories presuppose mythic patterns of thought that are hardly exclusively Gnostic, and it seems reasonable to read *Eph.* 9.1 in light of them" (ibid.).

[117] W. R. Inge, "Ignatius," in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 66 did not recognize this brief Pauline quotation, even though he did note the resemblance(s) between Ignatius, Eph. 9.1 and 1 Cor 3:10-17, which he assigned a "d" (i.e., possible) ranking.

when Hermas is widely believed to have been active in the imperial city — confirms the plausibility of my reading Hermas's depiction of the Tower as an extension of basic concepts contained in the *corpus Paulinum*.

Given the predominance of this construction theme in the Pauline letters and its use in later literature influenced by them, such as the writings of Ignatius, its centrality to the *Shepherd* should come as no surprise.[118] Admittedly, the term "tower" (πύργος), which is so common in the *Shepherd*, does not appear anywhere in the Pauline literary corpus. Even so, Hermas's preference for a term without an explicitly Pauline pedigree need not imply the absence of Pauline influence. Although in speaking of the believing community as building, the apostle sometimes did characterize its type (e.g., in 1 Cor 3:16-17 he names the Corinthian community a ναός), at other times he spoke of it in more general terms (e.g., the generic reference to οἰκοδομή at 1 Cor 3:9, 2 Cor 5:1). Likewise, the author of the Pastoral Epistles, for his own reasons, referred to the church as the "household (οἶκος) of God," itself "the pillar (στῦλος) and supporting base (ἑδραίωμα) of the truth" (1 Tim 3:15).[119] In other words, the freedom with which Hermas works with building metaphors is a freedom apparent already in the Pauline letters themselves. Even so, what we have in *Sim*. 9's extended description of the Christian community as constructed tower is evidence of Hermas's adoption of Pauline literary traditions beyond the

---

[118] Massaux correctly observed that "this ninth Similitude is devoted to the allegory of the tower which represents the building of the Church on earth," and then he immediately added, "the allegory of the construction is either present or hinted at in Paul" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 146; a list of Pauline citations follows.

[119] ἐὰν δὲ βραδύνω, ἵνα εἰδῇς πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, 1 Tim 3:15.

mode of verbatim quotation.[120] Simply put, Hermas's vision of the Tower-church betrays a real

conceptual and theological debt to Paul and at least one later author writing in the apostle's

name.[121] This debt is manifested, I contend, in Hermas's synthesizing the contents of the *corpus*

*Paulinum* by drawing multiple creative connections between its related parts.

A primary Pauline metaphor that Hermas adopts in *Sim*. 9 is that of the church as a

building with foundation. Among the Pauline letters, this idea of the Christian community as

building is most clearly stated in 1 Cor 3:9. This idea was "planted" by Paul in his authentic

letters and grown in the later pseudepigraphical letters, so one need not isolate an exclusively

influential text in order to responsibly claim Pauline influence upon Hermas at this point. Later

use of this identifiably Pauline metaphor is apparent in Ephesians, especially chapter 2.[122] As we

have seen, in describing Christ-followers as a building, the author of that letter also imagines

---

[120] Similarly, ibid., 147: "A Pauline literary influence stands out throughout the texts of Sim. 9, even though not one of the apostle's texts can be found literally. But the similarity of thought and the presence of identical words leave no doubt with respect to Hermas's source of inspiration."

[121] Dibelius, *Hirt*, 459-60 hints at the possibility of influence from 1 Corinthians upon Hermas's concept of the constructed church but does not argue for it.

[122] Drummond suggested "…the whole figure of the tower may have been suggested by Eph 2:10-22" ("Shepherd of Hermas," 107). According to Snyder, Hermas "is not indebted primarily to the NT figure [of the tower]…, but has adopted the Zion symbol of Jewish-Christian apocalypticism" (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 43; cf. 130). Similarly, Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 98 n. 1 argued that Hermas's vision of the tower incorporates "some Eastern and Jewish traditions about the heavenly city and heavenly mountain" ("des traditions orientales et juives sur la Ville céleste et la Montagne céleste"), and he cited Eph 2:20-22 only for comparison (107 n. 3). This is largely the position of Dibelius, *Hirt*, 459. It is labeled an "antiquated idea" ("alte Vorstellung") and rejected by Brox, *Hirt*, 118, in whose view the Tower represents a Jewish parable that has been Christianized by Hermas (377). Pohlmann, "Erbauung," 1059 noted similarities between the metaphors of Hermas and Barnabas while positing their divergence from those of building in NT texts. The Ephesian connection is not noted by Osiek, who in support of her claim that "[t]he church as building has a previous history" cites only 1 Cor 3:9-17 (*Shepherd*, 64, 64 n. 22). Among the earliest scholars to associate the image of the Tower with Pauline letters was Ernst Gaâb, *Der Hirte des Hermas: Ein Beitrag zur Patristik* (Basel: Felix Schneider, 1866), 50, who connected it with 1 Cor 3:11-13 and Eph 2:19-22.

their foundation to be the apostles and prophets (2:20). Hermas has adapted this founding base by expanding it to include others too.[123] In his imagination, the Tower's foundation is comprised of four "tiers" (στοῖχοι), each corresponding to a different group of people (*Sim.* 9.4.3 [81.3]).[124] These four are the (1) "first generation" (πρώτη γενεά); (2) "second generation of righteous men" (δευτέρα γενεὰ ἀνδρῶν δικαίων); (3) "God's prophets and his servants" (προφῆται τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ); and (4) "apostles and teachers of the proclamation of God's Son" (ἀπόστολοι καὶ διδάσκαλοι τοῦ κηρύγματος τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, *Sim.* 9.15.4 [92.4]).[125] This four-tiered foundation lies "upon the great rock and above the gate" (ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπάνω τῆς πύλης, *Sim.* 9.4.2 [81.2]). The Shepherd later identifies both the rock and the gate as the Son of God (i.e., Christ), as we saw above. But the Shepherd still maintains that the Son of God is their foundation. "He himself," the Shepherd tells Hermas, "became (the) foundation" of those who bear his name (*Sim.* 9.14.6 [91.6]).[126] This idea of God's Son (i.e., Christ) being the foundation of his followers is, among surviving early Christian literature composed prior to the

---

[123] According to Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 107, it is merely "possible" (i.e., [d] ranking) that *Sim.* 9.4.3 [81.3] (and presumably 9.15.4 [92.4]) contain a quotation of Eph 2:20.

[124] ἐγένοντο οὖν στοῖχοι τέσσαρες ἐν τοῖς θεμελίοις τοῦ πύργου, *Sim.* 9.4.3 [81.3]. This reading is a conjectural emendation proposed by Gebhardt and Harnack on the basis of the Latin (*Hermae Pastor graece*, 204; cf. Tornau and Cecconi, *Shepherd of Hermas in Latin*, 104). It is unattested in the Greek text of Codex Athos (Kirsopp Lake, *Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of the Shepherd of Hermas* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907] Plate X). But this is presumably due, as modern editors suggest, to the scribal error of *homoioteleuton*. My translation of στοῖχοι as "tiers" follows Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 626.

[125] Οἱ λίθοι δέ, φημί, κύριε, οἱ ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ ἡρμοσμένοι εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τίνες εἰσίν; Οἱ μὲν πρῶτοι, φησίν, οἱ ιʹ οἱ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τεθειμένοι, πρώτη γενεά· οἱ δὲ κεʹ δευτέρα γενεὰ ἀνδρῶν δικαίων· οἱ δὲ λεʹ προφῆται τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ· οἱ δὲ μʹ ἀπόστολοι καὶ διδάσκαλοι τοῦ κηρύγματος τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, *Sim.* 9.15.4 [92.4].

[126] αὐτὸς οὖν θεμέλιος αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο, *Sim.* 9.14.6 [91.6].

*Shepherd*, only attested in 1 Cor 3:11.[127] Later in *Sim*. 9, following the Tower's inspection, Hermas describes its appearance as uniform, employing the Pauline unity topos. He says, "[The Tower] had been built as if from one stone, without a single joint in it. And the stone appeared to have been chiseled out from the rock, for it seemed to me to be comprised of a single stone" (*Sim*. 9.9.7 [86.7]).[128] This apparent fusing together of the construction stones follows their changing color and becoming white, which occurred when they were placed in the Tower by the holy angels (*Sim*. 9.4.5 [81.5]). Their fusion into what looks like a single stone arguably represents the adaptation via expansion of the idea of believing community's being fitted together within God's building as it grows higher from Eph 2:20-22, as well as a maintaining of the Pauline unity and concord typos from 1 Cor 3.[129] Hermas switches to the more spatialized metaphor of the Tower because of where he stands — several generations beyond (i.e., above) what Paul in Corinthains describes as the constructed church's initially laid foundation.

---

[127] Zahn, *Hirt*, 419 made a more limited point focusing on the NT canon: "The notion that Christ himself is the entire edifice-bearing, immutable, and essential foundation, such as Hermas emphasizes it in the entire ninth Similitude, is found only in 1 Cor 3:11, whereas in Matt 21:42 and Eph 2:20 Christ is represented merely as the cornerstone holding the base and thus the entire building together" ("Die Anschauung, daß Christus selbst die das ganze Gebäude tragende, unveränderliche und unentbehrliche Grundlage sei, findet sich so, wie er sie im ganzen neunten Gleichnis betont, nur 1 Kor 3:11 während Matth 21:42, Eph 2:20 Christus nur als der das Fundament und damit den ganzen Bau zusammenhaltende Eckstein dargestellt wird"). Stanislas Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs: Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1963), 159 n. 1 also cited Christ as foundation in 1 Cor 3 for comparison (although he mistakenly cited v. 10). At *Sim* 9.14.6 [91.6], Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 490 n. 354 simply states, "Christus als θεμέλιος: 1Kor 3,11."

[128] οὕτω γὰρ ἦν ᾠκοδομημένος, ὡσὰν ἐξ ἑνὸς λίθου, μὴ ἔχων μίαν ἁρμογὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. ἐφαίνετο δὲ ὁ λίθος ὡς ἐκ τῆς πέτρας ἐκκεκολαμμένος· μονόλιθος γάρ μοι ἐδόκει εἶναι, *Sim*. 9.9.7 [86.7].

[129] *Pace* Pohlmann, on whose reading of Hermas "the church is no longer a living organism that lives through Christ and is held together in him" ("…ist Kirche nicht mehr ein lebendiger Organismus, der durch Christus lebt u. in ihm zusammengehalten wird") ("Erbauung," 1060).

Thus we see that Hermas's vision of the Tower represents an attempt to harmonize

similar and yet somewhat discordant ideas attested across the Pauline corpus and also to update it

for his own present situation. His governing metaphor is that of the Christian community as

building, itself originally the apostle's idea. Hermas has connected the idea of Christ as the

building's foundation in 1 Cor 3:11 with the idea of him as stone in 10:4.[130] This connection

possibly occurred in association with Eph 2:20, where Christ is named as the constructed

community's corner foundation-stone.[131] At the same time, Hermas has also expanded ideas that

---

[130] Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 105 gave *Sim*. 9.12.1 [ 89.1] / 1 Cor 10:4 a "d" ranking (i.e., possible). Giet also observed that in 1 Cor 10:4 Paul describes Christ as rock, but he emphasized the difference between its context and that of *Sim*. 9 (*Hermas et les Pasteurs*, 156). In commenting upon the Tower in *Vis*. 3, Giet noted, "Without a doubt, for a reader of St. Paul, the word θεμέλιος would normally call to mind the idea of Christ" ("Sans doute, pour un lecteur de saint Paul, le mot θεμελιος appellerait normalement l'idée du Christ"), and then he quoted the text of 1 Cor 3:11 (ibid., 115). He then immediately adds, "But are we in a Pauline context?" ("Mais sommes-nous dans un contexte paulinien?"), to which his implied the answer is, No. By contrast, according to Massaux, "…the Shepherd identifies the rock with the Son of God in Sim. 9.12.1… This reminds us naturally of Paul, who recalling the events in the desert, writes in 1 Cor. 10:4… There may be an allusion to this Pauline text" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 146). 1 Cor 1:4 is simply noted for comparison in Lelong, *Pasteur*, 254; and Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 253 n. 314.

[131] Anna Vezzoni, ed., *Il pastore di Erma: Versione Palatina*, NM 13 (Firenze: Casa editrice Le lettere, 1994), 20 argues unconvincingly that Hermas's depiction of not Christ but the Lord as the Tower's foundation represents "a unique trait that differentiates Hermas's ecclesiology from that of the New Testament writings" ("un altro tratto singolare che differenzia l'ecclesiologia di Erma da quella degli scritti neotestamentari"), esp. Eph 2:20. Similarly, Pohlmann, "Erbauung," 1059 inferred from Christ's putative absence from the Tower's foundation "a certain decoupling of the church from Christ and salvation from the saving event in Christ" ("eine gewisse Loslösung der Kirche von Christus u. des Heils von dem Heilsereignis in Christus"). He then added, "This implies that Christ's importance for the church building is starting to no longer be central" ("Das läßt daurauf schließen, das die Bedeutung Christi für den Kirchenbau anfängt, nicht mehr zentral zu sein"). Crucially, both Vezzoni and Pohlmann overlooked the fact that, according to Hermas, the Son of God does in fact undergird the foundation of the Tower; see *Sim*. 9.4.2 [81.2], 9.12.1 [89.1]. These mentions of the Son of God instead of Christ in these passages does not support their argument. As many others have, Massaux rightly recognized that "the absence of Χριστός, replaced by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ[,] is normal in Hermas" (*Influence:* Book

233

he learned from Pauline letters. To the list of figures comprising the church's foundation found in Eph 2:20 (i.e., apostles and prophets), Hermas has added a number of others now arranged in tiers, namely the first two righteous generations, teachers, and god's servants.[132] He also extended that same verse's image of the church-building's being fitted together by describing the Tower's stones fusing together into an apparently single white stone.

The recognition that Hermas's vision of the constructed Tower-church is fundamentally Pauline is important.[133] It further illuminates the extent to which Hermas was adopted and adapted the contents of the Pauline corpus. It also expands our understanding of that corpus's history of effects. In this particular case, the apostle applied a building metaphor to the assembly of Christ-believers in service of an argument for unity and concord. That metaphor was developed in discrete but still coherent ways by the author of Ephesians, subsequently by Ignatius, and then by Hermas in his visions of the Shepherd. Each of these authors grappled with the Pauline legacy to their own ends. But they share a commitment to the themes of the unity, stability, and upbuilding of the assembled body of Christ-believers, depicted as building, which the apostle himself first developed in his correspondence with Corinth.

---

2: *Later Christian Writings*, 146). Christ is correctly recognized as the Tower's foundation by Brox, *Hirt*, 390.

[132] Zahn, *Hirt*, 419 similarly connects *Sim*. 9.15.4 [92.4] with Eph 2:20.

[133] *Pace* Brox, *Hirt*, 377, according to whom there is no payoff for properly identifying the allegory's origin(s).

*Baptism*

Baptism is foundational to the theological logic of the *Shepherd*, particularly that evinced in the *Similitudes* section.[134] This is the case even though baptism appears infrequently in the tripartite text;[135] Hermas explicitly names the ritual only once.[136] Most prominent among Hermas's

---

[134] Surveys of baptism in the *Shepherd* include André Benoît, "Le 'Pasteur' d'Hermas," in *Le baptême chrétien au second siècle: La théologie des pères*, EHPR 43 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953), 115-37; Pernveden, *Concept of the Church*, 162-76; Victor Saxer, "Le 'Pasteur' d'Hermas," in *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du IIe au VIe siècle: Esquisse historique et signification d'après leurs principaux témoins*, CISAM 7 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1988), 49-55; Brox, *Hirt*, 546-49; Lars Hartman, "Obligatory Baptism—but Why? On Baptism in the Didache and in the Shepherd of Hermas," *SEÅ* 59 (1994): 127-43; Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 214-20; Mark Grundeken, "Baptism and Μετάνοια in the *Shepherd of Hermas*," in *Early Christian Communities Between Ideal and Reality*, ed. Mark Grundeken and Joseph Verheyden, WUNT I 342 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 127-42; Grundeken subsequently revised the former essay, publishing it as "Baptism and Metanoia," *Community Building in the* Shepherd of Hermas*: A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects*, VCSup 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 128-40.

[135] Vemund Blomqvist perceptively described this situation as a *paradox* ("The Teaching on Baptism in the Shepherd of Hermas," in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. David Hellholm et al., vol. 2, 3 vols., BZNW 176 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011], 850; similarly, 854, 865). Reinhart Staats likewise recognized baptism as the sole guarantor of salvation in in the *Shepherd*, despite its being only "casually mentioned" ("beiläufig genannt") ("Hermas," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, ed. Gerhard Müller, vol. 15 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986], 104). Pernveden too wondered whether "…[baptism] may have held a considerably more prominent position in Hermas than the texts seem to testify" (*Concept of the Church*, 163). Hartman admitted that for Hermas baptism was "not only self-evident but obviously obligatory," but even so in his view "…baptism is just in the background" (*"Into the Name of the Lord Jesus": Baptism in the Early Church*, SNTW [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997], 171, 178).

[136] *Vis.* 3.7.3 [15.3]. There alone Hermas uses the verb "to baptize" (βαπτίζειν), and he nowhere mentions the ritual itself (i.e., baptism, βάπτισμα) by name. Pernveden considered the rarity of overt baptismal terminology in the *Shepherd* to be consistent with the writings of most of the other so-called Apostolic Fathers and second-century Apologists (*Concept of the Church*, 162). And yet Ferguson rightly rejected focusing on the single occurrence of βαπτίζειν in the *Shepherd* and inferring from it a lack of importance in Hermas's thought: "This longest writing in the Apostolic Fathers contains the greatest number of references to baptism (but not the word itself) among the Apostolic Fathers; it also presents the strongest statements concerning the necessity of

symbols for or related to baptism are water, name, and seal. All of these symbols are found in the

Pauline corpus. And so, in this section, I shall demonstrate that the logic of baptism in the

Shepherd's *Similitudes* is fundamentally a Pauline logic, albeit a modified one. By this I mean

that Hermas adopted upon traditions attested in the writings of the apostle and his

pseudepigraphers in crafting his own creative vision of baptism as a necessary but not sufficient

condition of the Christ-follower's experience of salvation and life in the church. Here in the

*Similitudes*, Hermas does not have in mind the primordial waters upon which the church is

founded.[137] Likewise, he is not working with the tradition of the mythological waters of the

Acherusian Lake.[138]

---

baptism for salvation in early Christian literature" (*Baptism in the Early Church*, 215). Hermas's position on the necessity of baptism can be inferred from elsewhere in *Vis.* 3, and also in *Mand.* 4 and *Sim.* 8-9, where he refers to baptism symbolically, employing a number of images to describe or refer to it. Giet hypothesized that the opening scene of the *Visions* section, where Hermas assists Rhoda out of the Tiber River, depicts her baptism, perhaps with him serving as deacon during it. Giet first proposed the idea in *Hermas et les Pasteurs*, 297-300; see also his "Un témoignage possible sur l'administration du baptême dans les premières années du IIe siècle et sur le rôle ministériel d'Hermas," in *Atti del VI Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana, Ravenna, 23-30 Settembre, 1962*, SAC 26 (Città del Vaticano: Pontificio Instituto di archeologia cristiana, 1965), 191-97. The scene would provide a limited visual representation of baptism at the very beginning of the *Shepherd*, but Giet's suggestion has been soundly rejected. See, e.g., Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 218; Blomkvist, "Teaching on Baptism," 2:853.

[137] *Pace* Brox, *Hirt*, 431 : "Die Terminologie von (Hinab- und) Heraufsteigen bezieht sich hier und in den weiteren Zeilen auf den βυθός (Abgrund als Hades), in dem von H[ermas] auch das Wasser befindlich gedacht ist, 'durch' das hindurch man 'heraufsteigt'…, wobei dieses Heraufsteigen bereits Metapher der Taufe ist, die auch die Toten im Abgrund brauchen." Henne's recognition of Hermas's consistent distinction between the singular and plural water(s) of baptism and in creation, respectively, convincingly refutes Brox's claim ("La polysémie allégorique dans le Pasteur d'Hermas," *ETL* 65 [1989]: 131).

[138] *Pace* Erik Peterson, "Die 'Taufe' im Acherusischen See," in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen* (Rome: Herder, 1959), 328-30, according to whom Hermas attempted "die vorchristliche Waschung im apokalyptischen Fluß zu christianisieren" (330). On the Acherusian Lake itself and its appearance in early Jewish and Christian literature, see Violet

Three passages in the *Similitudes*, two short, the other extended, symbolically refer to baptism. In *Sim.* 8.6.3, the lengthy Parable of the Willow Tree, Hermas mentions a "seal" (σφραγίς) twice in short succession. He does so in the context of asking the Shepherd to interpret the various groups of people returning the different kinds of sticks distributed by the Angel of the Lord (67.2 *et passim*). He says, "Sir, now explain to me those people who have returned the sticks, what sort of person each one is and their dwelling place, so that *those who previously believed and received the seal* but have broken and not kept it sound, when they hear and recognize their own actions, *might repent, receiving a seal from you*."[139] The Shepherd's later statement in *Sim.* 9.16.4, which explicitly equates seal with water (ἡ σφραγὶς οὖν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστίν, 93.4), confirms that the seal at *Sim.* 8.6.3 is refers to baptism.[140] Here we find the first generally

---

MacDermot, *The Cult of the Seer in the Ancient Middle East: A Contribution to Current Research on Hallucinations Drawn from Coptic and Other Texts*, PWIHM n. s. 21 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 174-75; Kirsti B. Copeland, "Sinners and Post-Mortem 'Baptism' in the Acherusian Lake," in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, ed. Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz, SECA 7 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 91-107.

[139] Κύριε, νῦν μοι ἐπίλυσον τοὺς τὰς ῥάβδους ἀποδεδωκότας, ποταπός τις αὐτῶν ἐστι, καὶ τὴν τούτων κατοικίαν, ἵνα ἀκούσαντες οἱ πιστεύσαντες καὶ εἰληφότες τὴν σφραγῖδα καὶ τεθλακότες αὐτὴν καὶ μὴ τηρήσαντες ὑγιῆ, ἐπιγνόντες τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἔργα μετανοήσωσιν, λαβόντες ὑπὸ σοῦ σφραγῖδα, καὶ δοξάσωσι τὸν κύριον, *Sim.* 8.6.3 [72.3].

[140] Bousset dismissed this equation of seal and water at *Sim.* 9.16.4 as a scribal gloss, intended to explain a purportedly less common word (i.e., seal) by means of another (i.e., water). In Bousset's view, "Man darf sich durch die auf obigen Satz unmittelbar folgende, erklärende Glosse: ἡ σφραγὶς οὖν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστίν nicht täuschen lassen... Das ist keine Worterklärung zu σφραγίς. Vielmehr will der Satz dem Leser die wie es scheint ungebräuchlichere σφραγίς durch die gebräuchlichere ὕδωρ deuten" (*Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*, 2. umgearb. Aufl., FRLANT 4 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921], 228 n. 5). According to Brox, Bousset thought the gloss "clarifies the connection of the metaphor to baptism" (*Hirt*, 432: "…definiert den Bezug der Metapher auf die Taufe"). Brox himself implicitly rejected Bousset's attribution of the phrase to a later scribe, thereby affirming its authenticity, but he still accepted Bousset's suggestion regarding its function: "Durch eine direkte Identifikation wird das Wasser dann mit der Metapher des Siegels verbunden" (ibid., 546). Although he mistakenly implied that Bousset's suggested

237

recognized use of seal as baptismal metaphor in early Christian literature.[141] Hermas's second

use of the seal symbol at *Sim.* 8.6.3 is more enigmatic. There he speaks of receiving "a seal," not

"the seal," *after*, perhaps even long after, the first seal is received in baptism.[142] Hermas nowhere

---

gloss also included the following compound sentence (εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ οὖν καταβαίνουσι νεκροὶ καὶ ἀναβαίνουσι ζῶντες), Lampe's terse rejection of Bousset's fanciful suggestion is appropriate (*The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers* [London: Longmans, Green, 1951], 105 n. 8: "There is surely no need to follow Bousset in supposing this phrase to be a marginal gloss"). Schläger's attribution of the statement to a compiler of Hermas's writings is, like Bousset's attribution of it to a later scribe, equally unnecessary. "Seal" itself is not an uncommon word or idea in early Christian literature, even if it was, admittedly, rarely used in reference to baptism, and Hermas's habit of using "seal" in different ways allows such an usual use here. Furthermore, that the seal itself is received *after* coming to faith confirms it as reference to baptism (Karl Olav Sandnes, "Seal and Baptism in Early Christianity," in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. David Hellholm et al., BZNW 176 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011], 1452).
[141] Franz Joseph Dölger, *Sphragis: Eine altchristliche Taufbezeichnung in ihren Beziehungen zur profanen und religiösen Kultur des Altertums*, SGKA 5. Bd., 3./4. Heft (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1911), 70. For a concise list of other places in early Christian literature where baptism is referred to as "seal," including 2 Clement, *Acts of Thomas*, *Acts of Paul and Thecla,* and the Abercius inscription, consult Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 483 n. 239; Sandnes, "Seal and Baptism," offers a more extensive survey of these sources. On the meaning of "seal" in the *Shepherd*, see A. Hamman, "La signification de σφραγίς dans le Pasteur d'Hermas," *StPatr* 4.2 (1961): 286-90; Hartman, "Baptism," 183-86; Sandnes, "Seal and Baptism," 1450-57. Among the few scholars who reject any reference to baptism at *Sim.* 8.6.3 is Lars Hartman, but his presumption of consistency of meaning between the first and second instances of "seal" in the passage, which means that the first cannot mean baptism, is unsubstantiated and therefore unwarranted ("Baptism," 184, esp. n. 38). Ultimately, despite his demand for consistency of meaning at *Sim.* 8.6.3 [72.3], Hartman himself was unable to determine whether seal "stands for the same thing throughout the book… [or] is being used with several meanings" (184). Sandnes has recently shown the meaning of "sealing" to vary widely in the literature of our period, and even within the *Shepherd* itself he determined that seal can mean "water, most likely baptism, faith or repentance, [or] proclaiming the name of the Son of God" ("Seal and Baptism," 1455). Half a century prior, despite this variety of meaning even in the *Shepherd*, Hamman claimed to uncover a consistency in Hermas's use of "seal" in reference to baptism, penitence, and martyrdom ("σφραγίς," 286, 290).
[142] Hermas's distinction between "the seal" and "a seal" (i.e., the second one) is noted by Sandnes, "Seal and Baptism," 1452-53. A distinction on the basis of the definite article seems implicit in the treatment of Osiek, *Shepherd*, 206.

else posits the need for a second baptism after the first one that follows coming to faith.[143] So the second seal in this passage likely does not refer to that possibility, and some other meaning for this use of seal must be found.[144] Whatever it represents, reception of a *second* seal in *Sim.* 8.6.3 follows — and therefore likely is related to — a renewal of one's spirit, perhaps as after a demonstration of what would later become known as penance.[145] Such a renewal of spirit among those who repent is, according to Hermas, *a* if not *the* purpose for which the Shepherd has come.[146]

In *Sim.* 9, as discussed above, Hermas again takes up the metaphor of the church as Tower begun in *Vis.* 3. As he did in that vision, so too at *Sim.* 9.16.1-7 [93.1-7] he links baptism, depicted symbolically as seal and water, with salvation. The relevant passage is introduced by Hermas's question to the Shepherd regarding the reason for stones being brought "up from the

---

[143] As Hartman rightly put it, Hermas "is no anabaptist" ("Baptism," 184); similarly, Pernveden, *Concept of the Church*, 169.

[144] Snyder suggested that "[f]or Hermas the *sphragis* is the gift of unity between the holy Spirit and flesh, and as such comes both at baptism and repentance" (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 122). Surprisingly, though, in support of this claim Snyder cited *Sim.* 9.16.4 [93.4], which equates seal and (baptismal) water and thereby contradicts his suggestion that the seal does come at baptism but is not baptism itself. By contrast, according to Osiek, the second seal of *Sim.* 8.6.3 represents "the *laissez-passer* or certificate of entrance given to at least two of the three groups with originally green sticks that were admitted immediately into the tower by the great angel" (*Shepherd*, 206). This view is apparently an extension of Dibelius's original suggestion that the seals of *Sim.* 8.2 refer not to baptism but to a pass that allows entry into the Tower (*Hirt*, 591: "Das Siegel ist hier natürlich nicht die Taufe, sondern der Paß, mit dem sie in den Turm gelangen").

[145] Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 106.

[146] This is apparent from Hermas's statement of the grounds upon which those who repent will glorify the Lord: "because he had compassion on them and sent you [i.e., the Shepherd] in order to renew their spirits" (ὅτι ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐξαπέστειλέν σε τοῦ ἀνακαινίσαι τὰ πνεύματα αὐτῶν, 72.3).

deep" (ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ) and placed in the Tower, even though they bore the proper spirits.[147] The

Shepherd replies at length:

> "It was necessary to go up through water in order that *they might be made alive*
> (ζωοποιηθῶσιν). For otherwise they were unable to enter into God's kingdom,
> unless *they put off the deadness of their former life* (τὴν νέκρωσιν ἀπέθεντο τῆς
> ζωῆς αὐτῶν τῆς προτέρας). So too these who had fallen asleep received the son of
> God's seal and entered into God's kingdom. For… before a person bears the son
> of God's name, he is dead. But when he receives the seal, *he lays aside deadness
> and recovers life* (ἀποτίθεται τὴν νέκρωσιν καὶ ἀναλαμβάνει τὴν ζωήν). So the
> water is the seal. *Into the water, then, dead people go down, and they come up
> living* (εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ οὖν καταβαίνουσι νεκροὶ καὶ ἀναβαίνουσι ζῶντες). So this
> seal was proclaimed also to them, and they made use of it, in order that they might
> enter into God's kingdom."[148]

Here the Shepherd describes the locus and means of a faithful person's coming-to-life. Both are

found in baptism, itself a condition of entry into the Kingdom of God. Although baptism is not

explicitly mentioned in this passage, it can be inferred from the Shepherd's reference to "going

up through water" (δι' ὕδατος ἀναβῆναι, 93.2) and his definition of seal as water (ἡ σφραγὶς οὖν

τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστίν, 93.4).[149] According to Hermas, one descends into the water of baptism as a dead

---

[147] Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs*, 117, rightly noted that in the NT the "deep" (βυθός) appears
only in Paul (2 Cor 11:25), but there the apostle means the "deep sea" in which he was
shipwrecked, not the mythological Deep.

[148] Ἀνάγκην, φησίν, εἶχον δι' ὕδατος ἀναβῆναι, ἵνα ζωοποιηθῶσιν· οὐκ ἠδύναντο γὰρ ἄλλως
εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ μὴ τὴν νέκρωσιν ἀπέθεντο τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν τῆς
προτέρας. ἔλαβον οὖν καὶ οὗτοι οἱ κεκοιμημένοι τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθον
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· πρὶν γάρ, φησί, φορέσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ,
νεκρός ἐστιν· ὅταν δὲ λάβῃ τὴν σφραγῖδα, ἀποτίθεται τὴν νέκρωσιν καὶ ἀναλαμβάνει τὴν ζωήν.
ἡ σφραγὶς οὖν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστίν· εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ οὖν καταβαίνουσι νεκροὶ καὶ ἀναβαίνουσι ζῶντες.
κἀκείνοις οὖν ἐκηρύχθη ἡ σφραγὶς αὕτη καὶ ἐχρήσαντο αὐτῇ, ἵνα εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν
τοῦ θεοῦ, *Sim.* 9.16.2-4 [93.2-4].

[149] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 238. Sandnes disagreed. In his view, "the seal cannot simply be equated
with baptism as Herm. 93.4 seems to indicate" ("Seal and Baptism," 1455). He rejects equating
seal and baptism (1455) or even considering them synonymous (1454). And yet he still claims,
rather inconsistently, "Death here is clearly a theological notion which can be alleviated only by
the seal, name or water, and *the three work synonymously*" (1454, emphasis added).

person. In it, one "lays aside deadness and recovers life" (ἀποτίθεται τὴν νέκρωσιν καὶ ἀναλαμβάνει τὴν ζωήν, 93.3). And then one rises up alive, having moved from death to life.

Crucially, Hermas recognizes that the Shepherd only responded to the first half of his initial question in 93.1 about the stones *coming up from the deep*. He did not answer what was for Hermas the more fundamental question. And so Hermas asks it again, phrased slightly differently: "Why… did the forty stones come up with them from the deep, *even though they already had the seal*?"[150] Again, the Shepherd replies:

> Because, after they fell asleep, these apostles and teachers who had preached the name of the Son of God preached with power and *faith in (the) Son of God* (πίστει τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ) even to those who had previously fallen asleep, and they gave to them the seal of the proclamation.[151] So *they went down with them into the*

---

[150] Διατί, φημί, κύριε, καὶ οἱ μ΄ λίθοι μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ, ἤδη ἐσχηκότες τὴν σφραγῖδα; *Sim*. 9.16.5 [93.5].

[151] I construe πίστει τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ here as an objective genitive, which coheres conceptually with *Sim*. 8.3.2 [69.2] (πιστεύσαντες αὐτῷ); cf. *Vis*. 4.1.8 [22.8] (τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου), *Mand*. 11.4 [43.4] (τῇ πίστει τοῦ κυρίου), *Sim*. 6.1.2 [61.2] (τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου), *Sim*. 6.3.6 [63.6] (τῇ πίστει τοῦ κυρίου). In doing so, I follow a pattern predominantly apparent in German language scholarship: e.g., Lelong, *Pasteur*, 271; Dibelius, *Hirt*, 625; Brox, *Hirt*, 416; Andreas Lindemann and Henning Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), 513; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 331. Many other scholars, by contrast, take πίστει τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ here as a subjective genitive. See, among others, Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 329; Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs*, 160; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 146; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 261; Ian G. Wallis, *The Faith of Jesus Christ in Early Christian Traditions*, SNTSMS 84 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 188; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 232; Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers* 2:431; Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 653. None of the scholars in either group engages the underlying interpretive problem, though, which is of course a *crux interpretum* in Pauline studies. The phrase at *Sim*. 9.16.5 [93.5] is not included by Massaux in his list of "expressions similar or very close Paul" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 148). Nor is it discussed in Kukwah Philemon Yong, "The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Analysis of Paul's Use of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003), 104-05. The problem is engaged at some length by Michael R. Whitenton, "After ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Neglected Evidence from the Apostolic Fathers," *JTS* 61 (2010): 105-08, who tentatively concludes that a subjective reading is preferable (107). But Whitenton's complex syntactical argument overlooks the crucial witness of *Sim*. 8.3.2 [69.2].

*water and came up again* (κατέβησαν οὖν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πάλιν ἀνέβησαν). But *whereas these (apostles and teachers) went down living and came up living, those who had previously fallen asleep went down dead, but came up living* (ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ προκεκοιμημένοι νεκροὶ κατέβησαν, ζῶντες δὲ ἀνέβησαν). So then, *through these (apostles and teachers) they were made alive* (διὰ τούτων… ἐζωοποιήθησαν) and came to know the name of the Son of God. Because of this, they too came up together with them, and they were joined together into the building of the Tower, and they were built in together uncut. For in righteousness and in great purity they fell asleep, only they did not have this seal.[152]

Here we see that Hermas viewed baptism as utterly essential for salvation.[153] That he did so is particularly clear from the Shepherd's teaching that the apostles and teachers, after their own deaths, necessarily preached to and baptized the "righteous departed."[154] Such persons, although they lived "in righteousness and in great purity," lacked the seal, Hermas says, and so they were unable to be joined into the Tower. Here the seal that they lack is the seal of *proclamation* — the good news of Jesus Christ, or to use Hermas's phrase "the name of the Son of God." This the apostles and teachers communicated to the departed, and "through these [the latter] were made alive" thereafter in baptism. This process of the departed's coming-to-life closely parallels the

---

[152] Ὅτι, φησίν, οὗτοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι οἱ κηρύξαντες τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, κοιμηθέντες ἐν δυνάμει καὶ πίστει τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκήρυξαν καὶ τοῖς προκεκοιμημένοις καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ κηρύγματος. κατέβησαν οὖν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πάλιν ἀνέβησαν· ἀλλ' οὗτοι μὲν ζῶντες κατέβησαν καὶ ζῶντες ἀνέβησαν· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ προκεκοιμημένοι νεκροὶ κατέβησαν, ζῶντες δὲ ἀνέβησαν. διὰ τούτων οὖν ἐζωοποιήθησαν καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ συνανέβησαν μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ συνηρμόσθησαν εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ πύργου, καὶ ἀλατόμητοι συνῳκοδομήθησαν· ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ γὰρ ἐκοιμήθησαν καὶ ἐν μεγάλῃ ἁγνείᾳ· μόνον δὲ τὴν σφραγῖδα ταύτην οὐκ εἶχον, *Sim.* 9.16.5-7 [93.5-7].
[153] Lelong, *Pasteur*, 269; Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 328 n. 1; Hartman, "Obligatory Baptism— but Why?," 136.
[154] The label is that of Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 1 (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950), 101. It refers to those who "fell asleep in righteousness and in great purity" (*Sim.* 9.16.7 [93.7]).

experience of earthly catechumens.[155] Whether still living or already dead, in order to experience

salvation by virtue of incorporation into the church, represented by the metaphor of the Tower,

for Hermas one must first hear and accept the gospel's proclamation. Movement down into and

up through the baptismal waters then brings persons to life from a prior state of death.[156]

Hermas's description of the descended apostles' actions for and with the righteous departed

clearly reflects the pre-existing practice of Christian baptisms on behalf of the dead;[157] indeed,

they also represent an argument in support of it.[158] Such a practice was already known to take

place at Corinth in the mid-first century C.E. by Paul, who enigmatically appeals to it as part of

his argument for the reality of resurrection (1 Cor 15:29).[159]

Hermas's theology of baptism coheres strongly with the *corpus Paulinum.* Each of the

key elements of Hermas's theology of baptism finds a clear counterpart in the Pauline corpus: (1)

baptism as symbolic descent into and then ascent out of water; (2) baptism as a locus where the

deadness that is a barrier to entry into God's Kingdom is put off, life is taken up, and forgiveness

of sins is received; and (3) baptism as, or at least connected with, a seal.

---

[155] Similarly, Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 218.

[156] Kirsopp Lake, "The Shepherd of Hermas and Christian Life in Rome in the Second Century," *HTR* 4 (1911): 28: "The doctrine of baptismal regeneration, taking place ex opere operato, could scarcely be more clearly expressed." Similarly, Pernveden, *Concept of the Church*, 166: "Through baptism man moves from death to life."

[157] Staats, "Hermas," 15:104. Joly went even further, arguing that Hermas thought such baptisms were necessary (*Hermas Le Pasteur*, 328 n. 1).

[158] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 238. Osiek judges the argument to be a "good" one.

[159] "…Otherwise, what will those who are baptized on behalf of the dead do? If the dead actually are not raised, why are they even baptized on their behalf?" (Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν;). For a brief survey of the various exegetical and historical debates surrounding Paul's statement and the underlying ritual practice(s) that it might reflect, together with relevant bibliography, see N. H. Taylor, "Baptism for the Dead (1 Cor 15:29)?," *Neot* 36 (2002): 111-20.

The first way that Hermas's understanding of the meaning and function of baptism coheres with that presented by the Pauline letters is in its depicting of baptism as a symbolic passage down into and then up out of water. This is most clearly presented in the Shepherd's statements in *Sim.* 9.16.2, 4, 6 [93.2, 4, 6], in which he responds to Hermas's questions about the meaning of the stones' movement through water before their incorporation into the Tower. For his part, Paul implicitly describes baptism as descent and ascent using the metaphors of burial and resurrection in Rom 6:4.[160] He construes it as "*being buried* with Christ into death" (v. 4a). The sense of motion that this burial metaphor evokes is clear. Surely any reader or hearer of this passage would know that the bodies of those who die are, when buried, *lowered* into the ground, that is to say they *descend* into it. This co-burial with Christ occurs, according to Paul, in order that those who are so buried then "just as Christ *was raised*... might walk in newness of life" (v. 4b). In other words, Paul suggests, the believer's being raised out of water to a new life in baptism parallels Christ's being raised from the dead. This symbolic burial and subsequent raising in baptism is reiterated by the author of Colossians (2:12). Admittedly, in these passages neither the apostle nor his pseudepigrapher employs the specific verbs that did Hermas did, namely καταβαίνειν ("to go down") and ἀναβαίνειν ("to come up"). Nevertheless, through Hermas's use of the metaphors of being lowered (i.e., buried) and raised, he evokes the same

---

[160] συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν, Rom 6:4.

motion — descent and ascent — that these Pauline texts depict a believer undergoing in baptism.[161]

As an alternative influence upon Hermas's description of baptism in *Sim.* 9.16.2-6 [93.2-6], some scholars point to the story of the Ethiopian eunuch's baptism by Philip in Acts 8:26-40.[162] To be sure, strong verbal agreement exists between these two texts. As does the *Shepherd*, Acts 8 attests forms of the verbs καταβαίνειν and ἀναβαίνειν, plus the prepositional phrase εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ ("into the water"), in its description of baptism. But apart from the references to water in vv. 36, 38, and 39, the verbal or conceptual parallels between these texts are limited to the implied mechanics of the baptismal rite itself. By this I mean the motion of going down into and then coming up out of the water in which one is baptized: "…and [Philip] ordered the chariot to halt, and *they both went down into the water* (κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ), both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him. And when *they came up from the water* (ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος), (the) Spirit of the Lord snatched Philip. The eunuch did not see him any longer, and, rejoicing, he went on his way" (vv. 38-39).[163]

Alternatively, the depiction of baptism in the *Epistle of Barnabas* might seem conceptually closer to that in the *Shepherd*, because *Barnabas* includes another parallel in addition to that of motion down into and up from water. In chapter 11 its author mines the texts

---

[161] Grundeken, *Community Building*, 129 describes this as "the usual way of going down in the water and (fortunately!) coming up again." He does not pursue the question of potential Pauline influence on this "usual way" and its theological significance.

[162] E.g., Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 218.

[163] καὶ ἐκέλευσεν στῆναι τὸ ἅρμα καὶ κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, ὅ τε Φίλιππος καὶ ὁ εὐνοῦχος, καὶ ἐβάπτισεν αὐτόν. ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν οὐκέτι ὁ εὐνοῦχος, ἐπορεύετο γὰρ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρων, Acts 8:38-39.

of Israel's prophets in order to "determine whether the Lord cared to reveal the water [i.e.,

baptism] in advance."[164] He reads the blessing in LXX Psalm 1:1 of those who will be like the

"tree planted besides streams of water" (v. 3) as foreshadowing "those who having hoped in the

cross *went down into the water*" (οἳ ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐλπίσαντες κατέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, 11.8).

And he employs the same image of descent into water a few verses later, adding to it one of

ascent (11.11). There, in his exposition of a text strikingly similar to LXX Ezek 47:7-12, which

depicts blooming trees whose fruit gives eternal life rising out of water (v. 10), the author

describes baptism as occurring in two stages.[165] In the first step, believers "*descend into the*

*water* laden with sins and filth," and in the second they "*come up* bearing fruit in the heart."[166] In

Hermas's conception, the baptismal motion is the same. The conceptual overlap extends to these

authors' description of baptism as source of forgiveness. Much like Hermas linked the baptismal

descent with forgiveness of sin in *Mand*. 4.3.1 [31.1], as I showed in Chapter 3, the author of

*Barnabas* explicitly names the ritual as "the baptism that *produces forgiveness of sins*" (τὸ

βάπτισμα τὸ φέρον ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, 11.1), which he claimed Israel rejected and replaced.[167]

---

[164] Ζητήσωμεν δέ, εἰ ἐμέλησεν τῷ κυρίῳ προφανερῶσαι περὶ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, *Barn*. 11.1. The Greek text is that of Robert A. Kraft, ed., *Épître de Barnabé*, trans. Pierre Prigent, SC 172 (Paris: Cerf, 1971).

[165] Robert Kraft included the putative quotation at *Barn* 11.10 among those that "reflect particular OT passages and even have some Septuagintal wording, but which also deviate to such an extent from the LXX that they must be considered separately" ("The *Epistle of Barnabas*: Its Quotations and Their Sources" [Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1961], 56).

[166] Τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι ἡμεῖς μὲν καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπου, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τὸν φόβον καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἔχοντες.

[167] Περὶ μὲν τοῦ ὕδατος γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ, πῶς τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ φέρον ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν οὐ μὴ προσδέξονται, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς οἰκοδομήσουσιν.

Furthermore, from his bifurcation of the ritual at *Barn*. 11.11 we reasonably infer that at 11.1 he has the first half of the movement — the descent — in view, as did Hermas.

This linking of baptism and forgiveness is by no means original to the authors of *Barnabas* and the *Shepherd*. It is already apparent in the Gospels of Mark and Luke. Both depict John the Baptizer's "proclaiming a *baptism* of repentance *for (the) forgiveness of sins*" (βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Mk 1:4 / Lk 3:3). Acts also reflects this link, as Peter's so-called Pentecost speech at Jerusalem in chapter 2 indicates. The speech concludes with a two-fold imperative, followed by a promise. "Repent," Peter says, "and *be baptized*, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ *for (the) forgiveness of your sins*, and you will receive the gift of the holy Spirit" (v. 38).

These parallels between the descriptions of the mechanics and meaning of baptism in the *Shepherd*, on the one hand, and Acts and *Barnabas*, on the other, are significant. Both Acts and *Barnabas* portray the downward and upward movement of the believer in baptism, and both describe baptism as a locus for the forgiveness for sins. And, yet, neither Acts nor *Barnabas* attests what we find in two places within the Pauline corpus, namely the depiction of baptism, by Paul in Romans 6 and by his pseudepigrapher in Colossians 2, as the place wherein a believer moves from death to life. This is precisely the same idea at work in *Sim*. 9.16.2 [93.2], which depicts baptism as that ritual through which believers "are made alive" (ζωοποιηθῶσιν).

A second way that Hermas's construal of baptism coheres with those of Paul and later authors writing in his name is by describing baptism as a ritual in which a believer "sets aside deadness (νέκρωσιν) and takes up life" (*Sim*. 9.16.3 [93.3]). The deadness (νέκρωσις) in view here is that of one's "former life" (τῆς ζωῆς… τῆς προτέρας), which is itself a barrier to entry

247

into God's kingdom (93.2; cf. 1 Cor 6:9; 15:50, where the Pauline construal is "inheriting" [κληρονομεῖν] the kingdom).[168] Deadness is, for Hermas as for Paul and later Paulinists, a function of sin, which at *Mand.* 4.3.1 [31.1] he says he knows is forgiven in baptism's waters.[169] In the authentic Pauline epistles, this phenomenon of coming-to-life in baptism is most clearly depicted in Rom 6, discussed briefly above, which describes baptism as a participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. According to Paul, "…we have been buried together with him *through baptism* into death, so that just as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united to the likeness of his death, we certainly will be to that of his resurrection" (vv. 4-5).[170] But, Paul says, believers are not only "*buried* together" with Christ. They are actually *co-crucified* (v. 6) and *die* together with him (v. 8).[171] And yet, despite the movement from death to life that he believed occurs in baptism, the apostle contended that he still "carr[ied] the dying process (νέκρωσιν) of Jesus around in (his own) body," which, as in a procession, Paul thought made his Lord's life manifest

---

[168] Hermas's frequent use of the phrase "enter the Kingdom of God," which Karl Olav Sandnes labeled "a refrain," is typically attributed to his knowledge of the Gospels, especially John 3 ("Seal and Baptism," 1453). This was the position of Zahn, *Hirt*, 474, who thought it beyond dispute that Hermas's use of the phrase was dependent on Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus.

[169] See, e.g., Rom 6:13, 8:10, Eph 2:1, 5, Col 2:13.

[170] συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν, Rom 6:4-5. A connection between the depictions of baptism in *Sim.* 9.16 and Rom 6 is implicitly rejected by Pohlmann, "Erbauung," 1060, on the alleged basis that Paul refers to a daily dying and Hermas does not.

[171] Paul employs the same language of co-crucifixion at Gal 2:19: "For through the law I died with respect to the law, so that I might live with respect to God. I have been co-crucified with Christ" (ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι).

to others (2 Cor 4:9).[172] In his letter to the Galatians, Paul describes baptism using a different

metaphor, namely that of being clothed. "All of you," he writes, "are sons of God through faith

in Christ Jesus. For as many of you were baptized into Christ clothed yourself with Christ"

(3:26-27)."[173] Paul's notion of dying and coming to life with Christ in baptism is expanded by

the author of Colossians, who also describes baptism as being buried and raised with Christ. But

with regard to the latter notion of being raised he adds a particular statement of agency: "…being

buried together with [Christ] in baptism, with whom *you were also raised through faith in the*

*activity of God*, who raised him from the dead" (2:12).[174] The author of Ephesians likewise says,

"(God) made us alive with Christ when we were dead owing to (our) trespasses… and he raised

and seated us in the heavens with Christ Jesus" (2:5-6; cf. 2:1).[175] As in Colossians, here too

salvation occurs "through faith" (διὰ πίστεως), but, according to Ephesians, salvation is God's

gift and enacted by grace (v. 8). Baptism is not explicitly named in this passage from Eph 2,

neither is water mentioned in any way. But the author of Ephesians does understand the believer

---

[172] πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ, 2 Cor 4:9. In translating νέκρωσις as "dying process," not simply "dying," "death," or "deadness," I follow Paul Brooks Duff, "Apostolic Suffering and the Language of Processions in 2 Corinthians 4:7-10," *BTB* 21.4 (1991): 162, who provides a list of prior scholars who adopted the same position. More recently, for an argument that "Paul saw himself as a one-man multi-media presentation of the gospel of Christ crucified," of which the "dying process" was but a part, see Margaret M. Mitchell, "Epiphanic Evolutions in Earliest Christianity," *ICS* 28 (2004): 187-91; the quote is from p. 189.

[173] Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε, Gal 3:26-27.

[174] συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, Col 2:12; cf. 2:20.

[175] καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ, — χάριτί ἐστε σεσῳσμένοι — καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Eph 2:5-6.

to move from a state of death to life "in Christ Jesus" (vv. 6, 13), presumably through

participation in some way in his death on the cross (vv. 13, 16).[176]

Unlike Paul and the authors of Colossians and Ephesians, Hermas nowhere speaks of a

union or participation with Christ per se, whether in baptism or elsewhere.[177] Nevertheless, he

probably does assume it.[178] Moreover, even though Hermas does not depict baptism in terms of

participation in the specific death and resurrection of Christ, he still depicts it as a water rite in

which a believer moves from a state of sinfulness and thus death to that of life.[179] That

theological claim is most clearly expressed in the Pauline corpus at Rom 6:4-11 and Col 2:11-13,

some combination of which must be the original source(s) that Hermas adopted in discussing this

point with the Shepherd, unless one wants to argue that Hermas invented the claim *de novo*

himself. Furthermore, Hermas's vision of the righteous dead accepting the apostles and teachers'

proclamation of the Son of God prior to their going down into the water assumes an efficacious

belief in God like we find in Col 2:12, as well as the faith through which believers are said to be

saved in Eph 2:8. Previous scholars have been divided over whether or not they see a Pauline

---

[176] Nevertheless, with regard to *Sim* 9.16.1-4 [93.1-4], Lindemann claims, "Das hier vorgetragene Taufverständnis erinnert an Röm 6, vor allem aber an Eph 2" (*Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979], 285).

[177] To be sure, Hermas does refer to "life with God," which he suggests belongs to "those who fear him and keep his commandments" (*Mand*. 7.5 [37.5]), but such a vision coheres better with Paul's notion of the believer's life with Christ after death than it does with her life with him in the present (cf. 1 Thess 4:17). See the discussion of this passage in Chapter 3 (pp. 132-47).

[178] This point was implicitly admitted by Hartman, "Baptism," 186: "…[baptism] is the absolutely necessary *rite de passage* into the church, presumably because it binds the Christian to the Son of God."

[179] Similarly, Lampe, *Seal of the Spirit*, 105-06: "Here, though the believer's union with Christ in death and resurrection is not affirmed, and hence the whole conception is somewhat distorted, Baptism [*sic*] remains, as it was in St. Paul's theology, a means whereby the Christian 'rises' to newness of life."

influence here.[180] But given the clear conceptual correlations, Hermas must be working with baptismal traditions that first emerged in the apostle's letters and then were subsequently expanded and adapted in those written in his name, whether he knows their original source(s) or not.

The third and final way that Hermas's understanding of baptism coheres with the *corpus Paulinum* is by his connecting the initiatory rite with the notion of being sealed by God.[181] This connection is explicit in the Shepherd's statement to Hermas that the seal (σφραγίς) that is received by believers and wherein deadness is set aside is the water (of baptism) (93.4).[182] Here Pauline assumptions are logically at work although not overtly named. The idea of a seal or sealing is found throughout the authentic and pseudepigraphic Pauline letters.[183] Paul's description of God's anointing, "sealing," and giving the Spirit to him and his Corinthian audience in 2 Cor 1:21-22 is most important to my investigation. There, in the context of

---

[180] For example, Zahn, *Hirt*, 474 admitted that this passage reflects Hermas's association of rebirth with baptism but posited Johannine, not Pauline, influence. According to Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 147, "Hermas borrowed from Rom. 6:3-5 and Col. 2:12 Paul's ideas on the meaning of the baptismal ritual; namely, through baptism we are buried into death in order to obtain a new life." Here Massaux was following Lucien Cerfaux, *Une lecture de l'Épître aux Romains*, BISSR 2 (Tournai: Casterman, 1947), 60. Ultimately, Massaux concluded, "…Hermas had in mind these Pauline texts" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 147). Brox, *Hirt*, 432 denied that Hermas has the liturgical rite of baptism in view at all here.

[181] Zahn, *Hirt*, 413 correctly observed that this connection is only attested in the Pauline corpus.

[182] ἡ σφραγὶς οὖν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστίν, *Sim.* 9.16.4 [93.4]. Snyder comes close to admitting Pauline influence upon Hermas here, noting that the water with which the σφραγίς of *Sim.* 9.16.4 [93.4] is equated "is defined in Pauline terms," even though he never explains what he means (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 145). By contrast, Dibelius, *Hirt*, 464 construed Hermas's use of "seal" as an adaptation of pre-Christian mythical material. Brox, *Hirt*, 431-32 rooted it in the Hellenistic cults.

[183] I note but shall not engage the occurrences of σφραγίς at Rom 4:11, 1 Cor 9:2, and 2 Tim 2:19, as well as σφραγίζω at Rom 15:28. Strictly speaking, due to the different ways in which these words are used, they are not directly relevant to the discussion of sealing at hand.

defending himself against the charge of vacillation — that he only made plans to travel to

Corinth lightly — he appeals to God as the grounds of and witness in support of his action.

"But," Paul writes, "the one who confirms us with you in Christ and anoints us, and who *has*

*marked us with a seal* (ὁ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς) and has given the down payment (τὸν ἀρραβῶνα)

of the Spirit to our hearts, is God."[184] The discussion in Chapter 3 of the "deposit" of the Spirit

attested in *Mand.* 3 and 5 suggested the likelihood that Hermas adapted his conceptually

equivalent idea from one in Paul's letter(s).[185] Although here Paul does not explicitly mention

baptism, the rite is likely in view. This can be inferred from the confluence of metaphors

typically associated with the baptismal rite that the verse attests (i.e., confirmation, anointing,

sealing, Spirit-giving).[186] Paul's connection between being marked with a seal and receiving the

Spirit at 2 Cor 1:22 is twice taken up (and collapsed) by the author of Ephesians. At the

beginning of his letter, he recalls how his implied readers, "…having heard the word of truth, the

good news of your salvation, and having believed it, *were sealed with the promised holy Spirit*"

(1:13).[187] This order from Ephesians — hearing, believing, and being sealed — is essentially that

of *Sim*. 9.16.5-7 [93.5-7]. There, as shown above, according to Hermas, upon their deaths, the

apostles and teachers preached to the righteous departed, who came to know the Son of God and

were baptized with water, which Hermas explicitly labels a seal (93.4). Strikingly, as in 2

---

[184] ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς θεός, ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, 2 Cor 1:21-22.

[185] See pp. 156-70 above.

[186] Erich Dinkler, "Die Taufterminologie in 2 Kor 1.21f," in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht*, NovTSup 6 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), 173-91.

[187] Ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ, Eph 1:13.

Corinthians, the author of Ephesians goes on to say that the holy Spirit "is the down payment (ἀρραβών) of our inheritance" (1:14).[188] Later in his letter, he speaks a second time about being sealed with the Spirit, exhorting his implied audience to "not grieve *the holy Spirit of God, with which you were sealed* for the day of redemption" (4:30).[189] As I demonstrated in Chapter 3, the description of the two ways in which a sorrow-filled person (λυπηρός) grieves the holy Spirit in *Mand.* 10.3.2 [42.2] is typically viewed as a quotation and adaptation via expansion of the first part of the exhortation in Eph 4:30.[190] Hermas's baptismal theology, more specifically Hermas's notion of a believer's being sealed, provides secondary evidence that he knew that verse, or at least its content, in some manner. Even so, he maintains a distinction between sealing and receiving the Spirit and does not join the author of Ephesians in collapsing the two. Nevertheless, Hermas has employed a tradition attested previously in a constituent document(s) of the *corpus Paulinum*.[191]

---

[188] ὅ ἐστιν ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως, εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, 2 Cor 1:14.

[189] καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως, Eph 4:30. Following the logic of Eph 1:13, which describes being sealed by the Spirit, my translation of the relative pronoun ᾧ here in Eph 4:30 construes its antecedent as τὸ πνεῦμα, not τοῦ θεοῦ.

[190] See pp. 156-70 in Chapter 3.

[191] These instances of coherence are not, of course, exclusively between Hermas and the apostle Paul. For example, Hermas might have drawn the notion of being saved *through water* from 1 Pet 3:20. Whether the author of 1 Peter himself drew upon the *corpus Paulinum* at this and other points is, of course, an enduring question in the scholarly literature. See the relevant discussion on pp. 270-71 in Chapter 5.

Commentators commonly note parallels between this portion of *Sim.* 9 and various parts of the Pauline corpus.[192] Nevertheless, those aspects of Pauline baptismal theology that I have argued are apparent in Hermas's *Similitudes* are typically overlooked or denied for two reasons. First, the lack of substantive verbal agreement between passages in the *Shepherd* and discrete portions of Paul's letters is presumed to preclude the possibility of influence of the latter upon the former. In other words, either not enough Pauline material, or material that is not Pauline enough, is thought to be found in Hermas's description of baptism that could justify claims of Pauline influence upon it.[193] Second, Hermas's alteration, however slight, of material he

---

[192] E.g., Dibelius, *Hirt*, 625; Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 328; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 145; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 331 n. 366; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 238. See also Pernveden, *Concept of the Church*, 162-76.

[193] Such a focus on the alleged implications of what we do *not* find from Paul is particularly apparent in Lars Hartman's treatment of baptism in the *Shepherd*: "Although both Paul's Letter to the Romans and The [*sic*] Letter to the Hebrews certainly were to be found in the archives of the community, *Hermas* does not intimate that the kerygma made any mention of a crucified Messiah or of a resurrected Son of God, nor are there any hints that the forgiveness of sins depended on a once-for-all sacrifice of Christ. There is no ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ('for our sake') or 'for our sins' in *Hermas*" ("Baptism," 182-83). For my discussion of the possibility that Hermas encountered Pauline letters in a community archive or library extant among Christ-believers at Rome, which Hartman mentioned, see pp. 52-53 in Chapter 1. In n. 33, Hartman concedes that some scholars, whom he does not name, do read Hermas's statement in *Sim.* 5.6.2 as a reference to "Christ's atoning passion and death" ("…he himself [i.e., the Son of God], having cleansed the sins of the people, showed the paths of life to them," αὐτὸς οὖν καθαρίσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς τρίβους τῆς ζωῆς, 59.2). But Hartman follows Pernveden, *Concept of the Church*, 77, who denies any link between the Son's "cleansing" of sin in Hermas and Christ's crucifixion. Similarly, Hartman later writes, "Apparently some aspects of New Testament theologising on baptism which we have learnt to regard as crucial are hardly represented here. (I think above all of the way in which Christ and his work are described)" ("Baptism," 186). For Hartman, then, in order for it to be identifiably Pauline, Hermas's theology of baptism would have to affirm *explicitly* what Hartman views as the three (or four, depending on how one counts) primary markers of the Pauline kerygma listed above. Since it does not, it is not Pauline. Likewise, for André Benoît, the absence of Paul's putative mysticism from Hermas's depiction of baptism proves the apostle's lack of (significant) influence on our author ("Le 'Pasteur' d'Hermas," 135: "Dans toute cette conception, il n'y a pas trace de la conception proprement

conceivably drew from Pauline tradition is presumed to preclude the possibility that he was

working with Paul.[194] In other words, only if he repeats material verbatim from Paul's letters in

his treatment of baptism could Hermas have been influenced by the apostle.[195] Despite scholars'

aversion to positing Hermas's engagement with pre-existing Pauline material in fashioning this

*Similitude*, we find him reaching across the *corpus Paulinum*, synthesizing its contents by

creatively connecting thematically similar descriptions of baptism attested nowhere else in

---

paulinienne du baptême. La mystique de Paul en est totalement absente"). See also Benoît's conclusion on p. 137.

[194] Candida Moss also notes the way in which textual differences are often assumed to disqualify dependence: "Implicit in [treating intertextuality as mere duplication] is the assumption that allusion works by replicating the *meaning* of the intertext. There is no room in this process for adaptation or hybridity, much less subversion: the strongest case is always made by demonstrating absolute consonance between text and intertext" ("Nailing Down and Tying Up: Lessons in Intertextual Impossibility from the Martyrdom of Polycarp," *VC* 67 [2013]: 128; emphasis original). Hartman, "Obligatory Baptism—but Why?," 127 correctly observed that differences between the baptismal theologies of Hermas and (pseudo-)Paul need not imply any opposition between a later author and an earlier one.

[195] The preclusive power of textual variation is implicit in Benoît's treatment of baptism in the *Shepherd*. In his view, "it is possible to find some verbal similarities, but [Hermas's] thought is *fundamentally different* from Pauline thought" ("Le 'Pasteur' d'Hermas," 133: "Certes, il est possible de retrouver des similitudes verbales, mais la pensée est foncièrement différente de la pensée paulinienne"; emphasis added). Similarly, Benoît later acknowledges a "symbolism akin to that of Paul, *but not at all identical*" (ibid.: "Il y a là symbolisme voisin de celui de Paul, mais nullement identique"; emphasis added). Pernveden shares Benoît's underlying assumptions and results: "It may, then, seem *as if* we are dealing with a concept of baptism related to the Pauline one in which baptism includes the idea of both death and resurrection to life. *Paul and Hermas differ, however, in one important respect*" (*Concept of the Church*, 167; emphasis added). A similar perspective is also explicit in Osiek's commentary: "*[t]he language of death is similar to Pauline language [in Rom 6:1-11] but is not exactly the same*: here, death is the pre-baptismal state, not the dying process that is symbolically enacted in the course of baptism" (*Shepherd*, 238 ; emphasis added). Crucially, though, death as pre-baptismal state is in view both in Col 2:13 and in Eph 2:4-5. Admittedly, these two letters, especially the latter, might not have been written by Paul himself. However, both claim apostolic authorship (Col 1:1, Eph 1:1), and so they should be included in discussions of "Pauline" construals of the meaning of baptism.

Christian literature composed prior to the *Shepherd*, and adopting them in a new literary framework with slight but significant adaptations.

*Clothing and Unity Metaphors*

Just as he has adopted and adapted material from the *corpus Paulinum* in his depiction of the church as a constructed Tower and in the baptism of believers, so too Hermas's conceptual and theological debt to Pauline letters is apparent in his use of particular clothing and unity metaphors. Perhaps the most important of these is found at *Sim*. 9.13-15 [90-92] and 9.24.1-2 [101.1-2]. In the former instance, the Shepherd describes the clothes worn by the twelve virgins around the Tower and assumes a Pauline logic of salvation. The four primary virgins, those stationed at the corners of the Tower, each wear a virtue (9.15.2 [92.2]). According to the Shepherd, entry into God's kingdom requires being clothed with what these virgins wear (9.13.2 [90.2]). The first and therefore the most important of their clothes is faith (πίστις); the other three are self-control (ἐγκράτεια), strength (δύναμις), and patience (μακροθυμία). The singular importance of faith for salvation, described here as entry in God's kingdom, echoes the Lady's statement in *Vis*. 3 that "through this one [i.e., the woman Faith] all God's elect are saved."[196] Only in Ephesians do we find such an explicit statement of being saved *through faith* (2:8).[197] Speaking of Ephesians, at *Sim*. 9.24.1-2 [101.1-2] the Shepherd describes "believers… who have clothed themselves with the holy Spirit of the virgins" and thereby have put aside a former way

---

[196] ἡ μὲν πρώτη αὐτῶν, ἡ κρατοῦσα τὰς χεῖρας, πίστις καλεῖται· διὰ ταύτης σώζονται οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, *Vis*. 3.8.3 [16.3]. See the relevant discussion on pp. 276-77 in Chapter 5.
[197] However, note the similar expressions of salvation being effected through or in some relation to faith at 2 Thess 2:13, 2 Tim 3:15, 1 Pet 1:5, 9.

of life and been transformed.[198] Only here in his tripartite work does Hermas mention being

clothed with another being. He does so in a way essentially equivalent to the description of

taking off the old self and way of life and "putting on the new person" in Eph 4:24.[199] This

suggests that Hermas adapted from Ephesians the concept of putting on a new person,

presumably at baptism, within his call for the Christian to put on the virtuous clothes that the

seven virgins supporting the Tower wear and the holy Spirit they bear.[200] The likelihood of

Hermas's having adapted this portion of Ephesians climbs significantly when one remembers

that he also adopted another concept from the letter's immediate context, namely "grieving the

holy Spirit" from v. 30, as I showed in Chapter 3.[201]

Hermas also depicts the outcome of putting on the virgins' clothes with Pauline language.

"So too," the Shepherd says in *Sim*. 9.13.5 [90.5], "those who believe in the Lord through his

Son and clothe themselves (ἐνδιδυσκόμενοι) with these spirits will become one spirit, one body,

---

[198] οἱ πιστεύσαντες τοιοῦτοί εἰσι· πάντοτε ἁπλοῖ καὶ ἄκακοι καὶ μακάριοι ἐγίνοντο, μηδὲν κατ᾽ ἀλλήλων ἔχοντες, ἀλλὰ πάντοτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνδεδυμένοι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τούτων τῶν παρθένων, *Sim*. 9.24.1-2 [101.1-2].

[199] BDAG, "ἐνδύω," 334. Pieter W. van der Horst, "Observations on a Pauline Expression," *NTS* 19 (1973): 181-87 roots the use of the phrase "put on the new person" in Ephesians in the philosophical discourse of the third century B.C.E. Dahl and Hellholm are more cautious: "The widespread and multifaceted use of garment metaphors and clothing symbolism warns against any attempt to explain the tradition used in Eph 4:22-25 in a unilateral way" ("Garment-Metaphors: The Old and the New Human Being," in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy: Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 144).

[200] Dahl and Hellholm, "Garment-Metaphors," 155, 155 n. 79 cites *Sim*. 9.13.2-5 [90.2-4], 9.15.1-2 [92.1-2] as examples of "[a]ncient Christian baptismal rituals and homilies [that] paraphrase Eph 4:22-24 and related texts." In support of this claim, Dahl and Hellholm cited Osiek, *Shepherd*, 235, according to whom "[t]he language of clothing with virtues is common both in Hermas and in other early Christian texts." In footnote 24, Osiek added, "…especially the Pauline corpus" (ibid.).

[201] See pp. 156-70 in Chapter 3.

and the color of their clothes will be one."[202] This threefold outcome is repeated nearly verbatim a few sentences later: those who received the Son's name and the virgins' power "had one spirit and one body and one garment" (90.7).[203] Here, though, the Shepherd adds a crucial fourth outcome. Such persons, he indicates, "thought the same things" (τὰ αὐτὰ ἐφρόνουν). The importance of such proper thinking, that is to say, thinking the *right* things, is similarly presented as an implied condition of salvation at *Mand*. 9.11.12 [39.12].[204] These two notions of proper thinking and like-mindedness reappear at both *Sim*. 9.17.4 [94.4] and 9.18.4 [95.4].[205] In the former instance, the Shepherd connects believers' being called by the Son's name and receiving the seal, both of which presumably occur at baptism, with having a single thought (φρόνησις) and mind (νοῦς). Similarly, in the latter instance the Shepherd tells Hermas that after evil doers of various kinds are cast out, "God's church will be one body, one thought, one mind, one faith, one love (ἓν σῶμα, μία φρόνησις, εἷς νοῦς, μία πίστις, μία ἀγάπη)."[206] The importance of the community's maintaining sameness of thought is also evident at *Sim*. 9.29.2 [106.2]. There the Shepherd tells Hermas that future inhabitants of God's kingdom will be those innocent people who "spend all the days of their life in the same way of thinking (ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ φρονήσει)." These like-minded believers stand in contrast to the other twelve tribes of the earth, which are "diverse in thought and mind" (ποικίλα δέ εἰσι τῇ φρονήσει καὶ τῷ νοΐ, *Sim*. 9.17.2 [94.2])

---

[202] οὕτω καὶ οἱ πιστεύσαντες τῷ κυρίῳ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνδιδυσκόμενοι τὰ πνεύματα ταῦτα, ἔσονται εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα, ἓν σῶμα, καὶ μία χρόα τῶν ἱματίων αὐτῶν, *Sim*. 9.13.5 [90.5].

[203] …ἦν αὐτῶν ἓν πνεῦμα καὶ ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν ἔνδυμα, *Sim*. 9.13.7 [90.7].

[204] σὺ οὖν δούλευε τῇ ἐχούσῃ δύναμιν τῇ πίστει, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς διψυχίας ἀπόσχου τῆς μὴ ἐχούσης δύναμιν, καὶ ζήσῃ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ πάντες ζήσονται τῷ θεῷ οἱ ταῦτα φρονοῦντες, *Mand*. 9.11.12 [39.12].

[205] This is correctly observed by Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 147.

[206] μετὰ τὸ τούτους ἀποβληθῆναι ἔσται ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἓν σῶμα, μία φρόνησις, εἷς νοῦς, μία πίστις, μία ἀγάπη, *Sim*. 9.18.4 [95.4].

The emphasis on Christ-believers' unity and their having a singular thought and mind that we find in *Sim.* 9.13-18 [90-95] arguably originates in the *corpus Paulinum*.[207] This is most clearly the case with Hermas's reference to one spirit and one body at *Sim.* 9.13.5-7 [90.5-7]. There we find unmistakable instances of coherence in both thought and expression with the unity formula of Eph 4:4-6, especially v. 4 ("there is one body and one Spirit," ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα).[208] Pauline influence is further apparent in Hermas's adoption of the phrase "think the same things" (τὰ αὐτὰ φρονεῖν);[209] the apostle himself employs this precise phrase on multiple

---

[207] As Massaux correctly observed, "This passage is interwoven with Pauline images" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 140 n. 229). He was referring to *Sim.* 9.13.6-9 [90.6-9] in particular, but his observation extends to subsequent relevant parts of *Sim.* 9 as well.
[208] This is widely, although not universally, admitted in scholarship. See, e.g., Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 106: "These passages have all the appearance of being imitated from Ephesians"; Zahn, *Hirt*, 414-15; Dibelius, *Hirt*, 621: "Die Einheitsformel… erinnert an Eph 4:4" (cf. 627); Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 142, 163; Henne, *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*, 73; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 255 n. 321, 257 n. 322. Perhaps the most explicit is Massaux: "There is no doubt that Hermas took up the Pauline formulas [in *Sim.* 9.13.5-7]" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 146). "[B]ut," Massaux immediately added without explanation, "he interpreted them somewhat closer to the Hellenistic way of thinking." The limited verbal agreement between these texts leads certain scholars simply to note it for comparison, thereby implicitly denying Pauline influence. For example, Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 321, 331 included multiple parenthetical references to Eph 4:4 in his French translation but did not categorize them as quotations or allusions; as in the case of Snyder's commentary, the absence of "cf." before Joly's references to Eph 4:4 is perhaps indication that he detected some formal influence. Similarly, Eph 4:4-5 is cited simply for comparison in Brox, *Hirt*, 414 n. 32; and Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 490 n. 343. Osiek, *Shepherd*, 235-36 observed an "inverted allusion similar to Eph 4:4," but argued that it "testifies not so much to Hermas' [*sic*] knowledge of Ephesians as to the familiarity of the phrase in early Christianity".
[209] Except for Massaux, scholars are typically hesitant to regard Hermas's use of the phrase "think the same things" (τὰ αὐτὰ φρονεῖν) as evidence of Pauline influence. This hesitancy is particularly apparent in Osiek's commentary. She labeled the phrase at *Sim.* 9.13.7 [90.7] "a *near-quotation* of a favorite Pauline expression" (*Shepherd*, 236 [emphasis added]; comparanda are listed at n. 32). But Osiek not explain why it is not an actual quotation or otherwise not to be attributed to Paul. Similarly, Clayton N. Jefford, "Missing Pauline Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers?: *Didache*, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Papias, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, and the *Epistle to Diognetus*," in *The Apostolic Fathers and Paul*, ed. Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite, PPSD 2

occasions, writing to multiple communities.[210] Similarly, at 1 Cor 1:10, in confronting

factionalism at Corinth, Paul urges his letter's recipients to "agree (τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε)… and be

restored in the same mind and the same opinion (τῷ αὐτῷ νοῒ καὶ… τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ)."[211] And in

introducing the Christ hymn of Phil 2:6-11, Paul exhorts the Philippians to "think this (same)

thing (τοῦτο φρονεῖτε) that was also in Christ Jesus" (v. 5).[212] Simply put, in describing unity

among believers, Hermas adopts the same terminological and thematic web that we find Paul and

his pseudepigraphers weaving. This scenario is more likely than Hermas weaving that web

himself *de novo* independent of any encounter with Pauline tradition.


CONCLUSION

This chapter has sought to demonstrate that Hermas adopted, andapted, and synthesized

traditions attested throughout the *corpus Paulinum* in the *Similitudes* section of the *Shepherd*.

Specifically, focusing on the texts of *Sim*. 1, 5, and 9, I have shown where and how Hermas

engaged material known to us in the Corinthian correspondence as well as Paul's letters to the

Philippians and Romans. My investigation of the *Similitudes* has determined that Hermas must

have had access to material preserved in pseudepigraphic Pauline letters too, chief among them

---

(London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), 50 n. 37 considers it "a virtual quotation of the language that Paul himself uses." As in the case of Ephesian unity formula, others simply note various Pauline texts for comparison: e.g., Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 321; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 142; Brox, *Hirt*, 414 n. 33. A few scholars overlook it altogether: Dibelius, *Hirt*, 622; Brox, *Hirt*, 327.

[210] Rom 12:16, 15:5, 2 Cor 13:11, Phil 2:2, 3:15, 4:2; cf. Phil 3:19.

[211] Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες καὶ μὴ ᾖ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα, ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῒ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ, 1 Cor 1:10. My translation of τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν as "be in agreement" follows the NRSV.

[212] Τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Phil 2:5.

Ephesians and Colossians. Likewise, at various points in this section, Hermas reveals his knowledge of passages in Hebrews, which in antiquity was frequently associated with Paul. As was that of the *Mandates*, the theological fabric of the *Similitudes* is shot through with fundamental assumptions and patterns of conception established and developed in the *corpus Paulinum*, particularly on the topics of salvation, Christian identity, ethics, and ecclesiology. Here as there, Hermas recasts these elements of Pauline tradition in his own ways for his own discursive purposes, aiming, at least in part, to unify and build up the church as its members negotiate the challenges of living faithfully in present age even as they await completion of the Tower's construction at the dawn of the age to come. As discussed in Chapter 2, my argument for Hermas's meaningful encounter with the Pauline literary legacy does not require him to have read the epistles himself. He could, alternatively, have heard them or their contents read or discussed in Rome. To be sure, that does not exclude the possibility that Hermas did in fact access the *corpus* himself directly in some manner. But it is sufficient to explain the kind of loose but still grounded and identifiable intertextual encounter described in this chapter, whereby Hermas demonstrates himself to be a creative interpreter of material preserved in Pauline letters.

CHAPTER 5: THE *VISIONS* AND THE PAULINE LEGACY

INTRODUCTION

In this the last of my chapters comparing the *Shepherd* with what becomes the *corpus Paulinum*, I focus on the *Visions* that Hermas had of the elderly Lady, the young man, and the young woman and their discussion of them. Compared to the *Mandates* and *Similitudes*, the influence of letters written by or attributed to the apostle Pauline here is less extensive. Nevertheless, I will demonstrate that Hermas's visions are thoroughly inflected with identifiably Pauline turns of phrase, theological concepts, and community ideals that he has adopted and adapted at specific points. In multiple instances, this inflection rises to the level of verbatim quotation, although Hermas never marks them as such. Pauline phenomena in the *Visions* are attested from all of the corpus's constituent sections — the authentic letters, the pseudepigraphic ones, the Pastoral Epistles, and Hebrews.

This chapter begins with a brief presentation of the *Visions*' instances of coherence with the Pauline corpus, grouped under three headings. The first heading is Hermas's description of God's nature and activity. The second is his description of individual believers. The third is his description of the broader believing community constituted by those individuals. These instances of coherence establish not only the possibility that Hermas might have been working with Pauline traditions in the *Visions* but, owing to their sheer mass and volume, the probability that he in fact was.

The overwhelming probability of Hermas's meaningful encounter with a corpus of Pauline letters in the *Visions* is established in the chapter's central section that follows. The

discussion of Pauline influence upon the *Visions* is divided into four parts. First, I contend that such influence upon Hermas is recognizable in his depiction of baptism as an eschatological event preceded by a person's coming to faith, through which, the Lady says, a person is saved. Hermas connects the idea of baptism as necessary for salvation with the possibility of faith — in this particular instance, faith in the Lord (πίστις τοῦ κυρίου) — functioning as protective armor. Second, I demonstrate that Hermas quotes the notion of "turning away from the living God" (ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος) from Heb 3:12 twice in *Vis*. 2-3 in order to describe those who abandon saving faith. In one of these instances, he connects the concept with that of a wicked heart, thereby confirming that Hebrews is his source. Third, I show how the Shepherd's censure of the problematic behaviors exhibited by Hermas's children and wife indicate that he both granted the authority of the *Haustafeln* in the Pastoral Epistles and recognized that his failure to meet the criteria listed in them for one who holds a position of leadership in the church was potentially threatening to the reception of his visions by the Christian community at Rome. Finally, I argue that the Lady's diagnosis of and response to divisions in that community mirrors Paul's to the one at Corinth, particularly as reflected in 1 Cor 11. Collectively, these discrete instances of adoption and adaptation of Pauline tradition comprise a broader pattern wherein Hermas reveals himself to be conversant with the contours, contents, and concerns of letters associated with the apostle, indeed more so than previous scholarship has recognized.


THE *VISIONS*' COHERENCE WITH PAULINE WORLDVIEWS

I began Chapters 3 and 4 by outlining what to my ear are instances of coherence with what becomes the *corpus Paulinum* in the *Mandates* and *Similitudes* sections of the *Shepherd*,

respectively. Here in Chapter 5, I shall briefly do the same with the *Visions*, grouping these

instances under three categories: Hermas's descriptions of (1) the nature and activity of God; (2)

individual believers; and (3) the wider Christian community. Together, these instances of

coherence establish the plausibility that Hermas engaged a collection of Pauline letters on a

deeper level in his *Visions*, which the extended exegesis of particular parts of them that follows

in the rest of the chapter will demonstrate.

     In Hermas's theological imagination, God resides in heaven and created the things that

exist out of nothing. Hermas believes that God created both the world and the church, and God

created six holy angels first, to whom God entrusted all of creation and who also construct the

Tower that represents the church.[1] This Creator God goes by many names. Among these names

for God that Hermas knows are Lord (κύριος), King (βασιλεύς), Father (πατήρ), and Master

(δεσπότης).[2] God is a god of glory, whom human glorify.[3] God acts with mercy, compassion,

and power.[4] God possesses "foreknowledge."[5] God choose some (i.e., the elect) for eternal life;[6]

---

[1] 1.6, 3.4, 12.1; cf. 1 Cor 8:6, Rom 1:18, 20, Col 1:16, 1 Tim 4:4, Heb 1:10.

[2] Κύριος appears at 1.3, 5, 8, *et passim*. Normally, among Paul's authentic letters at least, κύριος is used in reference to (the Lord) Jesus Christ. Among those places where it might not, cf. 1 Cor 4:19, 16:7. Βασιλεύς appears a single time at 17.8; cf. 1 Tim 1:17, 6:15. Πατήρ appears once at 17.10; cf. Rom 1:7, 6:4, 8:15, 15:6, 1 Cor 1:3, 8:6, 15:24, 2 Cor 1:2-3, 11:31, Gal 1:1, 3-4, 4:6, Eph 1:2-3, 17, 2:18, 3:14, 4:6, 5:20, 6:23, Phil 1:2, 2:11, 4:20, Col 1:2-3, 12, 3:17, 1 Thess 1:1, 3, 3:11, 13, 2 Thess 1:1-2, 2:16, 2 Tim 1:2, Tit 1:4, Phlm 3, Heb 1:5, 12:9. Δεσπότης appears at 6.4-5; cf. the use of κύριος with the same sense at Eph 6:9, Col 4:1.

[3] This theme is ubiquitous in the Pauline corpus. Among the most prominent places it is attested, cf. Rom 1:21, 11:36, 15:6, 16:27; 1 Cor 6:20, 10:31; 2 Cor 1:20, 3:7-11, 18, 4:4, 6, 9:13; Gal 1:5, 24; Eph 1:12, 14, 17, 3:21; Phil 1:11, 2:11, 4:19-20; Col 1:27, 1 Thess 2:12; 2 Thess 3:1; 1 Tim 1:17, 3:16; 2 Tim 4:18, Tit 2:13; Heb 1:3, 2:9-10, 3:3, 13:21.

[4] References to divine compassion and mercy are found at 3.2, 6.3, 8, 17.1, 8, 23.3; cf. Rom 9:16, 23, 11:31, 12:1, 15:9, 2 Cor 1:3, Eph 2:4, Phil 1:8, 2 Tim 1:16, Tit 3:5, Heb 4:16. On divine power, see 11.5, 23.3; cf. Rom 1:4, 16, 20, 9:22, 15:3, 19, 1 Cor 1:18, 24, 2:4, 5:4, 6:14, 2 Cor

these elect are saved through faith.[7] God can be provoked to anger because of human sin, but can be "easily placated" through proper human behavior, which results in having a "good reputation" (δόξα) in heaven.[8] God can heal sins, and atonement must be made for them.[9] Similarly, Hermas learns from the Lady that God justifies and sanctifies (δικαιοῦν καὶ ἁγιάζειν) a person, indeed by causing righteousness to drip upon them.[10] And last but certainly not least, a chief element of Hermas's fundamental beliefs about God is that God has a Son.[11]

Just as he holds specific beliefs about God, so too Hermas believes specific things about the human beings whom God creates. Perhaps most importantly, given its foundational importance for the entirety of his work, a person can, like Hermas himself, be taken away by a (divine) spirit and can also be the recipient of divinely given visions, by means of which one can peer into the heavens, acquire new knowledge, and converse with a divine figure.[12] Another governing theme of Hermas's text is his belief that persons can be provoked to wrong action by improper or disordered desire, even though they know what is right. Hermas suggests that failing

---

4:7, 6:7, 10:4, 12:9, 13:3-4, Eph 1:19, 3:7, 16, 20, Phil 3:10, 21, Col 1:11, 29, 1 Thess 1:5, 2 Thess 1:7, 11, 1 Tim 6:15, 2 Tim 1:7-8, Heb 1:3.

[5] 3.4; cf. Rom 8:29, 11:2.

[6] 3.4, 5.3, 6.5, 8.2, 13.1, 16.3, 17.10, 23.5, 24.5; cf. Rom 8:29-30, 33, 9:11, 11:5, 7, 28, 16:13, Eph 1:4, 11, Col 3:12, 1 Thess 1:4, 2 Tim 2:10, Tit 1:1.

[7] 16.3; cf. Rom 10:9, 1 Cor 1:21, 15:1-2, Eph 2:8.

[8] 1.6, 1.8, 3.1, 23.6; cf. Rom 1:18, 2:5, 8, 3:5, 5:9, 9:22, 12:19, Col 3:6, 1 Thess 1:10, 2:16, 5:9. My translation of εὐκατάλλακτον as "easily placated" at 1.8 follows BDAG 407.

[9] 1.9, 2.1, 3.1; cf. Rom 3:25, Heb 2:17.

[10] 17.1; cf. Rom 3:24, 26, 30, 4:5, 5:1, 9, 8:30, 15:16, 1 Cor 1:2, 6:11, Gal 2:16, 3:8, 3:24, Eph 5:26, 1 Thess 5:23, 1 Tim 4:5, Tit 3:7, Heb 2:11, 10:10, 14, 29, 13:12.

[11] 6.8; cf. Rom 1:3-4, 9, 5:10, 8:3, 29, 32, 1 Cor 1:9, 2 Cor 1:19, Gal 1:16, 2:20, 4:4, Eph 4:13, Col 1:13, 1 Thess 1:10, Heb 1:2, 8, 3:6, 4:14, 5:5, 8, 6:6, 7:3, 28, 10:29. For a fuller discussion of Hermas's description of the meaning and function of God's Son in *Sim*. 5, see pp. 211-23 in Chapter 4.

[12] 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 5.1; cf. 1 Cor 9:1, 11:23, 15:8, 2 Cor 12:1-10, Gal 1:11-17.

to negotiate this tension faithfully by not acting on evil desire results in sin, and through it humans "draw death and captivity upon themselves."[13] In such instances, the divine calling is clear and summons sinners to repentance.[14] Those who do repent and wield the πίστις τοῦ κυρίου fully can put it on like armor and thus become strong in the face of challengers.[15]

Hermas labels the community of those who have such faith God's holy church.[16] One enters this church via the ritual of baptism, which is necessary for salvation.[17] This church has designated leaders, among them presiders, elders, apostles, overseers, teachers, and deacons.[18] As I argue later in this chapter, Hermas understands the necessity of such a church leader's household and family being properly governed and well behaved.[19] The church is comprised of saints, that is those who themselves are holy.[20] Such people are said to be God's slaves, and Hermas himself is one as well.[21] They, the righteous, are constructed in opposition to τὰ ἔθνη

---

[13] 1.8, 2.4. The quote is from 1.8. Cf. Rom 1:24, 5:12, 14, 21, 6:16, 23, 7:5, 7-8, 13-25, 8:2, 13:14, 1 Cor 10:6, 15:56, Gal 5:16-17, Eph 2:3, 4:22, Col 3:5, 1 Tim 6:9.

[14] Repentance and the call to it appear variously at 1.9, 3.2, 6.4-5, 11.2, 13.5, 15.2-3, 5, 21.4, 22.3, 23.5, 25.7; cf. Rom 2:4, 2 Cor 7:9-10, 12:21, 2 Tim 2:25, Heb 6:1, 6.

[15] The Pauline shorthand locution πίστις τοῦ κυρίου appears at 22.8, within the broader account of Hermas's confrontation with the hundred foot long beast in 22.5-10; note also the notion of becoming strong in faith at 20.3. Cf. Rom 3:22, 26, Gal 2:16, 3:22, Eph 3:12, Phil 3:9,

[16] 1.6, 3.4, 22.3; cf. Eph 5:26-27.

[17] 10.9, 11.5, 15.3; cf. Rom 6:3-4, 1 Cor 12:3, Eph 5:26, Col 2:12, Heb 10:22.

[18] 6.6, 8.2-3, 9.8, 17.7; cf. Rom 1:1, 11:3, 16:1, 7, 1 Cor 1:1, 4:9, 9:1-2, 5, 12:28, 2 Cor 1:1, 8:23, 11:5, 12:11-12, Gal 1:1, 17, 19, Eph 1:1, 2:20, 3:5, 4:11, 6:21, Phil 1:1, 2:25, Col 1:1, 7, 23, 25, 4:7, 1 Thess 2:7, 5:12, 1 Tim 1:1, 2:7, 3:1-13, 4:6, 14, 5:17, 19, 2 Tim 1:1, 11, 4:5, Tit 1:1, 5, 7, Heb 5:12.

[19] 3.1-2, 6.24, 7.1-2, 9.6. See the discussion of the Pastoral Epistles' influence upon Hermas on pp. 284-92 below.

[20] 1.9, 3.2, 6.4-5, 11.3, 14.2, 16.8-9, 11, 24.6; cf. Rom 1:7, 8:27, 12:13, 15:25-26, 31, 16:2, 15, 1 Cor 1:2, 6:1-2, 14:33, 16:1, 15, 2 Cor 1:1, 8:4, 9:1, 12, 13:12, Eph 1:1, 4, 15, 18, 2:19, 3:8, 18, 4:12, 5:3, 6:18, Phil 1:1, 4:22, Col 1:2, 4, 12, 22, 26, 3:12, 1 Thess 3:13, 2 Thess 1:10, 1 Tim 5:10, Phlm 5, 7, Heb 6:10, 13:24.

[21] 2.4, 22.3; cf. Rom 1:1, 6:22, Gal 1:10, Eph 6:6, Col 4:12, 1 Thess 1:9, Tit 1:1.

(i.e., outsiders), who, unlike those within the believing community, still possess the possibility of an additional chance for repentance.[22] That possibility exists until what Hermas calls the "last day";[23] prior to that point, he believes that a "great tribulation," presumably persecution on the basis of faith or association with the Christian community, is coming upon the community.[24] Certain members of it suffer on behalf of God's name, and some, such as Maximus, have even already denied.[25] Hermas constructs peace as a primary marker of this community.[26] And yet he knows that that peace and by extension the life of the community itself is threatened by factionalism, which he roots at least in part in an unwillingness of the rich to share sufficiently with those in need.[27] Such factionalism is effectively a failure of the saints to "be united" with each other.[28] Lawlessness is another problem that Hermas constructs;[29] practicing righteousness is its proper alternative.[30] In speaking to Hermas and by extension to his audience of believers, the Lady employs the language of fictive kinship, addressing him with them as her children.[31]

---

[22] 4.2, 6.5; cf. Rom 2:14, 9:30, 1 Cor 5:1, 12:2, Eph 4:17, 1 Thess 4:5.

[23] 6.5; cf. Rom 2:5, 16, 13:12, 1 Cor 1:8, 3:13, 5:5, 2 Cor 1:14, Eph 4:30, Phil 1:6, 10, 2:16, 1 Thess 5:2, 4, 2 Thess 1:10, 2:2, 2 Tim 1:12, 18, 4:8, Heb 10:25. "Last days" are also mentioned in 2 Tim 3:1, Heb 1:2.

[24] 6.7, 24.6; see also 7.4, 22.1, 23.4. Cf. Rom 2:9, 1 Thess 1:6, 3:3, 7, 2 Thess 1:4, 6, Heb 10:33.

[25] 7.4, 9.9, 10.1, 13.2; cf. 2 Cor 1:6, 6:4-5, 11:23, Gal 6:17, Phil 1:29, 1 Thess 2:14, 2 Thess 1:5, 1 Tim 5:8, 2 Tim 2:12, Tit 1:16, Heb 2:18

[26] 13.1, 14.3, 17.2, 10, 20.3; cf. Rom 1:7, 2:10, 8:6, 14:17, 19, 15:13, 33, 16:20, 1 Cor 1:3, 7:15, 14:33, 2 Cor 1:2, 13:11, Gal 1:3, 5:22, 6:16, Eph 1:2, 2:14-15, 17, 4:3, 6:15, 23, Phil 1:2, 4:7, 9, Col 1:2, 1 Thess 1:1, 5:23, 2 Thess 1:2, 3:16, 1 Tim 1:2, 2 Tim 1:2, 2 Tim 2:22, Tit 1:4, Phlm 3, Heb 12:14, 13:20.

[27] 17.2-5, 9. See the extended discussion of factionalism in 1 Cor 11 on pp. 292-99 below.

[28] 14.2; cf. Rom 12:9, 16, 1 Cor 6:16-17, 14:23, Phil 2:2.

[29] 6.2, 14.1, 4; cf. Rom 6:19, 2 Cor 6:14, 2 Thess 2:3, 7, 1 Tim 1:9, Tit 2:14, Heb 1:9, 10:17.

[30] 6.6-7, 7.3, 9.6, 14.4; cf. Heb 11:33. Similarly, see the mentions of "doing the good" (ἐργάζεσθαι τὸ ἀγαθὸν) at Rom 2:10, Gal 6:10, Eph 4:28.

[31] 17.1, 9; cf. 1 Cor 4:14, 17, 2 Cor 6:13, 12:14, Gal 4:19, Phil 2:22, 1 Thess 2:7, 11, 1 Tim 1:2, 18, 2 Tim 1:2, 2:1, Tit 1:4, Phlm 10.

Some of them, she says, are "young in faith."[32] This faith is, in the *Visions* section, the primary support of the constructed Tower, the symbolic representation of the church.[33] Six other virtues support it too, and the one who is able to seize the activities of the seven virtues will have residence in the tower with the saints.[34] That residence will fully and finally occur in "the age to come."[35] It follows, of course, this (present) age.[36]

Collectively, these instances of coherence sufficiently confirm the plausibility of my over-arching claim that in the *Visions* section, as in the *Mandates* and *Similitudes*, Hermas reveals himself to be working to a significant degree with material attested in what eventually becomes the c*orpus Paulinum*. Here as there, his deep awareness of the contours of Pauline language and central aspects of Pauline theology can be seen rippling through the very fabric of his visionary encounters with the various figures in this section and, furthermore, in the extended explanations of them that come after. Given the scale of this rippling, should we not expect Hermas to betray his conceptual debt to specific parts of the *corpus* too? Indeed, that proves to be the case at multiple points.

---

[32] 13.4; cf. 1 Cor 3:1-3. Note also the reference to "the one who is weak in faith" (τὸν… ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει) at Rom 14:1.

[33] 16.3; cf. the primary position of faith in 1 Cor 13:13, 2 Cor 8:7, Gal 3:23-26, Eph 1:15, 6:16, Col 1:4, 1 Thess 1:3, 3:5-6, 5:8, Tit 1:1, Heb 11.

[34] 16.3-8; cf. the various lists of virtues in the Pauline corpus, e.g., Gal 5:22-23.

[35] 24.5; cf. Eph 1:21, 2:7, Heb 6:5, 20.

[36] 1.8, 14.5-6; cf. Rom 12:2, 1 Cor 1:20, 2:6, 8, 3:18, 2 Cor 4:4, Eph 1:21, 2:22.

HERMAS, A PAULINE INTERPRETER

Baptism and Saving, Protecting Faith in the Lord (*Vis.* 3.3.5 [11.5], 3.7.3 [15.3], 3.8.3 [16.3], 4.1.5-10 [22.5-10])

In the discussion in Chapter 4 of the symbolism of the Tower in the *Similitudes*, I argued that the logic of baptism apparent there is a Pauline one with minor modifications.[37] The same is the case with the presentation of the meaning and function of baptism in the *Visions* section. This confirms and strengthens my argument about it in the *Similitudes*. In the *Visions*, and like Paul, Hermas construes baptism an eschatological event necessary for salvation, itself preceded by belief or coming-to-faith.

The first reference to baptism in the entire *Shepherd*, itself a symbolic one, appears in *Vis.* 3.3.5 [11.5]. There, having witnessed the construction of "a great tower built with shining square stones upon (the) waters" (10.4), Hermas wonders what the vision means.[38] So he asks, "Lady, why is the Tower built upon waters?" She replies, "Because *your life was saved and will be saved through water*" (διὰ ὕδατος ἐσώθη).[39] The "water" to which she refers is, of course, the water of baptism.[40] Here the Lady links the (singular) water of baptism with the (plural)

---

[37] See pp. 235-56 in Chapter 4.

[38] λέγει μοι· Σύ, ἰδοὺ οὐχ ὁρᾷς κατέναντί σου πύργον μέγαν οἰκοδομούμενον ἐπὶ ὑδάτων λίθοις τετραγώνοις λαμπροῖς; *Vis*. 3.2.4 [10.4].

[39] Διατί ὁ πύργος ἐπὶ ὑδάτων ᾠκοδόμηται, κυρία; … ὅτι ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν διὰ ὕδατος ἐσώθη καὶ σωθήσεται, *Vis*. 3.3.5 [11.5].

[40] Martin Dibelius, *Die apostolischen Väter: Der Hirt des Hermas*, vol. 4, HNT (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), 464; Robert Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 1st ed., SC 53 (Paris: Cerf, 1958), 109; Graydon F. Snyder, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, ed. Robert M. Grant, AF 6 (Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1968), 45; Martin Leutzsch, *Schriften des Urchristentums* Vol. 3*: Hirt des Hermas*, SUC 3 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), 414 n. 308; Norbert Brox, *Hirt des Hermas*, KAV 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 127; Juan José Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, FP 6 (Madrid: Editorial Ciudad Nueva, 1995), 89 n. 82; Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of*

primordial waters, but by mentioning the former in the singular and the latter in the plural, she

avoids confusing the two.[41] Scholars have frequently understood the Lady's mention of being

"saved through water" as an echo of 1 Pet 3:20-21.[42] That passage recounts how eight persons in

Noah's ark "were saved through water (διεσώθησαν δι᾽ ὕδατος), in accordance with which

baptism now saves you too."[43] There is only a slight difference between the two texts: Hermas

employs a form of the simple verb σῴζειν, whereas in 1 Peter a compound form, the verb

---

*Hermas*, Herm (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999), 69. In Hermas's understanding, baptism is thus necessary for salvation. See, for example, Ernst Gaâb, *Der Hirte des Hermas: Ein Beitrag zur Patristik* (Basel: Felix Schneider, 1866), 101: "Da die Menschen von Natur morti destinati sunt, so ist die Taufe etwas zum Heil Nothwendiges"; similarly, Lage Pernveden, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, STL (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966), 166, who speaks of "the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation."

[41] Philippe Henne, "La polysémie allégorique dans le Pasteur d'Hermas," *ETL* 65 (1989): 131. Snyder employed Joly's edition of the Greek text, which attests the tower as "founded upon (the) waters" (ἐπὶ ὑδάτων) (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 2). However, his idiomatic translation of Hermas's question in 11.5 as "Why is the tower built on *water*, Madam?" and the Lady's reply in the same manner unwittingly collapses Hermas's careful distinction between the plural primordial waters and the singular water of baptism that Henne later noted (ibid., 45). Joly's literal translation (*Hermas Le Pasteur*, 109) anticipates Henne's observation. Holmes makes the same mistake as Snyder (*The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings*, 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1992], 477). Osiek confusingly cites Henne, but still translates ἐπὶ ὑδάτων as "upon the water" in both instances (*Shepherd*, 69; see also 69 n. 6). The distinction between plural waters and singular water is maintained in the translations of Dibelius, *Hirt*, 463; and Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 167.

[42] For example, the possible connection with 1 Pet is recognized by Dibelius, *Hirt*, 464; Brox, *Hirt*, 122 n. 26; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 414 n. 308; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 69. The Oxford *NTAF* project labeled this only a "possible" but "uncertain" quotation (i.e., [d] strength) of 1 Pet 3:20-21 (James Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905], 115). Drummond offered the following as justification: "The context is quite different, the reference to Noah and the ark being absent from Hermas. The idea of salvation through water springs directly from the practice of baptism, and would readily suggest the figure of founding the tower ἐπὶ ὑδάτων." No justification was provided for his latter two claims.

[43] ἀπειθήσασίν ποτε ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι᾽ ὕδατος ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σῴζει βάπτισμα, 1 Pet 3:20-21.

διασώζειν, appears. If we were to assume dependence of the *Visions* section upon 1 Peter, we would have to admit that Hermas simplified the lexical form. In such a scenario, one could still argue for indirect Pauline influence upon the *Shepherd* through 1 Peter, since 1 Peter itself has been construed as significantly dependent upon the *corpus Paulinum*.[44] But even if one disputes either the claim that 1 Peter reflects the influence of Paulinism or the claim that *Vis.* 3.3.5 [11.5] reflects 1 Pet 3:20, one can discern Pauline influence in the conceptual congruence between the depictions of baptism in the apostle's letters and Hermas's visions.

Hermas, like Paul, construes baptism as an eschatological event. His doing so is clear from the Lady's statement to him in *Vis.* 3.3.5 [11.5]. She does not simply say, "your life *was saved* through water" (i.e., in the past). Nor does she simply say, "your life *will be saved* through water" (i.e., in the future, presumably on the last day). Instead, the Lady speaks to Hermas in the present of his being saved through baptism in both the past and future. This tension between salvation as both already and still not yet fully occurring is clearly apparent in Paul's letters too. In Rom 6 in particular, it appears in the context of the apostle's mature explication of the

---

[44] Perhaps the most extensive argument for dependence upon Pauline letters in 1 Peter is that of Edward Gordon Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1946), 365-466. The position that construes 1 Peter as directly influenced by the Pauline letters, especially Romans and Ephesians, has been weakened over the past generation by the following studies in particular: John H. Elliott, "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research," *JBL* 95 (1976): 243-54, who discerned a recent shift in scholarship seeking "the liberation of 1 Peter from its 'Pauline bondage'" and sought himself to establish that "1 Peter is the product of a Petrine tradition transmitted by Petrine tridents of a Petrine circle" (148); and Jens Herzer, *Petrus oder Paulus? Studien über das Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur paulinischen Tradition*, WUNT I 103 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998). Elliott's argument was thoroughly rejected by David G. Horrell, "The Product of a Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter," *JSNT* 86 (2002): 29-60.

meaning of baptism itself.[45] I have already argued for Hermas's adoption and adaptation of this part of Romans in *Sim*. 9.16 [93]. There Paul speaks of believers being baptized into Christ's death (v. 3) and thus buried with him (v. 4). This results in their already having been "joined with him in the likeness of his death" (σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, v. 5a). But they are not (yet) joined with him in that of his resurrection, which Paul says will happen subsequently, using the future tense (ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα, v. 5b). And yet, despite this future full participation in Christ's resurrection and by extension experience of final salvation, there is, according to Paul, an immediate quality to the believers' new life in the present that differs from that in the past. And so, in Paul's view, they ought to "consider [themselves] to be, on the one hand, *dead* as pertains to sin but, on the other, *living* in Christ Jesus as pertains to God (v. 11).[46] In short, the apostle says, baptized believers are now "living as from the dead" (ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, v. 13).

The Lady further describes the eschatological event of baptism in two other recognizably Pauline ways. The first is her depiction of baptism as (a) preceded by proclamation of the word and (b) inaugurated by coming-to-faith, that is to say by belief in God's Son (i.e., Christ). According to the Lady, the stones thrown from the Tower that land close to the water but do not roll into it represent "the ones who have heard the word (οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες) and wish to be *baptized into the name of the Lord* (βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου), but when the memory of the purity of the truth comes upon them, they change their mind and again follow

---

[45] On the development of Paul's baptismal theology between Gal 3 and Rom 6, see Hans Dieter Betz, "Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6," in *Paulinische Studien*, GA 3 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994), 261-70.
[46] ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς [εἶναι] νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Rom 6:11.

after their wicked desires" (*Vis.* 3.7.3 [15.3]).[47] In this description, baptism clearly comes after

"hearing the word," presumably proclamation and perhaps even additional teaching;[48] thus the

Lady's statement anticipates the Shepherd's later ones on the same topic in the *Similitudes*

section, where baptism explicitly follows belief.[49] According to the Lady, such "wishy-washy

catechumens" that these stones represent reject both the name (of Christ) and baptism and are,

consequently, not incorporated into the Tower.[50] Their rejecting faith, Christian identity, and

---

[47] οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες καὶ θέλοντες βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου· εἶτα ὅταν αὐτοῖς ἔλθῃ εἰς μνείαν ἡ ἁγνότης τῆς ἀληθείας, μετανοοῦσιν καὶ πορεύονται πάλιν ὀπίσω τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αὐτῶν τῶν πονηρῶν, *Vis.* 3.7.3 [15.3]. Sandnes roots the depiction of these stones that roll close to but not into the waters in John 5, which he determined "…belonged to the pool of baptismal texts Hermas had at his disposal" ("Seal and Baptism in Early Christianity," in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. David Hellholm et al., BZNW 176 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011], 1450-51). Over a century prior, Taylor made essentially the same point (*The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels* [London: C. J. Clay, 1892], 92); similarly, Charles Taylor, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, 2 vols., ECC (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903), 2:100. A more substantial argument for Hermas's broader dependence on the Fourth Gospel was offered by Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus: Book 2: The Later Christian Writings*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, NGS 5/2 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992), 135-42. Like Massaux, Ferguson is also open to Hermas's dependence on John 3:5, or at least their reflecting "a common Christian terminology" (*Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009], 218, 218 n. 65). On the possibility of Hermas's use of John, the original Oxford *NTAF* project gave both the Gospel in general and John 3:5 in particular a ranking of merely (d) [i.e., possible but uncertain] (Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 122-23). Drummond's view stands in stark contrast to the thoroughgoing positivism of Taylor, *Witness of Hermas*, 71-146, published roughly a decade prior.
[48] According to Osiek, the group of stones depicted in *Vis.* 3.7.4 [15.3] "can only be catechumens or those attracted to becoming so, who have undergone some instruction" (*Shepherd*, 74).
[49] E.g., *Sim.* 8.6.3 [72.3], 9.17.4 [94.4].
[50] Similarly, in *Sim.* 9.12.4 [89.4], the Shepherd tells Hermas, "…no one will enter in the Kingdom of God unless he bears the name of his Son" (εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς εἰσελεύσεται, εἰ μὴ λάβοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ). Ferguson considers "name" here to be "a clear baptismal allusion" (*Baptism in the Early Church*, 217 n. 64). The label "wishy-washy catechumens" is that of Osiek, *Shepherd*, 74.

baptism results in exclusion from it and an attendant inability to enter the church.[51] Only upon

demonstrating an enduring desire to uphold "the purity of truth" and refrain from "wicked

desires," the Lady suggests, are hearers are moved to baptism. For Paul, too, acceptance of the

Christian faith and by extension baptism itself and incorporation into the church are preceded by

proclamation (e.g., 1 Cor 1:21, 15:1-2, 11; Rom 10:9-10). Second, for both the Lady and for

Paul, baptism is properly "into" (εἰς) the name of the Lord.[52] Although it could be a general

reference to God,[53] most scholars agree that the name of the "Lord" at *Vis*. 3.7.3 [15.3] into

which persons are baptized probably refers instead to the name of *Christ*.[54] The plausibility of

this suggestion is confirmed by Hermas's explicitly mentioning the "name of the Son of God"

---

[51] Kirsopp Lake, "The Shepherd of Hermas and Christian Life in Rome in the Second Century," *HTR* 4 (1911): 29. However, the Lady suggests they and others represented by stones not thrown far from the Tower, including stones not thrown at all but lying near the Tower, still have another chance to repent (*Vis*. 3.7.5 [15.5]). If they do repent, "they will fit into a different place, one significantly inferior," but only "when they have been tormented and have completed the days of their sins" (ἑτέρῳ δὲ τόπῳ ἁρμόσουσιν πολὺ ἐλάττονι, καὶ τοῦτο ὅταν βασανισθῶσιν καὶ ἐκπληρώσωσιν τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, *Vis*. 3.7.6 [15.6]). Osiek's recognition that "[t]he complex relationships described here were probably never meant to be completely consistent as an overall system" is appropriate, and yet at the same time her critique of and counter-proposal to Brox's suggestion that the stones of *Vis*. 3.7.5-6 [15.5-6] refer "only to those thrown not far away from the tower" are persuasive (*Shepherd*, 74; cf. N. Brox, "Die weggeworfenen Steine im Pastor Hermae Vis III,7,5," *ZNW* 80.1 [1989]: 130-33, esp. 132).
[52] Betz, "Transferring a Ritual," 259.
[53] E.g., Jean-Paul Audet, "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline," *RB* 60 (1953): 50-56, esp. 55; Stanislas Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs: Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1963), 114-15.
[54] Among those scholars who understand "Lord" at *Vis*. 3.7.3 [15.3] to be a reference to baptism in the name of Jesus are the following: Lake, "Shepherd of Hermas and Christian Life," 35; Dibelius, *Hirt*, 470; G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers* (London: Longmans, Green, 1951), 105; Pernveden, *Concept of the Church*, 165-66; Brox, *Hirt*, 138; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 419 n. 364; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 74 n. 49; Sandnes, "Seal and Baptism," 1451 n. 38.

elsewhere in the *Shepherd*, which he does at least nine times;[55] it is also consistent with

Hermas's practice of circumspectly referring to Jesus by some other designation.[56] For Paul, too,

properly understood, baptism is baptism *into Christ (Jesus)*, as can be seen from Gal 3:27 and

Rom 6:3.[57] From 1 Cor 1:13-15, we can reasonably infer that baptisms were also conducted,

more specifically, into the *name* of Christ (Jesus), since there Paul expresses gratitude for the

Corinthians' inability to claim that they were baptized into his own name.[58] Thus we see that

Hermas's depiction in the *Visions* of baptism's basic meaning and function is indebted to the

apostle's prior theological reflections on the same topic, which he has adopted.

Furthermore, in this section of the *Shepherd*, Hermas reveals himself to have adopted

Pauline ways of construing the salvific function of the faith that precedes baptism and, at the

---

[55] 90.3, 90.7, 91.5 [*bis*], 92.2, 93.5, 93.7, 105.2, and 105.3. The phrase also likely appears at 93.3 and 94.4, where "of the Son" is lacking in Codex Athos but is, following earlier manuscript witnesses, typically restored by editors. The "name of his (i.e., God's) Son" appears at 89.5. The "name" at 90.2 is clearly a reference that of the "Son of God," mentioned shortly thereafter.

[56] For example, although in the *Shepherd* by "Lord" frequently Hermas simply means God, at *Vis*. 3.5.2 [13.2] the Lady mentions "those who suffered for the sake of the name of *the Lord*" (οἱ παθόντες ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου; cf. *Vis*. 3.1.9 [9.9], 3.2.1 [10.1], *Sim*. 9.28.5-6 [105.5-6]). There the name of *Christ* is in view as the identifying marker for which his followers, the martyrs, suffered (Dibelius, *Hirt*, 457). Similarly, Osiek, *Shepherd*, 63, who like Dibelius observes the uncertainty in the scribal tradition regarding whose name it is. By contrast, Brox, following Gustav Schläger, "Der Hirt des Hermas eine ursprünglich Jüdische Schrift," *NThT* 16 (1927): 328, appeals in particular to *Sim*. 9.28.6 [105.6]. There the Shepherd imagines the possibility of suffering "because of God" (διὰ τὸν θεὸν πάθῃ) in support of his claim that the "name" here is not that of Christ but of God (*Hirt*, 115).

[57] According to Betz, "Transferring a Ritual," 261, this idea of "baptism into Christ" represents the earliest stratum of tradition that the apostle expands and further explicates in the broader context of Rom 6.

[58] Paul's letters are the earliest surviving sources to attest these (and related) baptismal formulae, which are also attested in later ones: 1 Cor 10:2; cf. Matt 28:19, Acts 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5. The classic study of the baptismal name formula is Wilhelm Heitmüller, *"Im namen Jesu": Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe*, FRLANT 1/2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903).

same time, willing to bring that faith to bear on the (imagined) reality of the Christian's daily life in ways that evoke specific parts of the *corpus Paulinum*. Near the end of Hermas's discussion with the elderly Lady, she asks him a tantalizing question, "Do you want to see something else?" (*Vis*. 3.8.1 [16.1]). The always inquisitive Hermas confirms that he does, and then the Lady explains the meaning of the seven women whom Hermas suddenly sees supporting the Tower. Each of these women, he learns, has both a *name* and a *function* (ἐνέργεια, 16.3).[59] The first woman is named Faith (πίστις).[60] She appears with her hands clasped together or fingers intertwined in front of her, in what is probably some sort of apotropaic gesture.[61] Faith's function immediately follows her naming. "Through this (woman)," the Lady tells Hermas, "God's elect are saved" (διὰ ταύτης σώζονται οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, *Vis*. 3.8.3 [16.3]).[62] Here personified faith is, in a nutshell, "the agent of salvation."[63] Faith similarly appears in personified form in Gal

---

[59] My translation of ἐνέργεια as "function" follows BDAG 335. Similarly, Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 50; Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 485. Cf. Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols., LCL 24-25 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 2:213, who translates it "the work [the women] do."

[60] Similarly, Faith is the first of "the four stronger virgins who stand at the Tower's corners" (τῶν παρθένων… τῶν ἰσχυροτέρων, τῶν εἰς τὰς γωνίας σταθεισῶν) in *Sim*. 9.15.1 [92.1]. This primary positioning of Faith is not consistent across the entirety of the *Shepherd*. For example, it does not appear first in the list of good desires at *Mand*. 12.3.1 [46.1], as correctly recognized by Pernveden, *Concept of the Church*, 132 n. 6.

[61] ἡ μὲν πρώτη αὐτῶν, ἡ κρατοῦσα τὰς χεῖρας, πίστις καλεῖται, *Vis*. 3.8.3 [16.3]. The apotropaic sense of the way that Lady holds her hands was suggested by Antonio Carlini, "La rappresentazione della ΠΙΣΤΙΣ personificata nella terza Visione di Erma," *CClCr* 9 (1988): 85-94, largely on the basis of comparanda from the magical papyri. For a list of other interpretations and accompanying bibliography, see Brox, *Hirt*, 143-44, who recognizes that the gesture is "enigmatic and contested" ("rätselhaft und umstritten" [143]).

[62] In reading ταύτης for ταύτην against Codex Sinaiticus and Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 174, I follow the witness of Codex Athos. Even if ταύτην is the original reading, the sense is the same — faith is the grounds on which the Lady imagines God's elect to be saved.

[63] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 77.

3:23-26. There Paul writes, "Before the coming of faith, we were under guard, locked up under law for the faith that was to be revealed… so that we might be justified by faith. But since faith has come… you are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus."[64] Strikingly, in this Pauline passage faith also functions as salvation's agent — it is explicitly named by the apostle as the means through which persons become children of God (v. 26), as well as the grounds of justification (v. 24).[65] The foundational importance of faith for salvation is even more explicit in Ephesians, where the pseudepigrapher says, "…By grace *you have been saved through faith* (ἐστε σεσῳσμένοι διὰ πίστεως), and this is not something you have done; it is the gift of God gift" (2:8).[66] In telling Hermas that "through (Faith) God's elect are saved," the Lady is effectively saying the same thing that we find in the first half of this verse, thereby indicating the influence of a tradition preserved in Ephesians upon Hermas in yet another way.

To the general Pauline notion that faith *saves*, Hermas connects the idea that faith *protects* a person. Much like in the Pauline corpus, in *Vis.* 4.1.5-10 [22.5-10] we find Hermas putting on faith like armor in order to safeguard himself in a struggle. There he confronts a huge hundred foot-long beast like a sea-monster. Hermas is terrified, begins to weep, and asks the Lord to rescue him. Then, he says, "Putting on faith in the Lord (πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου) and recalling

---

[64] Πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν· ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν. Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Gal 3:23-26.

[65] Cf. Rom 1:16, where the gospel is described as the "power of God for salvation to everyone who believes" (δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι).

[66] Τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσῳσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον, Eph 2:8. Cf. Phil 3:9, where Paul himself argues that he has "the righteousness (that comes) from God founded on faith" (τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει).

the magnificent things that he taught me, I took courage and gave myself up to the beast."[67] As

Osiek observed, at this point Hermas "realizes that *faith in the Lord protects him like armor* and

is the source of his courage to face the beast head-on."[68] Only in the Pauline corpus among

surviving Greek literature composed prior to the *Shepherd* is *faith* depicted as *protective armor*

*to be put on*, essentially as we find in *Vis*. 4.1.8 [22.8].[69] I engaged Hermas's depictions of

spiritual armor and weaponry in greater detail earlier in the discussion of Pauline influence upon

the *Mandates* in Chapter 3.[70] Here I simply recall the clear depictions of faith as breastplate

(θώραξ) in 1 Thess 5:8 and shield (θυρεός) in Eph 6:16, both of which are obviously elements of

protective armor. Hermas himself does not explicitly say that he considers faith to be armor; he

only describes it functioning as such. In doing so, he employs a common Greco-Roman clothing

metaphor. But that metaphor was uniquely modified by Paul in reference to faith as an element

of spiritual armor and then re-adapted by the apostle's pseudepigrapher.[71] Hermas's use of faith

---

[67] ἐνδυσάμενος οὖν, ἀδελφοί, τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ μνησθεὶς ὧν ἐδίδαξέν με μεγαλείων, θαρσήσας εἰς τὸ θηρίον ἐμαυτὸν ἔδωκα, *Vis*. 4.1.8 [22.8].

[68] Osiek, *Shepherd*, 92 (emphasis added).

[69] The notion of putting on generic virtues as armor is attested in Philo, *de Abrah*. 243, which refers to "the virtues and their teachings and objects of contemplation" that reason puts on as a full set of armor (…τὸν σωφρονιστὴν λόγον· ὃς ἐπειδὰν ἀναλάβῃ τὴν αὐτοῦ παντευχίαν, τὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ τὰ τούτων δόγματα καὶ θεωρήματα, δύναμιν ἀνανταγώνιστον, ἐρρωμενέστατα κρατεῖ; ed. L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 4 [Berlin: Reimer, 1902]). Philo also depicts putting on faith as clothing (*De confusione linguarum* 31). Similarly, see *T. Levi* 8.2.

[70] See pp. 187-93 in Chapter 3.

[71] Despite the fact that faith is depicted as capable of providing protection, as if it were armor, only in the Pauline letters and in the *Shepherd*, scholars rarely admit Pauline influence upon Hermas at this point. Among the few who entertain the possibility, see Osiek, *Shepherd*, 92 n. 22 (a "Pauline image"). By his citations of Pauline letters, Taylor, *Witness of Hermas*, 56 implied that Hermas adopted the clothing imagery therein, especially that of Gal 3:27. Dibelius recognized that "perhaps [the clothing imagery] has become established in connection with the image of the spiritual armor" ("hat sich vielleicht im Zusammenhang mit dem Bilde der

with the same protective sense indicates that he has adopted a recognizable element of the Pauline theological tradition.

Turning Away from the Living God (*Vis*. 2.3.2 [7.2], 3.7.2 [15.2])

 In the words of the elderly Lady who appears to Hermas, those persons who abandon such saving and protecting faith in the Lord are said to "turn away from the living God" (ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος). This phrase is attested only in Hebrews and nowhere else in surviving Greek literature of the period. It is a strong indication of the influence of that book upon the *Visions*, expressed via Hermas's adoption and slight adaptation of part of its contents.

Through the Lady, Hermas employs this phrase in reference to salvation. He does so twice in relatively close proximity. In the first instance of the phrase in *Vis*. 2, *not* turning away from the living God is listed by the Lady among those things that are said to save Hermas. Here we find her dissuading him from turning away by implying what will happen if he does, in fact, turn away — he will not be saved. Confirmation of this possibility appears in the second instance of the phrase in *Vis*. 3. There, those who actually do turn away from the living God are represented by stones that are not incorporated into the Tower being built, but instead, after presumably being hurled from it like the other stones (*Vis*. 3.2.9 [10.9], 3.7.1 [15.1]), they "fall into the fire and are burned." This too is a dissuasive depiction. If Hermas wants to avoid the

---

geistlichen Waffenrüstung eingebürgert"), but he did not attribute it to Paul (*Hirt*, 484). André Benoît, "Le 'Pasteur' d'Hermas," in *Le baptême chrétien au second siècle: La théologie des pères*, EHPR 43 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953), 133 noted the similarities of language in Hermas and Paul (esp. Rom 13:12-15, 2 Cor 5:2) but found different meaning, thereby implying that no echoes between the texts exist.

same fate and instead be saved, he should not, the Lady implies, turn from the living God like

they did. For comparison with Hebrews, I quote the two relevant passages from *Vis.* 2-3 in full:

| TABLE 4: Turning Away from the Living God | |
|---|---|
| *Corpus Paulinum* | *Shepherd* of Hermas |
| Heb. 3:12<br>Βλέπετε, ἀδελφοί, μήποτε ἔσται ἔν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν τῷ <u>ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος</u><br>Beware, brothers and sisters, lest there be in any of you a wicked heart that lacks faith and <u>turns away from the living God</u> | *Vis.* 2.3.2 [7.2]<br>ἀλλὰ σώζει σε τὸ μὴ <u>ἀποστῆναί σε ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος</u>, καὶ ἡ ἁπλότης σου καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐγκράτεια<br>But your not <u>turning away from the living God</u> saves you, plus your sincerity and great self-control<br><br>*Vis.* 3.7.2 [15.2]<br>οἱ δὲ πίπτοντες εἰς τὸ πῦρ καὶ καιόμενοι, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τέλος <u>ἀποστάντες τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος</u><br>But those [stones] who fall into the fire and are burned, these are the ones who completely turned away from the living God |

The verbal agreement between the texts of Hermas and Hebrews consists of a form of the verb

ἀφίστημι, followed by a prepositional phrase begun by ἀπό whose object is θεοῦ ζῶντος ("living

God"). The closest verbal correspondence is found at *Vis.* 2.3.2 [7.2], which mirrors the phrase in

Heb 3:12 exactly. *Vis.* 3.7.2 [15.2] attests an only slightly different form — a participle instead

of an infinitive and two definite articles. But in both instances in the *Visions*, the sense of the

phrase is the same.

The concept of turning away from God functions somewhat differently in Hermas than in

Hebrews. In *Vis.* 2.3.2 [7.2], the framing of the idea is positive. Hermas's "not having turned

away from the living God" is what the Lady says saves him, together with his sincerity

(ἁπλότης) and great self-control (ἐγκράτεια). By contrast, in Heb 3:12, the governing idea is a negative one that describes a wicked, faithless heart that readers are exhorted not to have. In contrast to having such a heart, the author implores his audience to "encourage each other daily… so that none of you might be hardened by sin's deceit" (v. 13).[72] A strikingly similar sense is found in *Vis*. 3.7.2 [15.2], where an improper heart is also in view. There the Lady tells Hermas that the stones he saw falling into the fire are those "who utterly turned away from the living God" and into whose heart "the idea of repenting has not gone up because of desires for… the wicked things that they do."[73] Thus, in the case of *Vis*. 2.3.2 [7.2], as in Hebrews, the language of "turning away from the living God" is construed with the idea of a wicked heart.

Despite the similarities of language and concept in Hermas and Hebrews, only a limited number of scholars have considered what we find in the *Visions* section to be evidence of the influence of Heb 3:12.[74] Hesitancy to grant influence seems rooted in two phenomena. First, the phrase under consideration is (better yet, its two constituent elements are) conceptual commonplaces. The designation "living God" (θεὸς ζῶν), which comprises the second half of the

---

[72] ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Heb 3:13.

[73] … οὐκέτι αὐτοῖς ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ μετανοῆσαι διὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀσελγείας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν πονηριῶν ὧν ἠργάσαντο, *Vis*. 3.7.2 [15.2].

[74] For example, F. X. von Funk, ed., *Patres apostolici*, 2. adaucta et emendata. (Tubingæ: H. Laupp, 1901), 428-29, 446-47 placed the Greek and Latin text in italics and noted Heb 3:12 in the apparatus; Auguste Lelong, *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*, TDEHC 4 (Paris: A. Picard, 1912), 22-23, 42-43 placed the relevant Greek text at *Vis*. 2.3.2 [7.2] and 3.7.2 [15.2] in quotation marks and the corresponding French translation in italics. Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur* suggested on p. 95 that this is not a quotation but on p. 117 that it is; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 56, 74 n. 46 implied but did not explicitly state that Heb is the source of this expression.

phrase, is well attested in Jewish and early Christian sources of the period;[75] likewise, other

extant literature mentions the idea of "turning away from God" (ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ), which

comprises the first half of the Lady's phrase.[76] The independent attestation of these two ideas has

led certain scholars to overlook (or even dismiss) the possibility that the combination of the two

ideas — i.e., the full phrase ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος — in the *Visions* could be attributed to

Hebrews.[77] To my mind, theirs is an overly skeptical and thus untenable position. Simply

because Hermas could have learned to refer to God as "living" and to speak of "turning away

from God" from some other source(s) besides Hebrews does not logically preclude his

potentially having learned to speak of both ideas together from that biblical book. Indeed, the

fact that these two ideas appear linked together only in one other place (i.e., Hebrews) out of all

the surviving Greek literature composed prior to or contemporaneous with the *Shepherd*

---

[75] For a thorough analysis of the designation "living God," see Siegfried Kreuzer, *Der lebendige Gott: Bedeutung, Herkunft und Entwicklung einer alttestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnung*, BWANT 6. Folge, Heft 16 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1983). In the LXX, it is found at Deut 4:33, 5:26; Josh 3:10; 1 Kgdms 17:36; 4 Kgdms 19:4, 19:16; Esth 6:13, 16:16; Tob 13:2; 3 Marc 6:28; Psa 41:3, 83:3; Hos 2:1; Isa 37:4, 17; Dan 4:22, 5:23 [*bis*], 12:7. Among texts ultimately collected in the New Testament, it appears at Matt 16:16, 26:63; Acts 14:15; Rom 9:26; 2 Cor 3:3, 6:16; 1 Tim 1:9, 3:15, 4:10; 1 Pet 1:23; Rev 7:2, 15:7. Theodor Zahn, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1868), 441 n. 2 astutely observed that the epithet θεὸς ζῶν also appears three other times in Hebrews (9:14, 10:31, 12:22), the implication being that Hermas could have learned it there. The following texts in the Apostolic Fathers attest it too: Ignatius, *Phil.* 1.2; *2 Clem* 20.2.

[76] E.g., LXX Deut 13:11, 32:15, Josh 21:23, 2 Chron 30:7, Ode 2:15, Isa 59:13, Bar 3:8; cf. Deut 7:4, Josh 21:19, 2 Chron 26:18.

[77] For example, Dibelius concluded, "*If* one assumes Hermas's acquaintance with Hebrews, one can trace the phrase… back to Heb 3:12." "But," he added, "θεὸς ζῶν is a common biblical expression, so the correspondence can also be explained by both texts' common scriptural sounding language" (*Hirt*, 449: "*Wenn* man Bekanntschaft des Hermas mit Hebr annimmt, kann man die Wendung ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος auf Hebr 3:12 zurückführen; da θεὸς ζῶν aber ein geläufiger Bibelausdruck ist, so kann die Übereinstimmung auch aus der beiden Texten gemeinsamen biblisch getönten Sprache erklärt werden" [emphasis added]).

strengthens the possibility that Hermas has adopted and slightly adapted that book's contents

here. Second, as noted above, Hermas uses the phrase in a slightly different way than the author

of Hebrews. These differences are typically taken by scholars as indicators of the absence of

influence.[78] And yet, despite the admitted differences, Hermas not only adopts the same exact

phrase that we find in Heb 3:12 at *Vis.* 2.3.2 [7.2] but he also connects it with the notion of

wicked things entering a person's heart. A similarly "wicked heart" is also in view in Heb 3:12,

and this reality cements the probability of Hebrews' influence upon Hermas on this point.

Ultimately, the question of potential influence from Hebrews at *Vis.* 2.3.2 [7.2] and 3.7.2

[15.2] comes down to which of the following one thinks is more likely: (a) both the author of

Hebrews and Hermas independently combined these two concepts into expressions of precisely

the same form with a connection to a wicked heart within slightly differing arguments; or (b)

Hermas somehow adopted and adapted the expression from Hebrews. I argue the latter is more

likely, especially in light of Hermas's adoption of material from Hebrews elsewhere in his

tripartite work.[79] Consequently, in my judgment, the verbal and conceptual connections between

---

[78] For example, according to Massaux, "Given the identity of expression [in Hermas and Hebrews], it is tempting to assert a literary contact; but the difference in contexts is, however, not favorable to this notion" (*Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 149). Drummond gave this parallel a (c) rating (i.e., low probability), because in his view "[b]oth the ideas and the words in these passages *seem* to indicate dependence" ("Shepherd of Hermas," 107; emphasis added). Included in this categorization and assessment are *Sim.* 1.1.2 / Heb 11:13, 15, 13:14. However, these texts from Hermas and Hebrews agree at least as closely as *Mand.* 10.2 / Eph 4:30, which mention grieving the holy Spirit. Drummond assigned that parallel a (b) rating (i.e., high probability), and so his lower ranking here seems unduly skeptical by comparison.
[79] Similarly, Zahn, *Hirt*, 440-41, who implicitly denied that it was a "coincidence" ("Zufall") that Hermas used the phrase ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος independently of Hebrews.

*Vis.* 2-3 / Heb 3:12 rise beyond the level of mere parallel.[80] Here Hermas adopts the conception

and language of Heb 3:12, which he adapts and then integrates into his argument against "turning

away from the living God."

Hermas's Unfaithful Family (*Vis.* 1.3 [3], 2.2-3 [6-7])

 The *Visions* section famously begins with Hermas seeing Rhoda, the woman who he says raised

him, bathing in the Tiber at Rome (*Vis.* 1.1.1-2 [1.1-2]). Hermas recognizes Rhoda and

particularly her attractive appearance, thereby hinting at erotic themes to be developed through

the *Shepherd*.[81] But he says to himself, "Although I noticed her beauty, I caught myself and said

in my heart, 'I would be blessed if I had a woman of such beauty and character as a wife.' I

pondered only this, nothing else."[82] And yet when Rhoda reappears to Hermas while he is

praying, she tells him, "God… is angry at you, because you sinned against me" (*Vis.* 1.1.6

---

[80] The vast majority of scholars note the parallel. Among the few who do not mention it at all, see Oscar von Gebhardt and Adolf von Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e codice palatino*, PAO 3 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877), 22-23, 44-45; and Taylor, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 1:69, 86. It is provided for comparison only in Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Hermae Pastor* Vol. 3 of *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum* (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1881), 158; Molly Whittaker, *Die apostolischen Väter* Vol. 1: *Der Hirt des Hermas*, 2nd rev. ed., GCS (Berlin: Akademie, 1967), 6, 13; Brox, *Hirt*, 95 n. 12, 123 n. 31; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 78, 94; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 400 n. 198. Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 38, 49; p. 164 lists *Vis.* 2.3.2, 3.7.2 among Hermas's allusions to Hebrews.

[81] Antonius Hilhorst, "Erotic Elements in the Shepherd of Hermas," in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, ed. H. Hofmann and M. Zimmerman, vol. 9 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988), 193-204; B. Diane Lipsett, "Scrutinizing Desire: Hermas, Metanoia, and Manliness," in *Desiring Conversion: Hermas, Thecla, Aseneth* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 19-53.

[82] ταύτης οὖν ἰδὼν τὸ κάλλος διελογιζόμην ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου λέγων· Μακάριος ἤμην εἰ τοιαύτην γυναῖκα εἶχον καὶ τῷ κάλλει καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ. μόνον τοῦτο ἐβουλευσάμην, ἕτερον δὲ οὐδέν, *Vis.* 1.1.2 [1.2].

[1.6]).[83] Hermas is incredulous, but Rhoda confirms that there was in fact an evil desire, presumably for her, in his heart.

Shortly thereafter, though, Hermas learns a different reason for God's anger with him.[84] This time the divine messenger is not Rhoda but an "elderly woman" (γυνὴ πρεσβῦτις), who confirms Hermas's sinful desire for Rhoda (*Vis*. 1.2.2-4 [2.2-4]). "But," she says, "God is not angry with you because of this." She then offers the real reason: "…because you love your children, you did not admonish your family but allowed it to be terribly corrupted," which in turn resulted in Hermas himself being corrupted (*Vis*. 1.3.1 [3.1]).[85] One year later, the elderly woman appears to Hermas again, this time reading a little book that he copies without being able to understand. (*Vis*. 2.1.3-4 [5.3-4]).[86] Fasting and prayer result in the revelation of its meaning, which includes an explanation of his family's sinful behavior:

> Your offspring, Hermas, rejected God and blasphemed the Lord and with great wickedness betrayed their parents and were called parent-betrayers, but although they betrayed they did not derive any benefit. And yet they still added to their sins licentious acts and improper sexual activities, and thus their lawless acts were completed. But make these words known to all your children and to your spouse, who is going to be your sister. For even she does not restrain her tongue, with which she acts wickedly (*Vis*. 2.2.2-3 [6.2-3]).[87]

---

[83] ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κατοικῶν καὶ κτίσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος τὰ ὄντα καὶ πληθύνας καὶ αὐξήσας ἕνεκεν τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ ὀργίζεταί σοι ὅτι ἥμαρτες εἰς ἐμέ, *Vis*. 1.1.6 [1.6].

[84] As Steve Young, "Being a Man: The Pursuit of Manliness in *The Shepherd of Hermas*," *JECS* 2 (1994): 241 correctly observed, this "bait and switch" and the erotic overtones that drive it function in context to captivate the reader from the very outset of the book.

[85] Ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ἕνεκα τούτου σοι ὀργίζεται ὁ θεός, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα τὸν οἶκόν σου τὸν ἀνομήσαντα εἰς τὸν κύριον καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψῃς. ἀλλὰ φιλότεκνος ὢν οὐκ ἐνουθέτεις σου τὸν οἶκον, ἀλλὰ ἀφῆκες αὐτὸν καταφθαρῆναι δεινῶς· διὰ τοῦτο ὀργίζεταί σοι ὁ κύριος, *Vis*. 1.3.1 [3.1].

[86] See the discussion of this encounter on pp. 42-47 in Chapter 1.

[87] Τὸ σπέρμα σου, Ἑρμᾶ, ἠθέτησαν εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐβλασφήμησαν εἰς τὸν κύριον καὶ προέδωκαν τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτῶν ἐν πονηρίᾳ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἤκουσαν προδόται γονέων καὶ προδόντες οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν, ἀλλὰ ἔτι προσέθηκαν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν τὰς ἀσελγείας καὶ συμφυρμοὺς

The contents of the elderly woman's little book clearly list the sinful activities in which

Hermas's children and wife are engaged.[88] His wife has a tongue that is, according to the Lady,

out of control.[89] His children's sins are different and more manifold, though. They have earned a

poor reputation as betrayers of their parents, presumably because they have rejected their

parents' God. They are, furthermore, engaged in luxury and illicit sexual activity.[90] In the very

next section of this *Vision*, the woman tells Hermas that he too has done wrong. He "has

neglected [his family] and become entangled in… wicked (business) affairs" (*Vis*. 2.3.1 [7.1]).[91]

---

πονηρίας, καὶ οὕτως ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι αὐτῶν. ἀλλὰ γνώρισον ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα τοῖς τέκνοις σου πᾶσιν καὶ τῇ συμβίῳ σου τῇ μελλούσῃ σου ἀδελφῇ· καὶ γὰρ αὕτη οὐκ ἀπέχεται τῆς γλώσσης, ἐν ᾗ πονηρεύεται, *Vis*. 2.2.2-3 [6.2-3]. My translation of συμφυρμοὺς πονηρίας as "improper sexual activities" follows BDAG 960; cf. Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 465, who translates it "orgies of evil."

[88] *Pace* Dibelius, *Hirt*, 419-20, according to whom the references to Hermas's family were of no historical value because they were intended to symbolically represent the wider church. This position has largely been rejected by subsequent scholarship.

[89] Osiek notes the intriguing possibility that "[t]he objection to the behavior of Hermas's wife is possibly to her ready and assertive speaking out, perhaps in the assembly," and she cites 1 Cor 14:34-35; 1 Tim 2:11-16 (*Shepherd*, 54). Here Osiek is following the suggestion of Martin Leutzsch, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas,"* FRLANT 150 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 172. The suggestion is repeated by Mary Rose D'Angelo, "'Knowing How to Preside over His Own Household': Imperial Masculinity and Christian Asceticism in the Pastorals, *Hermas*, and Luke-Acts," in *New Testament Masculinities*, ed. Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson, SemeiaSt 45 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 283. By contrast, as a *comparandum* on the tongue's damaging impact, Brox, *Hirt*, 98 cited 1 Tim 5:13. These parallels from 1 Tim are particularly interesting because they clearly refer to women who, like Hermas's wife, speak out of place or otherwise use their tongues improperly.

[90] Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 397 n. 164 intriguingly notes the (Pauline) pairing of "Üppigkeit und sexuelle Ausschweifung" in Rom 13:13, 2 Cor 12:21, and Gal 5:19 in passing, but he does not pursue the connection at any length.

[91] οὐκ ἐμέλησέν σοι περὶ αὐτῶν. ἀλλὰ παρενεθυμήθης καὶ ταῖς πραγματείαις σου συνανεφύρης ταῖς πονηραῖς, *Vis*. 2.3.1 [7.1].

Significantly, these negative actions and characteristics of Hermas's family members are among those listed in the household codes of the Pastoral Epistles, specifically 1 Tim 3 and Tit 1, as disqualifying a man from serving as a church overseer (ἐπισκοπή, 1 Tim 3:1, 2), deacon (διάκονος, 1 Tim 3:12) or elder (πρεσβύτερος, Tit 1:5). Specifically, in 1 Tim 3 the pseudepigraphical Paul states that an overseer must "…manage his own family well," "keep (his) children under submission with all dignity," and "have a good reputation among outsiders" (vv. 4, 7a).[92] Similarly, deacons must "manage their children and households well" (v. 12).[93] For its part, the Letter to Titus states that appointed elders should "have children who are faithful, not accused of wild living or unruly (1:6)."[94] Hermas fails precisely these criteria for church leadership because his children are unfaithful, unruly, and, owing to their misbehavior, have developed a poor public reputation. Because of his wife's uncontrollable tongue and wicked behavior, he also fails the criterion stated in 1 Tim 3:11, namely that overseers' wives must be "reverent, not slanderous, self-controlled, faithful in everything" (v. 11).[95]

The author of 1 Timothy implies the reason for such requirements in the form of a rhetorical question. He asks, "If someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he take care of God's church?" (v. 5).[96] The underlying assumption is that if a person cannot even manage the limited sphere of his household well, then he certainly cannot manage the wider

---

[92] τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ, μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος… δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν, 1 Tim 3:4, 7a.

[93] τέκνων καλῶς προϊστάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἴκων, 1 Tim 3:12.

[94] εἴ τίς ἐστιν ἀνέγκλητος, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ, τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας ἢ ἀνυπότακτα, Tit 1:6. My translation of ἀσωτία as "wild living" follows BDAG 148.

[95] Γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνάς, μὴ διαβόλους, νηφαλίους, πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν, 1 Tim 3:11. My translation of νηφαλίους as "self-controlled" follows BDAG 672.

[96] εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προστῆναι οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται; 1 Tim 3:5.

sphere of the church well either. In Hermas's case, the problem is not simply mismanagement of his chaotic, misbehaving household. He has, as the elderly woman reminds him, shirked his responsibilities towards his family entirely, overlooking it and them by focusing instead on his business affairs.

The direct connections between the descriptions of his family's improper behavior and the disqualifying criteria for church leadership in the Pastoral Epistles suggest that Hermas knew at least parts of the latter.[97] Furthermore, these connections suggest that Hermas recognized his failure to meet the Pastorals' criteria as potentially threatening to his status as a leader of the community of Christians at Rome.[98] By extension, their reception of his visions as authoritative instances of divine communication was at risk too.[99] To be sure, Hermas nowhere explicitly indicates in the *Shepherd* that he aspires to or had been assigned such an overt office as overseer, deacon, or elder.[100] Nevertheless, at various points in the *Visions* section he is instructed to

---

[97] This claim stands at odds with the consensus position that claims (or by its silence implies) that Hermas did not know the Pastoral Epistles at all. See, e.g., Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas"; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 14; Brox, *Hirt*, 45-49; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 26; Joseph Verheyden, "The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 296-322. Marvin R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament* Vol. 4: *The Pastoral Epistles* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), 186 succinctly concluded: "There are no echoes [of the Pastoral Epistles] in Hermas."

[98] D'Angelo, "Knowing How to Preside," 265-66 does not argue for influence from the Pastorals themselves but does recognize that "the Shepherd of Hermas voices its author's anxiety about his own failures in parental authority"; cf. 281.

[99] D'Angelo essentially argues the inverse. She concludes, "By exerting control over his wife and children as their father and head, Hermas establishes his worthiness to speak in the spirit to and among the leaders of a larger household, the church" (ibid., 284).

[100] Similarly, Young, "Being a Man," 242, 244. Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 134 interprets the Lady's command in *Vis*. 2.4.2-3 [8.2-3] that Hermas give her book to the elders as evidence that he himself was not one of them and, by extension, also not a bishop or deacon.

interact with or even teach those who serve in church leadership.[101] For example, from the Lady's little book he learns that he is to "speak to those who preside over the church, so that they might set their paths straight in righteousness" (*Vis.* 2.2.6 [6.6]).[102] Later, she tells him that he is to read his copy of her words at Rome with the church's leaders there (*Vis.* 2.4.3 [8.3]).[103] Consequently, even if Hermas had not been established formally as a leader in the Roman Christian community and given the title that would accrue to such a position, the text of the *Shepherd* presents him as one called to fulfill a leadership role or function as a prophet who speaks by God's spirit.[104] Indeed, throughout the book, he is described as fulfilling multiple intersecting roles, chief among which are those of "*paterfamilias*, patron, prophet, and pastor."[105]

What we find in this part of the *Visions*, then, is both a granting of the authority of the Pastoral Epistles' household codes and also a development of a means of corrective redress for those potential leaders who like Hermas fail to meet the clear criteria stated therein. The elderly Lady presents this corrective redress to Hermas and by extension his audience through her sayings. She tells Hermas specifically that he must not "begrudge [his] children or leave [his]

---

[101] *Pace* both Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 135, in whose view Hermas was not likely a teacher; and Osiek, *Shepherd*, 55, according to whom "Hermas does not appear to be [a leader]."

[102] ἐρεῖς οὖν τοῖς προηγουμένοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἵνα κατορθώσωνται τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, *Vis.* 2.2.6 [6.6].

[103] σὺ δὲ ἀναγνώσῃ εἰς ταύτην τὴν πόλιν μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προισταμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *Vis.* 2.4.3 [8.3]. See the discussion of this passage in Chapter 1 (pp. 43-44).

[104] According to Eric G. Jay, "From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters: Christian Ministry in the Second Century: A Survey," *SecCent* 1 (1981): 144, 145, although "Hermas attaches to himself no title of office… He seems to have been accepted as an authentic prophet both by contemporaries and by posterity." Likewise, Young, "Being a Man," 243: "[Hermas] is a de facto prophet"; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 135: "Am ehesten käme die Rolle eines Propheten für Hermas in Frage."

[105] Young, "Being a Man," 255.

sister (i.e., his wife) to herself any longer" (*Vis*. 2.3.1 [7.1]).[106] Hermas's very transmission of the

Lady's words to his family will also have salubrious effect. Upon hearing them, the Lady

suggests that Hermas's wife "will desist (ἀφέξεται) and obtain mercy" (*Vis*. 2.2.3 [6.3]).[107]

Indeed, all those who hear the Lady's words through Hermas will have their previous sins

forgiven (ἀφίενται, *Vis*. 2.2.4 [6.4]) and cleansed (καθαρισθῶσιν, *Vis*. 2.3.1 [7.1]).[108] Stated

somewhat differently, and with respect to Hermas's family in particular, "they will be disciplined

with righteous discipline" (παιδευθήσονται… παιδεία δικαία, *Vis*. 2.3.2 [7.2]). Given the

influence of the Pastoral Epistles upon this passage that I have already established, the Lady's

mention of "being disciplined with righteous discipline" might be an allusion to the claim in 2

Tim 3:16 that scripture is useful, among other things, "for disciplining that occurs with

righteousness" (πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ).[109]

---

[106] Σὺ δέ, Ἑρμᾶ, μηκέτι μνησικακήσῃς τοῖς τέκνοις σου, μηδὲ τὴν ἀδελφήν σου ἐάσῃς, *Vis*. 2.3.1 [7.1]. My translation of τὴν ἀδελφήν σου ἐάσῃς as "leave [his] wife to herself" follows BDAG 269. Regarding the sense of μνησικακήσῃς, Osiek observes, "It may not be so much a question of holding grudges… as of resenting the obligations, shame, and perhaps even unwanted legal attention forced on him by [his family's] misdeeds" (*Shepherd*, 56). The implied sphere of unwanted attention in her construal would be that of Hermas's business affairs. If my argument for the influence of the Pastoral Epistles here is persuasive, then the proper sphere is not that of business but of the Christian community.

[107] ἀλλὰ ἀκούσασα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἀφέξεται καὶ ἕξει ἔλεος, *Vis*. 2.2.3 [6.3]. Holmes infers that what Hermas's wife will desist from is her unruly tongue, and accordingly he supplies a direct object for ἀφέξεται ("…she will control *it*" [emphasis added]; *Apostolic Fathers*, 465); similarly, Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 91. Cf. Dibelius, *Hirt*, 446 ("wird sie sich hüten"); Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 36 ("she will control herself"); Brox, *Hirt*, 95 ("wird sie sich zurückhalten"); Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 75 ("se moderará"); Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 157 ("wird sie Abstand halten").

[108] τότε ἀφίενται αὐτοῖς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι πᾶσαι ἃς πρότερον ἥμαρτον, καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασι μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας, *Vis*. 2.2.4 [6.4]; ἵνα καθαρισθῶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν προτέρων ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, *Vis*. 2.3.1 [7.1].

[109] 2 Tim 3:16 is offered for comparison with *Vis*. 2.3.1 [7.1] by Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 400 n. 194.

As in the debate over the question of post-baptismal repentance discussed in Chapter 3 on the *Mandates*, so too here in the *Visions* section we find Hermas admitting a theological ideal and at the same time making a crucial pastoral concession to the believing community's, including his own family's, lived experience.[110] The constructed ideal — a Christian household marked by believing and well-behaved children and self-controlled wife under the authority of a *paterfamilias* — can be seen in contradistinction to Hermas's own household. The ideal in the *Visions* is consistent with that of the *Haustafeln* in the Pastoral Epistles, particularly those outlined in 1 Tim 3 and Tit 1, where they are presented as criteria for a man's serving a leadership role in the Christian community. The elderly Lady exhorts Hermas to admonish his family and correct their behavior immediately before she instructs him to effectively fulfill a leadership role by speaking his (i.e., her) message to those who preside over the church at Rome (*Vis*. 2.2.6 [6.6]) and to Maximus (*Vis*. 2.3.4 [7.4]). Her implied need to do so arguably reflects Hermas's knowledge of the household codes in the Pastoral Epistles as well as his own recognition that the unruly state of his own household would likely be perceived by his audience as a threat to the authority of his message. The pastoral concession can be seen in the Lady's promises that the sins of Hermas's family will be forgiven and cleansed if they repent, turn from their wicked ways, and live rightly. The logic, conceptual framing, and even the language of this exchange between Hermas and the elderly Lady establishes the influence of the traditions preserved in the Pastoral Epistles on the *Visions* section. As I shall now show, such influence can

---

[110] The pastoral import of this passage is recognized in passing by Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 35.

also be seen in the way the elderly Lady diagnoses the Roman Christian community as divided, as well as in the response that she offers from 1 Corinthians to that state of division.

A Community Divided (*Vis*. 3.9 [17])

Following the elderly Lady's explanation of the image of the Tower, the constructed church, and the six other virtues personified as women, who, in addition to Faith, support it, she commands Hermas to "speak [her teachings] into the ears of the saints, so that when they hear them they might be cleansed from their wicked ways, and you too with them" (*Vis*. 3.8.11 [16.11]).[111] The attribution of wicked ways to the audience signals that the Lady recognizes problems in it, just as she recognized problems in Hermas's family itself, as I discussed in the preceding section. In this one, I argue that both the Lady's description of the problems that she diagnoses among Roman Christians and the solutions to them that she commends reflect Hermas's adoption and adaptation of language employed by the apostle Paul. This language is found in the apostle's treatment of community conflicts in his first letter to the Corinthians, particularly chapter 11, a text that was well known (or assumed to be known) at Rome in the late first and early second centuries.[112] Hermas's knowledge of Pauline letters is further reflected in the *Visions* in his use of what I contend are identifiably Pauline concepts of justification, which the Lady presents in tandem with that of sanctification.

---

[111] τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἅ σοι μέλλω λέγειν, λαλῆσαι αὐτὰ πάντα εἰς τὰ ὦτα τῶν ἁγίων, ἵνα ἀκούσαντες αὐτὰ καὶ ποιήσαντες καθαρισθῶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ σὺ δὲ μετ᾽ αὐτῶν, *Vis*. 3.8.11 [16.11].

[112] See the discussion of 1 Corinthians in *1 Clement* and the letters of Ignatius on pp. 38-39 in Chapter 1 above.

"Listen to me, children," the Lady says through Hermas, speaking as the Church. "I raised you with much sincerity and innocence and holiness thanks to the mercy of the Lord, who let righteousness drip upon you (τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς στάξαντος τὴν δικαιοσύνην) in order that you might be justified and sanctified (ἵνα δικαιωθῆτε καὶ ἁγιασθῆτε; cf. 1 Cor 6:11) from all wickedness and from all crookedness. But you do not want to give your wickedness a rest" (*Vis.* 3.9.1 [17.1]).[113] Pauline influence upon Hermas can be seen in this passage in two respects. The first respect is the phrase "let righteousness drip upon you," which implies an outside actor, namely the God who makes persons righteous (i.e., justifies). To my knowledge, the notion of righteousness dripping onto a person is unattested elsewhere in extant literary sources certainly composed prior to the *Shepherd*, whether Jewish or Christian;[114] the LXX admittedly attests numerous uses of the verb στάζειν to describe some dripping from the divine, but in all cases what drips down is decidedly negative (e.g., God's anger). The second respect is the close connection between a person's being "justified and sanctified." When considering the same body of surviving texts, the pairing of God's dual actions of justifying and sanctifying appears only in

---

[113] Ἀκούσατέ μου, τέκνα· ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐξέθρεψα ἐν πολλῇ ἁπλότητι καὶ ἀκακίᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς στάξαντος τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ἵνα δικαιωθῆτε καὶ ἁγιασθῆτε ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης σκολιότητος. ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐ θέλετε παῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς πονηρίας ὑμῶν, *Vis.* 3.9.1 [17.1].

[114] Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 123 cites for comparison Jer 42:18 (θυμός), 44:6 (ὀργή, θυμός), to which I add 2 Chron 12:17 (θυμός). The negative sense of such passages was recognized by Lelong, *Pasteur*, 49. LXX Jer 49:18 and 51:6 are the *comparanda* that scholars most frequently offered for our passage. No *comparanda* at all for the phrase στάξαντος τὴν δικαιοσύνην are provided in Funk, *Patres apostolici*, 450-51; Taylor, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 90; Whittaker, *Hirt*, 15; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 51; Brox, *Hirt*, 148; Andreas Lindemann and Henning Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), 358-59; and Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 142-50; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 100-01. Although Brox did not suggest an alternative, he correctly observed that comparisons with the passages listed here from the LXX are "not illuminating" ("nicht aufschlußreich") (*Hirt*, 149).

a letter written by Paul. Therefore, the description in *Vis*. 3.9.1 [17.1] of dripped righteousness leading to a person's being justified and sanctified seems to be a novel phrase, indeed a novel phrase that coheres tightly with central aspects of Pauline theology.[115]

The righteousness of which the Lady speaks here in *Vis*. 3.9.1 [17.1] is a righteousness that, as Gebhardt and Harnack rightly recognized, "comes *from God*."[116] This divine origin of human righteousness is apparent from the Lady's description of the Lord as the sole agent who causes righteousness itself to drip down upon the human. Consequently, in the theological imagination of the *Shepherd*, a person's obtaining righteousness is best understood as the result

---

[115] Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 423 n. 401 apparently recognized the Pauline connection in *Vis*. 3.9.1 [17.1] ("Rechtfertigung und Heiligung nebeneinander: 1Kor 6,19 [*sic*]; Rom 6,19.22"), even though he did not explore it. Presumably, Leutzsch meant to cite 1 Cor 6:11, since 1 Cor 6:19 mentions neither justification nor sanctification; see also 1 Cor 1:30. Leutzsch likewise recognized that the same δικαιοῦσθαι ἀπό construction also appears at Rom 6:7 (ibid. n. 400). In commenting upon *Mand*. 5.1.7 [33.7], where the Shepherd tells Hermas that all those who have fully repented "were justified by the most revered angel" (ἐδικαιώθησαν γὰρ πάντες ὑπὸ τοῦ σεμνοτάτου ἀγγέλου), Osiek correctly observed, "The last phrase has a peculiarly Pauline ring" (*Shepherd*, 120). She then immediately added: "but it is not to be understood in the Pauline way. Rather, it is the reward to all who are faithful in deeds of justice, beginning with the elimination of bad temper." This claim overlooks the witness of Rom 2:13; cf. *Vis*. 3.8.5 [16.5], 1 Thess 1:3. For an argument similar to Osiek's, see Siegfried Schulz, *Die Mitte der Schrift: Der Frühkatholizismus im Neuen Testament als Herausforderung an den Protestantismus* (Stuttgart: Kreuz-Verlag, 1976), 357. Ernst Dassmann, *Der Stachel im Fleisch: Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1979), 229-30 critiqued Schulz for seeing in Hermas "an unpauline devolution of the doctrine of justification" ("[e]ine unpaulinische Entartung der Rechtfertigungslehre"). Strikingly, Osiek, *Shepherd*, 80 did not detect a potential Pauline connection at *Vis*. 3.9.1 [17.1], even though the verb (δικαιοῦσθαι) is the same as at *Mand*. 5.1.7 [33.7]. Snyder's translation of *Vis*. 3.9.1 [17.1] — "in order that you might *be* righteous and purified" — completely paints over the Pauline ring that Osiek later recognizes in Hermas's use of this verb (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 51). The only other use of the verb δικαιοῦσθαι in the *Shepherd* is at *Sim*. 5.7.1 [60.1], where the object of justification is flesh (σάρξ); cf. Gal 2:16, Rom 3:20.

[116] Gebhardt and Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece*, 51: "*A deo* venit" (emphasis added). Jer 42:18 and 44:6 are cited for comparison.

of divine, not human, activity.[117] In a word, even though the Lady does not explicitly describe it thus, the righteousness that God offers to the human is effectively a "heavenly gift."[118] Here again we can discern echoes of the Pauline pseudepigrapher's statement in Eph 2:8. But here the conceptual dependence upon what becomes the *corpus Paulinum* extends deeper than the mere echo. As the Lady tells it, righteousness is given for a specific reason, namely in order that a person "might be justified and sanctified." This pairing is first attested in 1 Cor 6:11. Among other contemporaneous literature, the two words appear in close proximity in *Barn.* 15.7, but its author does not pair them like Paul in 1 Cor 6:11 and Hermas in *Vis.* 3.9.1 [17.1]. Furthermore, *Barnabas* cannot be conclusively dated prior to the *Shepherd*, and its author could very well have discovered the connection between being justified and sanctified in Paul's letter himself.[119] Regardless, it is more reasonable to assume to that Hermas adopted it either directly or indirectly from 1 Corinthians, a text that, as I have shown, he knew and used elsewhere, than that he did so from *Barnabas*, assuming for the sake of the argument that it had been composed before Hermas compiled his visions.

---

[117] This "divine activity" is recognized by BDAG 940, which construes the sense of the verb στάζω at *Vis.* 3.9.1 [17.1] as that of God's "instil[ling]" righteousness in the human. This is the only place in the *Shepherd* where Hermas construes righteousness in this manner. Of the over thirty times he uses the word righteousness (δικαιοσύνη), he typically depicts it as the result of human activity.

[118] Dibelius, *Hirt*, 475: "Gerechtigkeit erscheint hier als Gabe, die Gott herabträufeln läßt, aber die Erziehung der Kirche muß die Gläubigen für diese *himmlische Gabe* bereiten" (emphasis added).

[119] For a concise list of the competing dating suggestions for *Barnabas* and relevant bibliography, see Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 373-74 n. 8. Holmes assigns it to the period between 70 and 135 C.E.

Following her description of the Lord's dripping righteousness upon her imagined

children, the Lady turns to an explanation of the Roman community's "wicked ways" and

"wickedness." She expounds their improper actions at length:

> So then, listen to me and be at peace among yourselves (εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς)
> and look out for each other (ἐπισκέπτεσθε ἀλλήλους) and help each other
> (ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλων). And do not fish the good stuff out of the soup by
> yourselves,[120] but share also with those who lack. For on the one hand, some
> bring weakness upon their flesh (cf. 1 Cor 11:30) and injure their flesh with too
> much food, but on the other hand the flesh of those who do not have food is
> injured because they do not have the sufficient amount of nourishment, and their
> body is ruined. This lack of community spirit (ἀσυνκρασία) really is harmful to
> you who have (cf. 1 Cor 11:22) but do not share with those who lack.[121] Behold
> the coming judgment. You who have more than enough look out for the hungry
> until the Tower is completed, for after the Tower is completed you will want to do
> good but you will not have the opportunity (*Vis.* 3.9.2-5 [17.2-5]).[122]

The Lady's initial statements indicate that the Roman community to which Hermas was to speak

was marked by a number of problems. One problem is the inequality that exists between the rich

and the poor. This inequality manifests itself in the rich having so much food that their bodies are

harmed and the poor lack so much that their bodies are ruined. The Lady attributes this situation

to a "lack of community spirit" (ἀσυνκρασία), which is "harmful" (βλαβερά) to those of means

---

[120] My translation of μὴ μόνοι τὰ κτίσματα τοῦ θεοῦ μεταλαμβάνετε ἐκ καταχύματος follows BDAG 530. Calvo pithily noted that this is a "difficult text" ("[t]exto difícil"; *El Pastor*, 101 n. 106).

[121] The word ἀσυνκρασία is a *hapax legomenon* in extant Greek literature. My translation follows the suggestion of BDAG 146. Cf. 1 Cor 12:24b: ὁ θεὸς συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα.

[122] νῦν οὖν ἀκούσατέ μου καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπισκέπτεσθε ἀλλήλους καὶ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλων, καὶ μὴ μόνοι τὰ κτίσματα τοῦ θεοῦ μεταλαμβάνετε ἐκ καταχύματος, ἀλλὰ μεταδίδοτε καὶ τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἐδεσμάτων ἀσθένειαν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτῶν ἐπισπῶνται καὶ λυμαίνονται τὴν σάρκα αὐτῶν· τῶν δὲ μὴ ἐχόντων ἐδέσματα λυμαίνεται ἡ σὰρξ αὐτῶν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τὸ ἀρκετὸν τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ διαφθείρεται τὸ σῶμα αὐτῶν. αὕτη οὖν ἡ ἀσυνκρασία βλαβερὰ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἔχουσι καὶ μὴ μεταδιδοῦσιν τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις. βλέπετε τὴν κρίσιν τὴν ἐρχομένην. οἱ ὑπερέχοντες οὖν ἐκζητεῖτε τοὺς πεινῶντας ἕως οὔπω ὁ πύργος ἐτελέσθη· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ τελεσθῆναι τὸν πύργον θελήσετε ἀγαθοποιεῖν, καὶ οὐχ ἕξετε τόπον, *Vis.* 3.9.2-6 [17.2-6].

(17.4). Later in the same section, she tells the leaders of the community that they "have become

calloused" (ἐνεσκιρωμένοι, 17.8), presumably toward the needs of others, indeed others of lesser

means. She also posits the existence of "dissensions" (διχοστασίαι) in the community, which, she

warns, might rob the community of its life (17.9).[123]

The factious situation at Rome in the early second century marked by dissensions and

underlying inequality among Christians that the Lady addresses coheres strongly with Paul's

own surviving correspondence with other urban communities of Christ followers decades prior.

For example, the apostle lists "dissensions" (διχοστασίαι) and "factions" (αἱρέσεις) among the

works of the flesh from which he dissuades members of the churches in Galatia, claiming that

such divisions are a barrier to inheriting the Kingdom of God (5:20-21). Furthermore, at the

conclusion of his letter to the Romans, he instructs that audience to "look out for those who

cause dissensions (διχοστασίας) and scandals contrary to the teaching that you learned and [to]

shun them" (Rom 16:17).[124] He then asserts that such persons serve "their own belly" (τῇ ἑαυτῶν

κοιλίᾳ), not Christ (v. 18). The elderly Lady who speaks to Hermas adopts the same descriptor

(διχοστασίαι) and likewise connects it with food and physical self-indulgence.

Even stronger connections are apparent with Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.

Dissensions and factionalism are, of course, reflected and refracted throughout the entirety of 1

---

[123] βλέπετε οὖν, τέκνα, μήποτε αὗται αἱ διχοστασίαι ὑμῶν ἀποστερήσουσιν τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῶν, *Vis*. 3.9.9 [17.9].

[124] Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε ποιοῦντας, καὶ ἐκκλίνετε ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν, Rom. 16:17.

Cor.[125] But the community conflict that Paul diagnoses in ch. 11 is particularly relevant to *Vis*. 3.9 [17].[126] There Paul tells the Corinthians that he has heard that "when [they] come together in assembly, there are divisions (σχίσματα) among [them]" (v. 18; cf. 1:10-11 and also *v.l.* at 3:3).[127] Instead of coming "to eat the feast of the Lord" (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν, v. 21) together, Paul claims that individuals of means eat in the Corinthian house churches apart from the poor.[128] Given the disparity in members' wealth, such Christians feed themselves to excess while the poor remain famished (v. 21). As a response to this community division, the apostle exhorts participants who come together for the Lord's meal to "entertain each other" (ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε, v. 33). And he specifically commands that the truly hungry be allowed to eat at the meal in (the) house (church) (εἴ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω, v. 34a).[129] By coming together and sharing in this way, Paul says, the community avoids divine judgment (v. 34b.).

The Lady's statements to Hermas about his community at Rome have three things in common with Paul's statements to the Corinthians. In both *Vis*. 3.9 [17] and 1 Corinthians, we

---

[125] Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, HUT 28 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991), 65-183.

[126] In the scholarship of the late eighteenth century, this passage was commonly connected with 1 Cor 11, esp. v. 20 and following. See, e.g., Gebhardt and Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece*, 51; F. X. von Funk, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, SAKDQ 1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1901), 451. Strangely, though, this connection has largely fallen out of scholarly view since then. Among the few modern scholars who grant it are Dibelius, *Hirt*, 476, who also connects it with Paul's exhortation to reciprocity in 2 Cor 8:14; and Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 424 n. 412, who frames the connection in terms of ἀσυγκρασία in both contexts.

[127] πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω, 1 Cor 11:18.

[128] Suzanne Watts Henderson, "'If Anyone Hungers': An Integrated Reading of 1 Cor 11.17-34," *NTS* 48 (2002): 195-208.

[129] Ibid., 196, who denies that vv. 22 and 34 "constitute the necessary escape clause of an at-home eating option for the hungering 'haves.'"

find (1) recognition of divisions in the Christian community; (2) attributing the divisions to both a lack of sharing between rich and poor and, more specifically, an overindulgence on the part of the rich; and (4) linking the misbehavior and the dissensions it causes to judgment. These commonalities reflect agreement in both verbiage and logical form. Therefore, they sufficiently demonstrate the adoption and the adaptation of traditions preserved in 1 Corinthians by Hermas. He recognized that Pauline letter as an authoritative text useful for diagnosing and correcting communal conflicts among early Christians, much like Clement did in his own conflict-confronting letter, itself composed previously in the same place as the *Shepherd*.

The possibility of Pauline influence upon Hermas is further apparent in and thus strengthened by the elderly Lady's initial instructions to him in this passage, which together set up the description of dissensions among the Roman community that follows. "Be at peace among yourselves" (εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς), she tells the *Shepherd*'s audience through him, addressing him and them together in the second-person plural (*Vis.* 3.9.2 [17.2]). Her statement is a direct, albeit brief, quotation of 1 Thess 5:13 (cf. 2 Cor 13:11).[130] It is stronger than a mere echo.[131] To

---

[130] According to Zahn, "the entire context [of 1 Thess 5:13] is dominated by similar ideas" ("Man könnte in der Ermahnung die Vorsteher εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς um so mehr eine Erinnerung an 1 Thess. 5, 13 finden, als der ganze dortige Zusammenhang von ähnlichen Gedanken beherrscht ist") (*Hirt*, 411). But, given a similar statement in Mark 9:50, Zahn denies that dependence upon Paul here can be proven. The quotation of 1 Thess 5:13 is recognized by F. X. von Funk, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 2nd ed., SAKDQ 1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1906), 155, 157; Lelong, *Pasteur*, 48-49; Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 123, 125. According to Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 51, 52, it is an allusion (cf. 164). 1 Thess 5:13 is offered for comparison by Dibelius, *Hirt*, 475, who explicitly denies "conscious quotation" ("bewußte Zitierung"), as he likewise does with reference to Rom 15:7; Whittaker, *Hirt*, 51; Brox, *Hirt*, 148 nn. 62, 67; Lindemann and Paulsen, *Apostolischen Väter*, 358; Massaux, *Influence:* Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 149 n. 251; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 100; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 416 n. 326; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 81 n. 5. The connection between 1 Thess 5:13 and *Vis.* 3.9.2 [17.2] is overlooked entirely by Gebhardt and

the contrary, it is part of a wider rhetorical web wherein peace and peaceable living in community are constructed as the proper alternatives to dissension and division across the tripartite text of the *Shepherd*.[132] The Lady herself repeats the same statement at the end of her words to Hermas (*Vis*. 3.9.10 [17.10]). The young man (νεανίσκος, *Vis*. 3.10.7 [18.7]) who appears and explains Hermas's three visions of the Lady repeats it as a condition for his having additional visions as well (*Vis*. 3.12.3 [20.3]). Elsewhere in the *Shepherd*, the absence of peace is connected with the existence of dissensions (*Vis*. 3.6.3 [14.3], *Mand*. 2.3 [27.3], *Sim*. 8.7.2. [73.2]). Perhaps the clearest articulation of this problem and its implications is found in *Sim*. 9.32.2 [109.2], where the Shepherd tells Hermas, "The Lord lives among people who love peace. Indeed, to him peace is precious, but he stays far away from those who are litigious (*litigiosis*)

---

Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece*, 51; Taylor, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 90. Drummond, "Shepherd of Hermas," 115 assigned this parallel a strength of "d" (possible but uncertain).

[131] Osiek described Hermas's multiple uses of the phrase εἰρηνεύειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς in various, sometimes even competing, ways. For example, she labeled it a "familiar refrain" (*Shepherd*, 80). Elsewhere, she suggested it is an "echo" (87, 207) and even "a favorite allusion of the author" (207). But she never explained why, in her view, it does not count as a quotation, despite its verbatim agreement with 1 Thess 5:13. The claim that "be at peace with each other" is a "favorite allusion" of Hermas clearly conflicts with Osiek's contention that, in the *Shepherd*, "[t]here are no explicit allusions or quotations from… Pauline writings" (26). Similarly, Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 14 included the exhortation to "be at peace," known from 1 Thess 5:13, among Hermas's "preferred phrases which sound Pauline," although he immediately added, "the form of the Shepherd and its content has nothing to do with that of Paul."

[132] In addition to the texts engaged here, see *Vis*. 3.5.1 [13.1], where the Lady tells Hermas that church leaders "always had peace with each other" (πάντοτε… καὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς εἰρήνην ἔσχαν) and 3.6.3 [14.3], where she explains that cracked stones in the Tower represent those (Christians) "who do not live peaceably with each other" (οἱ… μὴ εἰρηνεύοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς). At *Vis*. 3.12.3 [20.3], "being at peace with each other" is stated as a criterion for the Lord's showing Hermas additional visions. The antithesis between "being at peace" (εἰρηνεύοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς) and "creating divisions" (διχοστατοῦντες) is explicitly articulated at *Sim*. 8.7.2 [73.2]. Furthermore, the Shepherd says, "if someone returns yet again to division, she will be cast out from the Tower and will lose her life" (ἐὰν δέ τις αὐτῶν πάλιν ἐπιστραφῇ εἰς τὴν διχοστασίαν, ἐκβληθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ πύργου καὶ ἀπολέσει τὴν ζωὴν αὐτοῦ, *Sim*. 8.7.5 [73.5]); cf. *Sim*. 8.7.5 [73.5], 8.8.5 [74.5].

and have been lost to ill will" (cf. 1 Cor 6:1-8).[133] These appeals for peace on the part of the

Lady and later the Shepherd himself cohere strongly with the construction of peace as a

communal ideal across broad swathes of the *corpus Paulinum*.[134]

After exhorting the Roman community to put aside division and instead be at peace, the

Lady immediately adds, "…and look out for each other (ἐπισκέπτεσθε ἀλλήλους) and help each

other (ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλων)."[135] The latter imperative encouraging the community to share

with each other is perhaps an adapted quotation of a similar imperative by Paul at the end of his

own letter to Rome: "…accept (προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους) each other, just as Christ also

accepted (προσελάβετο) you" (Rom 15:7).[136] The only difference between the two imperatives is

their being different compounds of the verb -λαμβάνω. In *Vis*. 3.9.2 [17.2], we find a form of

---

[133] *Dominus habitat en viris amantibus pacem; ei enimvero pax cara est, a litigiosis vero et perditis malitiae longe abest*, *Sim*. 9.32.2 [109.2]. Here too we find probable Pauline influence upon the *Shepherd*, namely from the apostle's response to the reality of division at Corinth, where Christians were accusing each other before secular courts (1 Cor 6:1-8). Cf. the pointed statement in 1 Cor 14:33: "God is not the God of unruliness but peace (οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ εἰρήνης).

[134] Note especially 2 Cor 13:11, Rom 12:18; cf. also 1 Thess 5:23; 1 Cor 7:15, 14:33, 16:11; Gal 5:22, 6:16; Phil 4:7, 9; Rom 2:10, 5:1, 8:6, 14:17, 19, 15:13, 33, 16:20; Col 1:20, 3:15; Eph 2:14-15, 17, 4:3, 6:15, 23; 2 Thess 3:16; 2 Tim 2:22; Heb 12:14, 13:20.

[135] BDAG 89 suggests translating ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε here as "take part, come to the aid of" (i.e., help). However, in light of the exhortation to sharing that immediately follows in *Vis*. 3.9.2 [17.2] (μεταδίδοτε καὶ τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις), the intended help probably had a sharing quality to it. According to LSJ 157, the verb itself could even be translated "share."

[136] Διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom 15:7. This quotation was observed in Funk, *Apostolischen Väter*, 155; Lelong, *Pasteur*, 48-49, although he mistakenly cited v. 17. Rom 15:7 is offered for comparison by Dibelius, *Hirt*, 475, who, as in the case of 1 Thess 5:17, explicitly denies "conscious quotation" ("bewußte Zitierung"); Massaux, *Influence*: Book 2: *Later Christian Writings*, 149 n. 253; Leutzsch, *Hirt*, 423 n. 406; Osiek, *Shepherd*, 81 n. 5, according to whom, presumably following Dibelius, "the paraenesis of mutual care is traditional" (80; cf. 81 n 6). No mention of the parallel at Rom 15:7 is made by Gebhardt and Harnack, *Hermae Pastor graece*, 51; Taylor, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 90-91; Joly, *Hermas Le Pasteur*, 123; Whittaker, *Hirt*, 15; Snyder, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 51; Brox, *Hirt*, 148 n. 63; Lindemann and Paulsen, *Apostolischen Väter*, 358; Ayán Calvo, *El Pastor*, 100.

ἀντιλαμβάνω (cf. "helpful deeds" [ἀντιλήμψεις] at 1 Cor 12:28), whereas in Rom 15:7 we find a form of προσλαμβάνω.[137] It is possible that, as a member of the Roman community of Christ-followers to whom Paul's letter was addressed decades prior, Hermas adopted the apostle's charge that members of it "accept each other" and adapted it slightly to fit the context of his visions.[138] And yet even if Pauline influence cannot be proven at this specific point, the text of *Vis*. 3.9 [17] still betrays the broader influence of 1 Corinthians. Hermas has adopted the apostle's identifiable diagnosis and rooting of dissensions among the community of Christians at Corinth in a lack of sharing between rich and poor, as well as the apostle's connecting such improper behavior with divine judgment, and applied both to dissensions that exist among the community at Rome in his own day.

CONCLUSION

Pauline influence upon Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd*, extends beyond the *Mandates* and *Similitudes* sections. It can readily be seen in the *Visions* section too, even though the scale of Hermas's encounter with textual traditions contained in what becomes the *corpus Paulinum* there is less extensive. That was the over-arching claim substantiated in this chapter, defended via detailed analyses of the ways that Hermas adopted and adapted the contents of Pauline letters in his various visions. These analyses included Hermas's descriptions via his discussions with the Lady of the necessity of baptism, the saving faith that precedes it, and the divine acts of justification and sanctification; the problem of abandoning faith and thereby turning away from

---

[137] My translation of ἀντιλήμψεις as "helpful deeds" follows BDAG 89.
[138] This adaptation could have occurred under the influence of Paul's response to a different community's unwillingness to accept and share with each other in 1 Cor 11.

the living God; the threat presented by an unruly household to the legitimacy of a Christian's claim to leadership status; and the damaging divisions identified in the community of believers at Rome in Hermas's own day. There are perhaps fewer instances of an overt encounter between Hermas and Pauline letters in this section than in the *Mandates* or *Similitudes*. But an unmistakable Pauline construal of key theological concepts and ecclesiological problems is still apparent. Hermas clearly adopted and adapted particular traditions attributed to or otherwise associated with the apostle, among them Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, and 1 Corinthians in his *Visions*. Together with those examples found in the *Mandates* and *Similitudes*, these in the *Visions* further demonstrate the substantial and significant influence of Pauline literature upon the *Shepherd* of Hermas.

CONCLUSION

Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd*, was conversant with wide swathes of what became the *corpus Paulinum*. That claim, various versions of which can be traced back into antiquity, has been the focus of this project. It confronts a widely held position in modern scholarship, namely that Hermas knew very little and probably cared even less about the letters written by or associated with the apostle Paul. That minimalist consensus was solidified over a hundred years ago and largely endures in the scholarly literature, with precious few exceptions. And yet it is a position that, despite its purported rigor, suffers from a number of historical and methodological weaknesses.

Perhaps the most glaring problem with the view that Hermas was uninformed about or at least uninfluenced by Pauline tradition is the recognition that he was active at Rome in precisely the period when Pauline letters were not only gaining widespread recognition but also accruing authority in the imperial city. The compositional history of the *Shepherd* is admittedly convoluted, and various theories have been offered over the years to explain what appear to be the extended writing process that the text underwent, the independent circulation of some of its parts, and perhaps even its composition or editing by multiple persons. But over the past generation or so, the vast majority of specialists on the *Shepherd* have abandoned unduly complicated theories of multiple authorship and come to affirm the essential unity of the text on thematic and conceptual grounds. Furthermore, they now largely agree that the one whom the *Shepherd* names as Hermas was its sole author, and he was not simply a religious sage who rotely transcribed his visionary experiences but a literary figure who engaged in an extended

period of orally presenting and revising them during the first few decades of the second century C.E. Before the end of the first century, the author of *1 Clement*, who himself wrote from Rome to Corinth, discussed the contents of a Pauline letter (i.e., 1 Corinthians) and presumed his letter's recipients would grant its authority. The community of Christ-believers at Rome had itself received a letter from the apostle Paul (i.e., Romans) in the years before what the tradition remembers as his ultimate journey to and death in the city under Nero (64 C.E.). So we know that at least some of Paul's authentic letters were available there in Hermas's time (ca. 100-40 C.E.). Other texts roughly contemporaneous with the *Shepherd* and written to the community at Rome, such as Ignatius's letter, confirm this point, because they quote or otherwise engage the apostle's writings and thus signal their assumption that readers are familiar with and grant authority to them. It is, moreover, reasonable to assume that Roman Christians possessed other letters in addition the one that the apostle sent to them and the one that *1 Clement* explicitly mentions, because by this point Pauline letters had begun circulating beyond — indeed, in some cases far beyond — their original addressees, as can be seen, for example, from Polycarp's letter to Philippi, which was composed at Smyrna and quoted Romans. Whether or not a full collection of all extant letters written by the apostle or in his name, such as $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, had yet been compiled and published, and regardless of who was primarily responsible for that process or when the *corpus* took final form, as a Christian leader active at Rome in the early second century, Hermas almost certainly would have encountered Pauline letters in some manner.

How, then, should we imagine the shape of that encounter? The *Shepherd* rhetorically presents Hermas as at least semi-literate and, more specifically, capable of copying, writing down, and reading texts. Its portrait of Hermas as effectively engaging Roman book technologies

and cultures functions to affirm the divine origin and thus the authority of his composed text and to commend its acceptance and engagement by Hermas's audience. Hermas himself could have engaged a corpus of Pauline letters at Rome in various ways. Although no certain evidence for it survives, it is possible that a communal library or archive of some sort containing such correspondence existed among Christ-believers there like those that have been found in other urban centers of the period. Hermas could have read the letters there himself, as has been suggested by some scholars. Another scenario for Hermas's encounter with Pauline letters, which in my view is more probable, is the corporate reading and discussion of them among the Roman community of believers during a ritual or some other kind of gathering, perhaps a communal meal on the Lord's Day. Those letters presume that they will be read in such a manner, and 1 Thess 5:27 even enjoins the practice. The *Shepherd* itself depicts Hermas participating in the corporate reading of authoritative texts at *Vis*. 2.4.2-3 [8.2-3], which makes this scenario all the more likely. At points, Hermas reincorporates discrete parts of the *corpus Paulinum* verbatim, as in his adoption of the texts of 1 Thess 5:13 at *Vis*. 3.9.1 [17.1] and 1 Cor 7:28 at *Mand*. 4.4.2 [32.2], so one can imagine the possibility of him having a set of Pauline letters before him as he composed and revised the *Shepherd*. But even if Hermas did not read Pauline letters himself, by virtue of his historical setting he still could have become knowledgeable about and conversant with their contours, in addition to the various ways that the contents of those letters were transmitted, interpreted, and debated by his contemporaries, who in their own ways sought to make meaning with Pauline literature in light of the demands and vicissitudes of daily life.

That kind of encounter, in which Hermas hears the contents of what became the *corpus Paulinum* read and discussed, either in whole or in part, should qualify as a "direct literary" one, as much as Hermas's reading a letter by Paul to himself or even paying someone to read to him would. The absence of formal citations of the Pauline corpus (i.e., quotations marked by a citation formula) in the *Shepherd* does not constitute evidence that Hermas did not know it. Instead, their absence fits the pattern whereby with one exception (i.e., the reference to *Eldad and Modat* at *Vis*. 2.3.4 [7.4]) he never cites an authoritative text at all, in keeping with the wider custom of other authors of apocalyptic texts. It also avoids threatening the status of the *Shepherd* as a uniquely inspired, divinely-given text that deserves its own independent authority, both of which Hermas was at pains to protect.

Despite not mentioning the apostle Paul or any letters written by or associated with him, the *Shepherd* of Hermas was still connected to the Pauline legacy developing in the second century. Such connections were recognized even in antiquity. Origen famously suggested that Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd*, was the same Hermas to whom Paul sent greetings in Rom 16:14. Eusebius and Jerome transmitted this idea, and it endured in the manuscript tradition for centuries. Even closer connections can be found therein, such as the suggestion that Hermas was actually a disciple of Paul or even a pseudonym for the apostle himself. Whether or not these associations are historical, they indicate the widespread recognition of the fundamental compatibility between the texts of the Pauline letters and the *Shepherd* and the possibility of influence by the former upon the latter.

The likelihood of such Pauline influence upon Hermas occurring on a meaningful level has been widely discounted in the modern period, resulting in a complete reversal of

longstanding tradition. Since at least the mid-1800s, scholars have typically denied that Hermas knew about or was interested in the apostle, the letters he composed, or those written in his name. They have almost always sought evidence of and ultimately denied "directly literary influence," construing Hermas's potential encounter with "Paul" as only verifiably occurring in the mode of Hermas reading letters himself and incorporating extended verbatim quotations from them directly into his visions wholesale and without change. They have also typically required that a discrete pretext from a particular Pauline letter be identified and isolated as exclusively influential in order for an intertextual encounter to have occurred. And they have usually assumed that Hermas could only ever be (and always have been) overtly Pauline or anti-Pauline. He was either a "Paulinist" or he was not, and if he was not, so the argument goes, then speaking of Pauline influence upon him is nonsensical.

The history of modern inquiry on the problem of Hermas and Pauline letters has been further hampered by broader scholarly preoccupations with particular topics that in effect have likewise limited the likelihood of affirming Pauline influence upon him. Exploring potential relationships between the *Shepherd* and *corpus Paulinum* has normally yielded center stage to investigations of the history of the canon and refutations of "early Catholicism." It has also been skewed by over-arching attempts to discover a "Paul" or "Paulinism" framed primarily in terms of a putatively Pauline agenda that promotes justification by faith and disavows the Law. The frequent association of the *Shepherd* with James, which is normally taken in scholarship to be anti-Pauline in orientation, fuels the governing assumption that the *Shepherd* was likewise opposed to the central aspects of the apostolic legacy. Such scholarly stances and orientations have not only contributed to flat readings of the *Shepherd*. They have also short-circuited the

process of responding sufficiently to the question at hand. This has resulted in the entrenchment of a minimalist scholarly position, according to which Hermas might have known about a few ideas or perhaps even short passages in 1 Corinthians and/or Ephesians but probably nothing more. To be sure, some scholars have argued that he knew other letters too, just as still others have argued that he knew only one of those letters, maybe none at all. But the basic impression of the history of scholarship is readily apparent: Hermas did not know, use, or engage Pauline letters to any substantial and thus meaningful degree.

The problems of approach and perspective outlined above and this minimalist consensus notwithstanding, over the past decade or so two scholars in particular, Joseph Verheyden and Clayton Jefford, reopened the problem of Hermas and Pauline tradition in brief, ultimately concluding that that there very well might be more to it than has historically met other scholars' eyes. I have extended their initial forays across the entirety of the *Shepherd*, starting with explorations of the basic instances of coherence that I detect between it and the *corpus Paulinum* and then compiling a plausible account of Hermas's specific encounter with texts comprising the Pauline literary legacy. A key marker of my study has been openness to discerning influence in data that do not rise to the level of extended verbatim quotation. I have grouped such additional data under three broad categories. These are, first, Hermas's *adoption* of Pauline literary phenomena (e.g., vocabulary and shorthand locutions, metaphors, theological concepts and themes, and argumentative structure and rhetorical form); second, his *adaptation* of Pauline literary phenomena (e.g., use of synonyms and conceptual equivalents, and expansions of ideas); and, third, his *synthesis* of Pauline literary phenomena (e.g., connecting, harmonizing, and clustering related concepts).

Evidence of Hermas's meaningful engagement with Pauline tradition is spread across the three sections of the *Shepherd*. It is strongest in the *Mandates*, slightly less so in the *Similitudes*, and less prominent, but still apparent, in the *Visions*. It is, moreover, both wide-ranging and, at points, remarkably specific. My analysis has shown him to have incorporated, contested, or otherwise engaged material preserved in both the authentic and the pseudepigraphic epistles. Among the former, he probably knew material preserved in 1 Thessalonians, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians and Romans. Among the latter, he probably knew material preserved in Colossians and Ephesians, as well as the Pastoral Epistles. Hermas was also familiar with material preserved in Hebrews, which was widely associated with the apostle in antiquity, even though that view eventually fell out of favor. His familiarity with specific traditions in these particular texts does not allow determination of the full contents of the *corpus Paulinum* that Hermas had access to or the ordering of the letters that it presumably contained. Conclusive evidence that Hermas knew Philemon or 2 Thessalonians, for example, is lacking.

Ultimately, though, what Hermas does cumulatively know about and in what became the *corpus Paulinum* is substantial and significant. But, in light of his historical setting at Rome in the early second century C.E., his extensive engagement with the emerging Pauline literary legacy should not be surprising. Hermas affirms both major and minor topics and theological themes developed within and across the *corpus* through time. These run the gamut from the meaning and function of the rite of Christian initiation (i.e., baptism), the primacy of faith and justification in the divine economy of salvation, and the general necessity of properly oriented ethical living upon conversion to the specific shape such living must take in the household, the wider believing community, and the *polis* beyond. Particular Pauline patterns of thought and

assumptions first attested in the *corpus* on these issues are embedded throughout the *Shepherd*. At points, Hermas connects and then construes certain parts of Pauline letters in light of each other, as can been seen, for example, in his construal of the possibility of causing God's deposited holy Spirit to grieve.

Even though it would be unwise to assert that he was an expert on extant Pauline tradition, Hermas was a Pauline interpreter. He himself might not have wanted that label or that of Paulinist. But Hermas carefully and creatively engaged traditions preserved in letters written by or associated with the apostle, and he also interpreted (and corrected) his own experience and the experience of the Roman Christ-believing community to which he belonged in light of those letters. At times Hermas even implicitly participates in particular Paulinist debates, using many of their own terms. Indeed, much of what was foundational for and uniquely developed by the apostle and those whose writings together came to comprise the Pauline legacy was foundational for Hermas too. Recognizing the central importance of Pauline tradition for Hermas should reorient scholarly study of the *Shepherd* by reconnecting it with early Paulinism and, at the same time, extend reconstructions of the sphere of Pauline influence even wider in the second century C.E.

The three sections of the *Shepherd* represent only a few of the many interpretive arenas into which the letters produced by Paul and his pseudepigraphers entered. Over such arenas he and they lacked full control.[1] Within these arenas, readers and hearers of Pauline letters made meaning with them in ways that collectively represent the apostle's history of effects and

---

[1] Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 96.

constitute his emerging legacy. Hermas inhabited the Christian literary world that Paul

inaugurated and participated within the group of Christ-believing interpreters of what became the

*corpus Paulinum* at Rome, even as he presumably participated in other groups too. Therefore,

Hermas and the *Shepherd* should be re-connected with the broad, conflicted, and porously

bounded history of Paulinism, even if he did not aspire to affect its course and outcome to the

degree that staunch supporters of the apostle, such as the author of the Pastoral Epistles or the

*Acts of Paul*, did. Together with texts like the Gospel of Matthew and James, and others too, the

letters comprising the *corpus Paulinum* that Hermas engaged were crucial ingredients in his

literary stew.[2] Rituals, forms of ideal community, identified problems, theological positions, and

points of debate preserved in that collection of letters offered Hermas distinct elements of a

religious language that he adopted, adapted, and synthesized to his own ends as he presented the

literary version of his visionary encounters with various figures throughout the *Shepherd*.

---

[2] On the possibility of Pauline conceptual *theologoumena* as they relate to second-century
authors more generally, see Andreas Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des
Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis
Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979), 18.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aageson, James W. *Paul, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Early Church*. LPS. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008.

d'Abbadie, Antonius, ed. *Hermae Pastor: Aethiopice primum edidit et aethiopica latine vertit*. AKM II, 1. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1860.

Agnigori, Hippolyte. *Le pasteur d'Hermas: Une vision de l'au-delà au IIe siècle: Conception eschatologique dans la Sim. IX*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2015.

Ahern, Barnabas M. "The Indwelling Spirit, Pledge of Our Inheritance (Eph. 1:14)." *CBQ* 9 (1947): 179-89.

Aland, Kurt. "Die Entstehung des Corpus Paulinum." Pages 302-50 in *Neutestamentliche Entwürfe*. TBNT 63. München: Kaiser, 1979.

———. "Methodische Bemerkungen zum Corpus Paulinum bei den Kirchenvätern des zweiten Jahrhunderts." Pages 29-48 in *Kerygma und Logos: Beitrage zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum: Festschrift für Carl Andresen zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Adolf Martin Ritter. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979.

Aland, Kurt, and Hans-Udo Rosenbaum, eds. *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri* Vol. 2: *Kirchenväter - Papyri* Part 1: Beschreibungen. PTS 42. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 1995.

Aleith, Eva. *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche*. BZNW 18. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1937.

Allenbach, J., A. Benoît, D. A. Bertrand, A. Hanriot-Coustet, P. Maraval, A. Pautler, and P. Prigent, eds. *Biblia patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique* Vol. 1: *Des origines à Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullien*. Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975.

Alves de Sousa, G. "A penitência no Pastor de Hermas, mensagem de esperança." *AT* 15.2 (2001): 551-66.

Anger, Rudolf. *Hermae Pastor*. Leipzig: Weigel, 1856.

Asher, Jeffrey R. "An Unworthy Foe: Heroic Ἔθη, Trickery, and an Insult in Ephesians 6:11." *JBL* 130 (2011): 729-48.

Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Herm. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989.

Audet, Jean-Paul. "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline." *RB* 60 (1953): 41-82.

Aune, David E. "Herm. Mand. 11.2: Christian False Prophets Who Say What People Wish to Hear." *JBL* 97 (1978): 103-4.

———. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.

Ayán Calvo, Juan José. *El Pastor*. FP 6. Madrid: Editorial Ciudad Nueva, 1995.

Babcock, William S., ed. *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*. 1st ed. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.

Backus, Irena. "Renaissance Attitudes to New Testament Apocryphal Writings: Jacques Lefevre d'Etaples and His Epigones." *RQ* 51 (1998): 1169-98.

Bagnall, Roger S. *Early Christian Books in Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Baker, David Ian. "*The Shepherd of Hermas*: A Socio-Rhetorical and Statistical-Linguistic Study of Authorship and Community Concerns." Ph.D. diss., University of Wales, Cardiff, 2006.

Barberet, F. "La formule ζῆν τῷ θεῷ dans le Pasteur d'Hermas." *RevScRel* 46 (1958): 379-407.

Bardy, G., ed. *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire ecclésiastique*. 3 vols. SC 31, 41, 55. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952, 1955, 1958.

Barnard, Leslie W. *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.

Barnett, Albert Edward. *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Barrett, C. K. "Pauline Controversies in the Post-Pauline Period." *NTS* 20 (1974): 229-45.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. PointsLit 70. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1970.

Batovici, Daniel. "A New Hermas Papyrus Fragment in Paris." *APF* 62 (2016): 20-36.

———. "*Hermas*' Authority in Irenaeus' Works: A Reassessment." *Aug* 55 (2015): 5-31.

———. "The Second-Century Reception of John: A Survey of Methodologies." *CBR* 12 (2010): 396-409.

Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Translated by Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

———. "Der Wortgottesdienst der ältesten Christen." Pages 155-209 in *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*. Edited by Georg Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr, 1967.

Baumgärtner, P. *Die Einheit des Hermas-Buchs*. Freiburg im Breisgau: J. C. B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1889.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, His Epistles and Teachings: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. Edited by Eduard Zeller. 2 vols. 2nd ed. TTFL. London: Williams and Norgate, 1873.

BeDuhn, Jason D. *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon*. Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013.

Behr, John, trans. *St. Irenaeus, On the Apostolic Preaching*. PP. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.

Beker, J. C. "Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology." Pages 64-69 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTSup 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Benecke, P. V. M. "Polycarp." Pages 84-104 in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Benoît, André. *Le baptême chrétien au second siècle: La théologie des pères*. EHPR 43. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953.

Berding, Kenneth. *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of Their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature*. VCSup 62. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Berger, Klaus. *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschickes Jesu in frühchristlichen Texten*. SUNT 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6." Pages 240-71 in *Paulinische Studien*. GA 3. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994.

Beylot, Robert. "Hermas: Le Pasteur: Quelques variantes inédites de la version éthiopienne." Pages 155-62 in *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont: Contributions à l'étude des Christianismes orientaux*. Edited by René-Georges Coquin. CahOr 20. Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1988.

Bigg, Charles. *The Origins of Christianity*. Edited by T. B. Strong. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

Bird, Michael F., and Joseph R. Dodson, eds. *Paul and the Second Century*. LNTS 412. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

Birt, Theodor. *Aus dem Leben der Antike*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1918.

———. *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur*. Berlin: W. Hertz, 1882.

Bishop, M. C., and J. C. Coulston. *Roman Military Equipment: From the Punic Wars to the Fall of Rome*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006.

Blomkvist, Vemund. "The Teaching on Baptism in the Shepherd of Hermas." Pages 849-70 in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by David Hellholm, Tor Vegge, Øyvind Norderval, and Christer Hellholm. Vol. 2. 3 vols. BZNW 176. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Bonner, Campbell. "A New Fragment of the Shepherd of Hermas (Michigan Papyrus 44-H)." *HTR* 20 (1927): 105-16.

———. "A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas." *HTR* 18 (1925): 115-27.

———. *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas: (Similitudes 2-9) with a Fragment of the Mandates*. UMSHS 22. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1934.

Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*. 2. umgearb. Aufl. FRLANT 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.

Braun, Herbert. *An die Hebräer*. HNT 14. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1984.

Brewer, Raymond R. "The Meaning of *Politeuesthe* in Philippians 1:27." *JBL* 73 (1954): 76-83.

Brox, Norbert. *Hirt des Hermas*. KAV 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

———. "Die weggeworfenen Steine im Pastor Hermae Vis III,7,5." *ZNW* 80.1 (1989): 130-33.

Bucur, Bogdan Gabriel. "Angelmorphic Pneumatology in the Shepherd of Hermas." Pages 113-38 in *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*. VCSup 95. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Ignatius and Paul." Pages 267-77 in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*. Edited by Schubert M. Ogden, Translated by Schubert M. Ogden. LAB. New York: Meridian Books, 1960.

———. "Ignatius und Paulus." Pages 37-51 in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii*. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: de Erven F. Bohn, 1953.

Campbell, Douglas A. *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26*. JSNTSup 65. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Campenhausen, Hans von. *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. BHT 14. Tübingen: Mohr, 1953.

———. *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe*. SHAW, PHK 36. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1951.

Canavan, Rosemary. *Clothing the Body of Christ at Colossae: A Visual Construction of Identity*. WUNT II 334. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Carlini, Antonio. "Due estratti del Pastore di Erma nella versione Palatina in *Par. Lat.* 3182." *SCO* 35 (1985): 311-12.

———. "Erma (*Vis*. II 3, 1) testimone testuale di Paolo?" *SCO* 37 (1987): 235-39.

———. "P. Michigan 130 (inv. 44-H) e il problema dell'unicità di redazione del Pastore di Erma." *ParPass* 38 (1983): 29-37.

———. *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII. Erma: Il Pastore (Ia-IIIa visione)*. PBB. Cologne; Geneva: Foundation Martin Bodmer, 1991.

———. "La rappresentazione della ΠΙΣΤΙΣ personificata nella terza Visione di Erma." *CClCr* 9 (1988): 85-94.

———. "Testimone e testo: il problema della datazione di PIand I 4 del *Pastore* di Erma." *SCO* 42 (1992): 17-30 and Tables I-II.

———. "La tradizione testuale del Pastore di Erma e i nuovi papiri." Pages 21-43 in *Le Strade del testo*. Edited by Guglielmo Cavallo. StC 5. Bari: Adriatica, 1987.

Carlini, Antonio, and M. Bandini. "Il *Pastore* di Erma: nuove testimonianze e vecchi problemi." Pages 91-105 in *I papiri letterari cristiani: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi in memoria di Mario Naldini, Firenze, 10-11 giugno 2010*. Edited by Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova. STP n. s. 13. Firenze: Istituto papirologico "G. Vitelli," 2011.

Carlyle, A. J. "I Clement." Pages 37-62 in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Cerfaux, Lucien. *Une lecture de l'Épître aux Romains*. BISSR 2. Tournai: Casterman, 1947.

Chadwick, Henry. "The New Edition of Hermas." *JTS* 8 (1957): 274-80.

Champagny, Franz de. *Les Antonins, ans de J.-C. 69-180* Vol. 1: *Suite de Césars et de Rome et la Judée*. 3rd rev. ed. EER 7. Paris: Bray et Retaux, 1874.

Charlesworth, James H. "Odes of Solomon." Pages 725-71 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Vol. 2: *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, and Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.

———. "Towards a Taxonomy of Discerning Influence(s) Between Two Texts." Pages 41-54 in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt. NTOA / SUNT 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Choat, Malcolm, and Rachel Yuen-Collingridge. "The Egyptian Hermas: The Shepherd in Egypt Before Constantine." Pages 191-212 in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. TENTS 5. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Clabeaux, John James. *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion*. CBQMS 21. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.

Clivaz, Claire. "Categories of Ancient Christian Texts and Writing Materials 'Taking Once Again a Fresh Starting Point.'" Pages 35-58 in *Ancient Worlds in Digital Culture*. Edited by Claire Clivaz, Paul Dilley, and David Hamidović. DBS. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Cohn, L. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Vol. 4. Berlin: Reimer, 1902.

Coleborne, William. "A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas." Ph.D. diss., University of Newcastle, 1965.

———. "A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas." *Colloq* 3 (1969): 133-42.

———. "The Shepherd of Hermas - A Case for Multiple Authorship and Some Implications." *StPatr* 10.1 (1970): 65-70.

Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Study. *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Copeland, Kirsti B. "Sinners and Post-Mortem 'Baptism' in the Acherusian Lake." Pages 91-107 in *The Apocalypse of Peter*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz. SECA 7. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Cotelier, Jean-Baptiste. *SS. patrum, qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabæ, Clementis, Hermæ, Ignatii, Polycarpi opera, vera, et suppositicia*. Luteciæ Parisiorum: Typis Petri Le Petit, 1672.

Coulston, Jonathan C. N. "Arms and Armour." *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. 3rd rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

———. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. ASP 36. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Cullmann, Oscar. *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*. ATANT 3. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1950.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup, and David Hellholm. "Garment-Metaphors: The Old and the New Human Being." Pages 139-58 in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy: Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "'Knowing How to Preside over His Own Household': Imperial Masculinity and Christian Asceticism in the Pastorals, *Hermas*, and Luke-Acts." Pages 265-95 in *New Testament Masculinities*. Edited by Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson. SemeiaSt 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Daniélou, Jean. *Philo of Alexandria*. Translated by James G. Colbert. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014.

Dassmann, Ernst. *Der Stachel im Fleisch: Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1979.

Dehandschutter, Boudewijn. "Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: An Early Example of 'Reception.'" Pages 275-91 in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*. Edited by Jean-Marie Sevrin. BETL 86. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1989.

Dekkers, Eligius. "Les traductions latines du Pasteur d'Hermas." *Euph* N.S. 22 (1994): 13-26.

Delaporte, Louis. "Le Pasteur d'Hermas: Fragments de la version copte-sahidique." *ROC* 10 (1905): 424-33.

———. "Le Pasteur d'Hermas: Nouveaux fragments sahidiques." *ROC* n.s. 1 (1906): 301-11.

DeSilva, David Arthur. *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*. SCS. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Dibelius, Martin. *Die apostolischen Väter: Der Hirt des Hermas*. Vol. 4. HNT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923.

———. *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Michael A. Williams. Herm. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Dibelius, Martin, and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro. Herm. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

Dierks, Theodore. *Reconciliation and Justification*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1938.

Dines, Jennifer M. *The Septuagint*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb. UBW. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Dinkler, Erich. "Die Taufterminologie in 2 Kor 1.21f." Pages 173-91 in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht*. NovTSup 6. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962.

Dölger, Franz Joseph. *Sphragis: Eine altchristliche Taufbezeichnung in ihren Beziehungen zur profanen und religiösen Kultur des Altertums*. SGKA 5. Bd., 3./4. Heft. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1911.

Doering, Lutz. "The Commissioning of Paul: Light from the Prophet Jeremiah on the Self-Understanding of the Apostle?" Pages 544-65 in *Jeremiah's Scriptures: Production, Reception, Interaction, and Transformation*. Edited by Hindy Najman and Konrad Schmid. JSJSup 173. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Doutreleau, L., B. Hemmerdinger, B.C. Mercier, and A. Rousseau, eds. *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre 4*. 2 vols. SC 100. Paris: Cerf, 1965.

Doutreleau, L., and A. Rousseau, eds. *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre 3*. 2 vols. SC 211. Paris: Cerf, 1974.

Dressel, Albert Rudolf Maximilian. *Hermae Pastor* in *Patrum apostolicorum opera*. Lipsiae: J. C. Hinrichs, 1857.

Drummond, James. "Shepherd of Hermas." Pages 105-23 in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Duff, Jeremy. "$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and the Pastorals: A Misleading Consensus?" *NTS* 44 (1998): 578-90.

Duff, Paul Brooks. "Apostolic Suffering and the Language of Processions in 2 Corinthians 4:7-10." *BTB* 21.4 (1991): 158-65.

Dunn, Peter W. "The *Acts of Paul* and the Pauline Legacy in the Second Century." Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1996.

———. "The New Testament in the *Acts of Paul*." Pages 149-71 in *Christian Apocrypha: Receptions of the New Testament in Ancient Christian Apocrypha*. Edited by Jean-Michel Roessli and Tobias Nicklas. NTP 26. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.

Eastman, David L. *Paul the Martyr: The Cult of the Apostle in the Latin West*. WGRWSup 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. LCL 24-25. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Elliott, John H. "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research." *JBL* 95 (1976): 243-54.

Elliott, J. K., ed. "The Acts of Paul." Pages 350-89 in *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Translated by J. K. Elliott. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Erho, T. "A Third Ethiopic Witness to the Shepherd of Hermas." *ParPass* 67 (2012): 363-70.

Ferguson, Everett. *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.

———. "Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance." *StPatr* 17 (1982): 677-83.

———. "Review of *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* by Geoffrey Mark Hahneman." *JTS* 44 (1993): 691-97.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Finegan, Jack. "The Original Form of the Pauline Collection." *HTR* 49 (1956): 85-103.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Ford, Josephine Massingberd. "A Possible Liturgical Background to the Shepherd of Hermas." *RevQ* 6 (1969): 531-51.

Foster, Paul. "Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament." *JSNT* 38 (2015): 96-111.

———. "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament." Pages 159-86 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Frei, Hans A. "Metanoia im 'Hirten' des Hermas." *IKZ* 64 (1974): 118-39, 189-202.

———. "Metanoia im 'Hirten' des Hermas." *IKZ* 65 (1975): 120-38, 176-204.

Frend, W. H. C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.

Funk, F. X. von. *Die Apostolischen Väter*. SAKDQ 1. Tübingen: Mohr, 1901.

———. *Die Apostolischen Väter*. 2nd ed. SAKDQ 1. Tübingen: Mohr, 1906.

———. "Die Einheit des Hirten des Hermas." *TQ* 81 (1899): 321-60.

———, ed. *Patres apostolici*. 2. adaucta et emendata. Tubingæ: H. Laupp, 1901.

Gaâb, Ernst. *Der Hirte des Hermas: Ein Beitrag zur Patristik*. Basel: Felix Schneider, 1866.

Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

———. "The Book Trade in the Roman Empire." Pages 23-36 in *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

———. "Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping of the New Testament Canon." Pages 27-39 in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels -- The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P[45]*. Edited by Charles Horton. JSNTSup 258. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

———. "Marcion and the 'Canon.'" Pages 195-213 in *The Cambridge History of Christianity* Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine*. Edited by Frances M. Young and Margaret M. Mitchell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

———. *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning*. GBSNTS. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Gebhardt, Oscar von, and Adolf von Harnack. *Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e codice palatino*. PAO 3. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877.

Gerbel, Nikolaus. *Pastoris Nuntii Poenitentiae, Visiones quinq[ue], Mandata duodecim, Similitudines vero decem*. Argentorati: Schott, 1522.

Giet, Stanislas. *Hermas et les Pasteurs: Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1963.

———. "Un témoignage possible sur l'administration du baptême dans les premières années du IIe siècle et sur le rôle ministériel d'Hermas." Pages 191-97 in *Atti del VI Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana, Ravenna, 23-30 Settembre, 1962*. SAC 26. Città del Vaticano: Pontificio Instituto di archeologia cristiana, 1965.

Goldhahn-Müller, Ingrid. *Die Grenze der Gemeinde: Studien zum Problem der Zweiten Busse in Neuen Testament unter Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung im 2. Jh. bis Tertullian*. GTA 39. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Gonis, Nikolaos. "P.Oxy. 4706: Hermas, Visiones III 4.3, 6.6, 9.6-7, 13.3-IV 1.1, 7-9; Mandata II 4-5, IV 1.1, 3.6, 4.3-4, V 1.6-7, VI 1.3-5, VII 5, VIII 6, IX 7-8, X 1.1-2." Pages 3-12 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 69. GRM 89. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2005.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. *Die ältesten Apologeten: Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915.

———. *The Apostolic Fathers, an American Translation*. New York: Harper, 1950.

———. "Foreword." Pages vii-viii in *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. By Albert Edward Barnett. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

———. *The Meaning of Ephesians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.

Goppelt, Leonhard. *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert: Ein Aufriss der Urgeschichte der Kirche*. BFCT 2. Reihe 55. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954.

Grant, Robert M. *The Formation of the New Testament*. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1965.

———. "The Heresy of Tatian." *JTS* 5 (1954): 62-68.

———. *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*. London: Collins, 1963.

———. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. ECF. London: Routledge, 1997.

———. "Review of *Hermas et les Pasteurs: Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas* by Stanislas Giet." *Gn* 36 (1964): 357-59.

———. "Tatian and the Bible." *StPatr* 1 (1957): 297-306.

Gray, Patrick. "The Early Reception of Hebrews 6:4-6." Pages 321-39 in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*. Edited by Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day. NovTSup 129. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Gregory, Andrew F. "*1 Clement* and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament." Pages 129-57 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Gregory, Andrew F., and Christopher M. Tuckett. "Reflections on Method: What Constitutes the Use of the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers?" Pages 61-82 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Gronewald, Michael. "Ein verkannter Hermas-Papyrus (P. Iand. I 4 = Hermae Pastor, Mand. XI 19-21; XII 1,2-3)." *ZPE* 40 (1980): 53-54.

Grundeken, Mark. "Baptism and Μετάνοια in the *Shepherd of Hermas*." Pages 127-42 in *Early Christian Communities Between Ideal and Reality*. Edited by Mark Grundeken and Joseph Verheyden. WUNT I 342. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

———. *Community Building in the* Shepherd of Hermas*: A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects*. VCSup 131. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Gudorf, Michael E. "The Use of ΠΑΛΗ in Ephesians 6:12." *JBL* 117 (1998): 331-35.

Guéranger, Prosper. *Sainte Cécile et la société romaine aux deux premiers siècles*. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1877.

Guth, Charles J. "The Relationship of Faith and Works in the Soteriologies of the Apostolic Fathers." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1994.

Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. 4th rev. ed. MRC. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990.

Haelst, Joseph van. "Les origines du codex." Pages 13-35 in *Les débuts du codex: actes de la journée d'étude*. Edited by Alain Blanchard. Bibl 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.

———. *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*. Papyr 1. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976.

Hahn, Ferdinand. "Prophetie und Lebenswandel: Bemerkungen zu Paulus und zu zwei Texten der Apostolischen Vater." Pages 527-37 in *Neues Testament und Ethik: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg*. Edited by Helmut Merklein. Freiburg: Herder, 1989.

Hahneman, Geoffrey Mark. *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. OTM. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

———. "The Muratorian Fragment and the Origins of the New Testament Canon." Pages 405-15 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.

Hagner, Donald Alfred. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. NovTSup 34. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Hamman, A. "La signification de σφραγίς dans le Pasteur d'Hermas." *StPatr* 4.2 (1961): 286-90.

Harmer, John Reginald, and Joseph Barber Lightfoot. *The Apostolic Fathers*. London: Macmillan, 1891.

Harnack, Adolf von. "Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden." Pages 124-41 in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1928.

———. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament*: Vol. 6: *Über den privaten Gebrauch der heiligen Schriften in der alten Kirche*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912.

———. *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christlichen Briefsammlungen*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926.

———. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893.

———. "Geschichte der Lehre von der Seligkeit allein durch den Glauben in der alten Kirche." *ZThK* 1 (1891): 82-178.

———. *Militia Christi: Die christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1905.

———. *New Testament Studies*: Vol. 5: *Bible Reading in the Early Church*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. CTL 37. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

Harris, J. Rendel. "On the Angelology of Hermas." *JHUC* 3.30 (1884): 75.

———. "On the Angelology of Hermas." Pages 21-25 in *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.

Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Hartman, Lars. *"Into the Name of the Lord Jesus": Baptism in the Early Church*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

———. "Obligatory Baptism—but Why? On Baptism in the Didache and in the Shepherd of Hermas." *SEÅ* 59 (1994): 127-43.

Hartog, Paul Anthony. *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and Its Allusions to New Testament Literature*. WUNT II 134. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Haussleiter, Johannes. "De versionibus Pastoris Hermae latinis." *ASPE* 3 (1884): 399-477.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

van der Heide, A. "Appendix I: The Hebrew *Testament of Naphtali*." Pages 446-50 in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.

Heilig, Christoph. *Hidden Criticism? The Methodology and Plausibility of the Search for a Counter-Imperial Subtext in Paul*. WUNT II 392. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Heitmüller, Wilhelm. *"Im namen Jesu": Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe*. FRLANT 1/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.

Hemmerdinger, Bertrand. "Observations critiques sur Irénée, IV (*Sources chrétiennes* 100) ou les mésaventures d'un philologue." *JTS* 17 (1966): 308-26.

Henderson, Suzanne Watts. "'If Anyone Hungers': An Integrated Reading of 1 Cor 11.17-34." *NTS* 48 (2002): 195-208.

Henne, Philippe. *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*. Par 33. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1992.

———. "La Datation du Canon de Muratori." *RB* 100 (1993): 54-75.

———. "Hermas en Egypte: La tradition manuscrite et l'unité rédactionnelle du Pasteur." *CNS* 11 (1990): 237-56.

———. "Hermas, un pseudonyme." *StPatr* 26 (1993): 136-39.

———. *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*. CA. Paris: Cerf, 2011.

———. "La pénitence et la rédaction du Pasteur d'Hermas." *RB* 98 (1991): 358-97.

———. "La polysémie allégorique dans le Pasteur d'Hermas." *ETL* 65 (1989): 131-35.

———. *L'Unité du Pasteur d'Hermas: Tradition et rédaction*. CahRB 31. Paris: Gabalda, 1992.

———. "Un seul 'Pasteur', un seul Hermas." *RTL* 23 (1992): 482-88.

Herzer, Jens. *Petrus oder Paulus? Studien über das Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur paulinischen Tradition*. WUNT I 103. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Die Apostolischen Väter: Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Ursprung der unter ihrem Namen erhaltenen Schriften*. Halle: Pfeffer, 1853.

———. *Hermae Pastor: Veterem latinam interpretationem e codicibus*. Leipzig: Reisland, 1873.

———. *Hermae Pastor* Vol. 3 of *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum*. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1881.

———. *Novum testamentum extra canonem receptum* Vol. 3: *Hermae Pastor*. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1866.

———. "Das Urchristenthum und seine neuesten Bearbeitungen von Lechler und Ritschl." *ZWT* 1 (1858): 377-440.

Hilhorst, Antonius. "Erotic Elements in the Shepherd of Hermas." Pages 193-204 in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*. Edited by H. Hofmann and M. Zimmerman. Vol. 9. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988.

———. *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*. GCP fasc. 5. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976.

Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

———. "Paul and Polycarp." Pages 57-69 in *Paul and the Second Century*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson. LNTS 412. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

———. "Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament." Pages 187-227 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Horrell, David G. "The Product of a Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1 Peter." *JSNT* 86 (2002): 29-60.

Horsley, G. H. R. "Novatian Christians at Nikaia?" Pages 259-61 in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1979*. Vol. 4. North Ryde, N.S.W.: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1987.

Horst, Pieter W. van der. "Observations on a Pauline Expression." *NTS* 19 (1973): 181-87.

Hort, F. J. A. "Hermas and Theodotion." *JHUC* 4.35 (1884): 23.

Hückstädt, Ernst. *Der Lehrbegriff des Hirten: Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des zweiten Jahrhunderts*. Anklam: A. Schmidt, 1889.

Hunt, Emily J. *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian*. RECM. London: Routledge, 2003.

Inge, W. R. "Ignatius." Pages 63-83 in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Irmscher, J., F. Paschke, and B. Rehm. *Die Pseudoklementinen I. Homilien*. 2nd ed. GCS 42. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969.

Jachmann, Karl Reinhold. *Der Hirte des Hermas: Ein Beitrag zur Patristik*. Königsberg: J. H. Bon, 1835.

James, M. R. *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Apocryphal Books and Fragments*. TS 2, no. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893.

Janssen, David. "The Roman Cuirass Breastplate Statue and Paul's Use of Armour Language in Romans 13:12 and 1 Thessalonians 5:8." *Colloq* 46 (2014): 55-85.

Jaubert, A., ed., *Clément de Rome: Épître aux Corinthiens*, SC 167. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971.

Jauhiainen, Marko. *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation*. WUNT II 199. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Jay, Eric G. "From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters: Christian Ministry in the Second Century: A Survey." *SecCent* 1 (1981): 125-62.

Jefford, Clayton N. *The Apostolic Fathers and the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.

―――. "Missing Pauline Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers?: *Didache*, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Papias, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, and the *Epistle to Diognetus*." Pages 41-60 in *The Apostolic Fathers and Paul*. Edited by Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite. PPSD 2. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.

―――. "The Shepherd of Hermas." Pages 134-58 in *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.

Jewett, Robert. *Romans*. Edited by Eldon J. Epp. Herm. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*. AB 35A. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Joly, Robert. "La doctrine pénitentielle de Pasteur d'Hermas et l'exégèse récente." *RHR* 147 (1955): 32-49.

―――. "Hermas et le Pasteur." *VC* 21 (1967): 201-18.

―――. *Hermas Le Pasteur*. 1st ed. SC 53. Paris: Cerf, 1958.

―――. *Hermas Le Pasteur*. 2nd rev. ed. SC 53 [bis]. Paris: Cerf, 1968.

———. "Le milieu complexe du 'Pasteur d'Hermas.'" Pages 524-51 in *ANRW*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Part 2, *Principat*, 27.1. New York: de Gruyter, 1993.

Jones, Brian W. *The Emperor Domitian*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Judge, E. A. "Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents." *TynBul* 35 (1984): 3-24.

Kasser, Rodolphe, and Philippe Luisier. "Le Papyrus Bodmer XLI en Édition Princeps: L'Épisode d'Éphèse des *Acta Pauli* en Copte et en Traduction." *Mus* 117 (2004): 281-384.

Kehl, Alois. "Gewand (der Seele)." Pages 945-1025 in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. Vol. 10. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1978.

Kelhoffer, James A. "'How Soon a Book' Revisited: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ as a Reference to 'Gospel' Materials in the First Half of the Second Century." Pages 39-75 in *Conceptions of "Gospel" and Legitimacy in Early Christianity*. WUNT I 324. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Kensky, Meira Z. *Trying Man, Trying God: The Divine Courtroom in Early Jewish and Christian Literature*. WUNT II 289. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* Fasc. I: *General Introduction*. London: Emery Walker, 1933.

———, ed. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* Fasc. III: *Pauline Epistles and Revelation: Text*. London: Emery Walker, 1934.

———, ed. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* Fasc. III Supplement: *Pauline Epistles: Plates*. London: Emery Walker, 1937.

Kim, Chŏng-hun. *The Significance of Clothing Imagery in the Pauline Corpus*. JSNTSup 268. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Kim, Young Kyu. "Palaeographical Dating of P[46] to the Later First Century." *Bib* 69 (1988): 248-57.

Kirkland, Alastair. "The Literary History of the Shepherd of Hermas, Visions I to IV." *SecCent* 9.2 (1992): 87-102.

———. "Review of *L'Unité du Pasteur d'Hermas: Tradition et redaction* by Philippe Henne." *NovT* 37 (1995): 305-07.

———. "The Shepherd of Hermas: Some Aspects of Its Composition and Transmission." Ph.D. diss., University of Cape Town, 1990.

Kitzberger, Ingrid R. *Bau der Gemeinde: Das paulinische Wortfeld oikodomē, (ep)oikodomein*. FzB 53. Würzburg: Echter, 1986.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. *4. Makkabäerbuch*. JSHRZ 3; ULF 6. Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1989.

Kliefoth, Theodor. *Die ursprüngliche Gottesdienstordnung in den deutschen Kirchen lutherischen Bakenntnisses: Ihre Destruction und Reformation*. Rostock: Stiller, 1847.

Knox, John. *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul: A New View of Its Place and Importance*. Rev. ed. New York: Abingdon, 1959.

Koester, Craig R. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 36. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament* Vol. 2: *History and Literature of Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. New York: de Gruyter, 2000.

Kraft, Robert A., "The *Epistle of Barnabas*: Its Quotations and Their Sources." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1961.

———, ed. *Épître de Barnabé*. Translated by Pierre Prigent. SC 172. Paris: Cerf, 1971.

Krentz, Edgar. "Paul, Games, and the Military." Pages 344-83 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Kreuzer, Siegfried. *Der lebendige Gott: Bedeutung, Herkunft und Entwicklung einer alttestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnung*. BWANT 6. Folge, Heft 16. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1983.

Kristeva, Julia. "Le mot, le dialogue et le roman." Pages 82-112 in *Sēmeiōtikē: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. PE 96. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1969.

Kruger, Michael J. *The Question of Canon: Challenging the Status Quo in the New Testament Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013.

Kwon, Yon-Gyong. "'Αρραβων as Pledge in Second Corinthians." *NTS* 54 (2008): 525-41.

Lake, Kirsopp. *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul: Their Motive and Origin*. London: Rivingtons, 1911.

———. *Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of the Shepherd of Hermas*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

———. "The Shepherd of Hermas and Christian Life in Rome in the Second Century." *HTR* 4 (1911): 25-46.

Lampe, G. W. H. *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers*. London: Longmans, Green, 1951.

Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Edited by Marshall D. Johnson. Translated by Michael Steinhauser. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003.

Lampros, Spyridon P. *A Collation of the Athos Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas*. Translated by J. Armitage Robinson. Cambridge: Clay and Sons, 1888.

Lantshoot, Arnold van. "Un second témoin éthiopien du 'Pasteur' d'Hermas." *Byz* 32 (1962): 93-96.

Lappa-Zizicas, Eurydice. "Cinq fragments du *Pasteur* d'Hermas dans un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris." *RevScRel* 53 (1965): 251-56.

Lefèvre d'Etaples, Jacques. *Liber trium virorum et trium spiritualium virginum*. Paris: Stephanus, 1513.

Lefort, L. Théophile, ed. *Les Pères apostoliques en copte*. CSCO 135; ScrCopt 17. Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1952.

Lehtipuu, Outi. *Debates Over the Resurrection of the Dead: Constructing Early Christian Identity*. OECS. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Leipoldt, Johannes. "Der Hirt des Hermas in saïdischer Übersetzung." Pages 261-68 in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1903.

Lelong, Auguste. *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*. TDEHC 4. Paris: A. Picard, 1912.

Lenaerts, Jean. "Un papyrus du *Pasteur* d'Hermas: *P. Iand.* 1,4." *ChrEg* 54.108 (1979): 356-58.

Leutzsch, Martin. *Schriften des Urchristentums* Vol. 3*: Hirt des Hermas*. SUC 3. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998.

———. *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas."* FRLANT 150. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Lewis, Naphtali. *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.

Lietzmann, Hans, ed. *Das Muratorische Fragment und die Monarchianischen Prologe zu den Evangelien*. 1st ed. KTVÜ 1. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1902.

———. "Zur Würdigung des Chester-Beatty-Papyrus der Paulusbriefe." Pages 774-82 in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1934.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, and John Reginald Harmer. *The Apostolic Fathers: Revised Texts*. London: Macmillan, 1898.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, John Reginald Harmer, and Michael W. Holmes. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1992.

Lindemann, Andreas. "Paul's Influence on 'Clement' and Ignatius." Pages 9-24 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*. BHT 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.

Lindemann, Andreas, and Henning Paulsen. *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch-deutsche Parallelausgabe*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.

Link, Adolf. *Die Einheit des Pastor Hermae*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1888.

Lipsett, B. Diane. "Scrutinizing Desire: Hermas, Metanoia, and Manliness." Pages 19-53 in *Desiring Conversion: Hermas, Thecla, Aseneth*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Lipsius, R. A. "Der Hirte des Hermas und der Montanismus in Rom." *ZWT* 8 (1865).

———. "Die Polemik eines Apologeten." *ZWT* 12 (1869): 249-311.

Lipsius, R. A., and M. Bonnet, eds. *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1891.

Lusini, Gianfrancesco. "Nouvelles recherches sur le texte du Pasteur d'Hermas." *Apoc* 12 (2001): 79-97.

MacDermot, Violet. *The Cult of the Seer in the Ancient Middle East: A Contribution to Current Research on Hallucinations Drawn from Coptic and Other Texts*. PWIHM n. s. 21. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*. Philadelphia: Westminister, 1983.

Maier, Harry O. "The Politics and Rhetoric of Discord and Concord in Paul and Ignatius." Pages 307-24 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Malherbe, Abraham J. "Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War." *HTR* 76 (1983): 143-73.

Marguerat, Daniel, ed. *Reception of Paulinism in Acts = Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*. BETL 229. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Martín, José Pablo. "Espíritu y dualismo de espíritus en el *Pastor de Hermas* y su relaciones con el judaísmo." *VetChr* 15 (1978): 295-345.

Massaux, Edouard. *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*. Louvain: Universitaires de Louvain, 1950.

———. *Influence de l'Evangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*. BETL 75. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.

———. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 1: *The First Ecclesiastical Writers*. Translated by Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht. NGS 5/1. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990.

———. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 2: *The Later Christian Writings*. Translated by Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht. NGS 5/2. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992.

———. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus:* Book 3: *The Apologists and the Didache*. Translated by Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht. NGS 5/3. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1993.

McDonald, Lee Martin. *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*. 3rd ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.

McGiffert, Arthur C. "The 'Didache' Viewed in Its Relations to Other Writings." *AR* 5 (1886): 430-42.

McGowan, Andrew Brian. "Word: Reading and Preaching." Pages 65-110 in *Ancient Christian Worship: Early Church Practices in Social, Historical, and Theological Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014.

McLean, Bradley H., ed. "Military Language and Metaphors in Philippians." Pages 105-27 in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*. JSNTSup 86. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Metzger, Bruce M. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Repr. of 1987 ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Miller, Ernest C. "Πολιτεύεσθε in Philippians 1:27: Some Philological and Thematic Observations." *JSNT* 15 (1982): 86-96.

Mitchell, Margaret M. "The Continuing Problem of Particularity and Universality within the *corpus Paulinum*." *ST* 64 (2010): 121–37.

———. "Corrective Composition, Corrective Exegesis: The Teaching on Prayer in 1 Tim 2,1-15." Pages 41-62 in *1 Timothy Reconsidered*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. MRB; BÖA 18. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.

———. "The Emergence of the Written Record." Pages 175-94 in *The Cambridge History of Christianity* Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine*. Edited by Frances M. Young and Margaret M. Mitchell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

———. "Epiphanic Evolutions in Earliest Christianity." *ICS* 28 (2004): 183-204.

———. "The Letter of James as a Document of Paulinism?" Pages 75-98 in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James*. Edited by Robert L. Webb and John S. Kloppenborg. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

———. *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality*. WUNT I. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, Forthcoming.

———. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. HUT 28. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991.

———. "Rhetorical Shorthand in Pauline Argumentation: The Functions of 'the Gospel' in the Corinthian Correspondence." Pages 63-88 in *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians,*

*Galatians, and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*. Edited by L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson. JSNTSup 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Mitchell, Matthew W. "In the Footsteps of Paul: Scriptural and Apostolic Authority in Ignatius of Antioch." *JECS* 14 (2006): 27-45.

Moss, Candida R. *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions*. AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

———. *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom*. New York: HarperOne, 2013.

———. "Nailing Down and Tying Up: Lessons in Intertextual Impossibility from the Martyrdom of Polycarp." *VC* 67 (2013): 117-36.

Moule, C. F. D. *The Birth of the New Testament*. 3rd rev. ed. BNTC. London: A. & C. Black, 1981.

———. "Death 'to Sin,' 'to Law,' and 'to the World': A Note on Certain Datives." Pages 367-75 in *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*. Edited by A.-L. Descamps and André de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.

Mount, Christopher. *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*. NovTSup 104. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Muddiman, John. "The Church in Ephesians, *2 Clement*, and the *Shepherd of Hermas*." Pages 107-21 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Müller, F. W. K. "Eine Hermas-Stelle in manichäischer Version." Pages 1077-83 in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Vol. 51. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1905.

Müller, Hermann. "Zum Pastor Hermae." *TQ* 90 (1908): 89-94.

Muratori, Lodovico Antonio. *Antiquitates Italicæ medii ævi*. Milan: Societas Palatina, 1740.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills*. GNS. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995.

Nässelqvist, Dan. *Public Reading in Early Christianity: Lectors, Manuscripts, and Sound in the Oral Delivery of John 1-4*. NovTSup 163. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Neumann, Nils. "Die πανοπλία Gottes: Eph 6,11-17 als Reflexion der Belagerung einer Stadt." *ZNW* 106 (2015): 40-64.

Nongbri, Brent. "The Limits of Palaeographic Dating of Literary Papyri: Some Observations on the Date and Provenance of P. Bodmer II (P66)." *MH* 71 (2014): 1-35.

———. "Reconsidering the Place of Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV (P75) in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." *JBL* 135 (2016): 405-37.

———. "The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel." *HTR* 98 (2005): 3-48.

Noormann, Rolf. *Irenäus als Paulusinterpret: Zur Rezeption und Wirkung der paulinischen und deuteropaulinischen Briefe im Werk der Irenäus von Lyon*. WUNT II 66. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994.

Obeng, E. A. "The Origins of the Spirit Intercession Motif in Romans 8.26." *NTS* 32 (1986): 621-32.

———. "The Spirit Intercession Motif in Paul." *ExpTim* 95 (1984): 360-64.

Opitz, Helmut. *Ursprünge frühkatholischer Pneumatologie: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist in der römischen Gemeinde unter Zugrundelegung des I. Clemens-Briefes und des "Hirten" des Hermas*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960.

Orsini, Pasquale, and Willy Clarysse. "Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography." *ETL* 88 (2012): 443-74.

Osiek, Carolyn. "The Oral World of Early Christianity in Rome: The Case of Hermas." Pages 151-72 in *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried and Peter Richardson. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*. CBQMS 15. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.

———. *Shepherd of Hermas*. Herm. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999.

Outtier, Bernard. "La version géorgienne du *Pasteur* d'Hermas." *REGC* 6-7 (1990): 211-16.

*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 69. GRM 89. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2005.

Pagels, Elaine H. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Perkins, Pheme. "Review of *Influence de l'Evangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* by Édouard Massaux." *SecCent* 8 (1991): 247-48.

Pernveden, Lage. *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*. STL. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966.

Pervo, Richard I. *Acts*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Herm. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

———. *The Acts of Paul: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014.

———. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2006.

———. *The Making of Paul: Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.

Peterson, Erik. "Kritische Analyse der V. Vision des Hermas." *HJGG* 77 (1957): 362-69.

———. "Kritische Analyse der V. Vision des Hermas." Pages 271-84 in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen*. Rome: Herder, 1959.

———. "Die 'Taufe' im Acherusischen See." Pages 310-32 in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen*. Rome: Herder, 1959.

Pfammatter, Josef. *Die Kirche als Bau: eine exegetish-theologische Studie zur Ekklesiologie der Paulusbriefe*. AnGreg 110. Roma: Libreria Editrice dell'Università Gregoriana, 1960.

Pfitzner, V. C. *Paul and the Agon Motif: Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature*. NovTSup 16. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.

Pfleiderer, Otto. *Paulinism: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology*. Translated by Edward Peters. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London: Williams and Norgate, 1877.

Pickering, Stuart. "The Dating of the Chester Beatty-Michigan Codex of the Pauline Epistles (P46)." Pages 216-27 in *Ancient History in a Modern University: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Macquarie University, 8-13 July, 1993*. Edited by T. W. Hillard and E. A. Judge. Vol. 2. N.S.W., Australia: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Pohlmann, H. "Erbauung." *RAC* 5 (1962): 1043-70.

Porter, Stanley E. "Paul and the Pauline Letter Collection." Pages 19-36 in *Paul and the Second Century*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson. LNTS 412. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

———. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Methodology." Pages 79-96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Poschmann, Bernhard. "Die Bußlehre des Hermas." Pages 134-205 in Paenitentia secunda: *Die kirchliche Busse im ältesten Christentum bis Cyprian und Origenes: Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Theoph 1. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1940.

Pringle, John. *The Three Books of Hermas the Disciple of Paul the Apostle*. London: John White, 1661.

Probst, Ferdinand. *Lehre und Gebet in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten*. Tübingen: Laupp, 1871.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. Vol. 1. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950.

Rahner, Karl. "Die Bußlehre im Hirten des Hermas." *ZKT* 77 (1955): 385-431.

Raineri, O. "Il Pastore di Erma nel secondo testimone etiopico." *OCP* 59 (1993): 427-64.

Ranft, Joseph. "Depositum." Pages 778-84 in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*. Edited by Theodor Klauser. Vol. 3. Leipzig: K. W. Hiersemann, 1957.

Rathke, Heinrich. *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe*. TUGAL 99. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967.

Reiling, J. *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*. NovTSup 37. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Reis, David M. "Following in Paul's Footsteps: *Mimesis* and Power in Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 287-305 in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Rensberger, David K. "As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981.Reumann, John Henry Paul. *Philippians: A New Translation*. Vol. 33B. AYB. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

Rich, Audrey N. M. "The Cynic Conception of Aytapkeia." *Mnem* 9 (1956): 23-29.

Richards, E. Randolph. *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*. WUNT II 42. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991.

Ritschl, Albrecht. *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche: Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie*. Bonn: A. Marcus, 1850.

———. *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche: Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie*. 2nd ed. Bonn: A. Marcus, 1857.

Roberts, Colin H. "P.Oxy. 3528: Hermas, Similitudes 9.20-22." Page 21 in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 50. GRM 70. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983.

Roetzel, Calvin J. "Paul in the Second Century." Pages 227-41 in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. CCPRC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

———. *Paul, the Man and the Myth*. SPNT. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1998.

Roloff, Jürgen. "Der Gottesdienst im Urchristentum." Pages 45-71 in *Handbuch der Liturgik: Liturgiewissenschaft in Theologie und Praxis der Kirche*. Edited by Hans-Christoph Schmidt-Lauber, Michael Meyer-Blanck, and Karl-Heinrich Bieritz. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

Roth, Dieter T. "Marcion and the Early New Testament Text." Pages 302-12 in *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Rothschild, Clare K. *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*. WUNT I 235. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Rousseau, Adelin, ed. *Irénée de Lyon, Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*. SC 406. Paris: Cerf, 1995.

Rouwhorst, Gerard A. M. "The Reading of Scripture in Early Christian Liturgy." Pages 305-31 in *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster*. Edited by Leonard Victor Rutgers. ISCIA 1. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.

Rüpke, Jörg. "A Judaeo-Christian Variant of Professional Religion in Rome: *The Shepherd of Hermas*." Pages 53-82 in *From Jupiter to Christ: On the History of Religion in the Roman Imperial Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Salmon, George. "Note on Hermas and Theodotion." Pages 654-68 in *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament: Being an Expansion of Lectures Delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin*. London: John Murray, 1885.

Salzmann, Jorg Christian. *Lehren und Ermahnen: Zur Geschichte des christlichen Wortgottesdienstes in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. WUNT II 59. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994.

Sanders, Henry A., ed. *A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul*. UMSHS 38. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935.

Sandnes, Karl Olav. "Seal and Baptism in Early Christianity." Pages 1441-82 in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by David Hellholm, Tor Vegge, Øyvind Norderval, and Christer Hellholm. BZNW 176. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Sarischouli, Panagiota, ed. *Berliner griechische Papyri: Christliche literarische Texte und Urkunden aus dem 3. bis 8. Jh. n.Chr.* SGr 3. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1995.

Saxer, Victor. "Le 'Pasteur' d'Hermas." Pages 49-55 in *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du IIe au VIe siècle: Esquisse historique et signification d'après leurs principaux témoins*. CISAM 7. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1988.

Schäfer, Ernst. "P. Iand. 1.4." Page 12-13, Tab. III in *Voluminum codicumque fragmenta Graeca cum amuleto Christiano*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

Schenke, Hans-Martin. "Das Weiterwirken des Paulus und die Pflege seines Erbes durch die Paulus-Schule." *NTS* 21 (1975): 505-18.

Scherbenske, Eric W. *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the* Corpus Paulinum. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Schläger, Gustav. "Der Hirt des Hermas eine ursprünglich Jüdische Schrift." *NThT* 16 (1927): 327-42.

Schmid, Ulrich. *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. ANTF 25. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.

Schmidt, Carl, and Wilhelm Schubart, eds. Πράξεις Παύλου: *Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*. Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1936.

Schmithals, Walter. *Paul and the Gnostics*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. "The Acts of Paul." Pages 213-63 in *New Testament Apocrypha*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, Translated by R. McL. Wilson. Rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

———. "Paulus in der griechischen Kirche des 2. Jahrhunderts." *ZKG* 75 (1964): 1-20.

Schnelle, Udo. *Paulus: Leben und Denken*. dGL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

Schodde, George H. *Hêrmâ Nabî: The Ethiopic Version of Pastor Hermae*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1876.

Schoedel, William R. "Enclosing, Not Enclosed: The Early Christian Doctrine of God." Pages 75-86 in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant*. Edited by William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken. ThHist 54. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1979.

———. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Herm. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Schubart, Wilhelm. *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*. Edited by Eberhard Paul. 3rd ed. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1962.

Schulz, Siegfried. *Die Mitte der Schrift: Der Frühkatholizismus im Neuen Testament als Herausforderung an den Protestantismus*. Stuttgart: Kreuz-Verlag, 1976.

Selwyn, Edward Gordon. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. London: Macmillan, 1946.

Shanor, J. "Paul as Master Builder: Construction Terms in First Corinthians." *NTS* 34.3 (1988): 461-71.

Skarsaune, Oskar. "Justin and His Bible." Pages 53-76 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Skeate, T. C. "The Length of the Standard Papyrus Roll and the Cost-Advantage of the Codex." *ZPE* 45 (1982): 169-75.

———. "Was Papyrus Regarded as 'Cheap' or 'Expensive' in the Ancient World?" *Aeg* 75 (1995): 75-93.

Smith, Carl B. "Ministry, Martyrdom, and Other Mysteries: Pauline Influence on Ignatius of Antioch." Pages 37-56 in *Paul and the Second Century*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson. LNTS 412. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Snyder, Glenn E. *Acts of Paul: The Formation of a Pauline Corpus*. WUNT II 352. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Snyder, Graydon F. *The Shepherd of Hermas*. Edited by Robert M. Grant. AF 6. Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1968.

Southern, Pat. *Domitian: Tragic Tyrant*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Staats, Reinhart. "Hermas." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*. Edited by Gerhard Müller. Vol. 15. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986.

Stoops, Robert F. "If I Suffer… Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch." *HTR* 80 (1987): 161-78.

Still, Todd D., and David E. Wilhite, eds. *Tertullian and Paul*. PPSD 1. New York: Bloomsbury; T&T Clark, 2013.

———, eds. *The Apostolic Fathers and Paul*. PPSD 2. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.

Sturdy, John. *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Date of Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Jonathan Knight. BibW. London: Equinox, 2007.

Sundberg, Albert C., Jr. "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List." *HTR* 66 (1973): 1-41.

———. "Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon." *SE* 4 (1968): 452-61.

Taussig, Hal. *In the Beginning Was the Meal: Social Experimentation and Early Christian Identity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

Taylor, Charles. "The Didache Compared with the Shepherd of Hermas." *JP* 18 (1890): 297-325.

———. *The Shepherd of Hermas*. 2 vols. ECC. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903.

———. *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels*. London: C. J. Clay, 1892.

Taylor, N. H. "Baptism for the Dead (1 Cor 15:29)?" *Neot* 36 (2002): 111-20.

Thiersch, Heinrich W. J. *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter und die Entstehung der neutestamentlichen Schriften*. Frankfurt am Main: Heyder und Zimmer, 1852.

Thomassen, Einar. "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome." *HTR* 97 (2004): 241-56.

Thompson, Michael. *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13*. JSNTSup 59. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Tornau, Christian, and Paolo Cecconi, eds. *The Shepherd of Hermas in Latin: Critical Edition of the Oldest Translation Vulgata*. TUGAL 173. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.

Torrance, Thomas F. "The *Shepherd* of Hermas." Pages 111-25 in *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948.

Trammell, Franklin. "(Re)Growing the Tree: Early Christian Mysticism, Angelomorphic Identity, and the Shepherd of Hermas." Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 2014.

Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux. *Canon Muratorianus: The Earliest Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1867.

Trobisch, David. *The First Edition of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Turner, Eric G. *The Typology of the Early Codex*. HFS 18. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.

Verheyden, Joseph. "The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute." Pages 487-556 in *The Biblical Canons*. Edited by J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de. Jonge. BETL 163. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

———. "The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament." Pages 293-329 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Vezzoni, Anna, ed. *Il pastore di Erma: Versione Palatina*. NM 13. Firenze: Casa editrice Le lettere, 1994.

———. "Un testimone testuale inedito della versione Palatina del 'Pastore' di Erma." *SCO* 37 (1987): 241-65.

Vielhauer, Philipp. "Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus." Pages 1-168 in *Oikodome: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by Günter Klein. TBNT 65. München: C. Kaiser, 1979.

Villa, Massimo. "La versione etiopica del Pastore di Erma: Riedizione critica del testo (*Visioni* e *Precetti*)." Ph.D. diss., University of Naples "L'Orientale," 2016.

Vincent, Marvin R. *Word Studies in the New Testament* Vol. 4: *The Pastoral Epistles*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.

Völter, Daniel. *Die apostolischen Väter, neu untersucht*: Vol. 1: *Clemens, Hermas, Barnabas*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904.

Wahl, Otto. *Apocalypsis Esdrae, Apocalypsis Sedrach, Visio beati Esdrae*. PVTG 4. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Wallis, Ian G. *The Faith of Jesus Christ in Early Christian Traditions*. SNTSMS 84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Wake, William. *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, S. Barnabas, S. Ignatius, S. Clement, S. Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp*. 3rd ed. London: Richard Sare, 1719.

Weinel, Heinrich. "Der Hirt des Hermas." Pages 290-323 in *Handbuch zu den Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*. Edited by Edgar Hennecke. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1904.

Weiß, Hans-Friedrich. "Zur Frage der Ablehnung einer zweiten μετάνοια im Hebräerbrief (zu 6,1 ff)." Pages 347-80 in *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. 15. Aufl. KEKNT 19. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Werline, Rodney. "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho.'" *HTR* 92 (1999): 79-93.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. 1st ed. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1855.

———.*A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. 6th ed. London: Macmillan, 1889.

White, Benjamin L. *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests Over the Image of the Apostle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Whitenton, Michael R. "After ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Neglected Evidence from the Apostolic Fathers." *JTS* 61 (2010): 82-109.

Whittaker, Molly. *Die apostolischen Väter* Vol. 1: *Der Hirt des Hermas*. 2nd rev. ed. GCS. Berlin: Akademie, 1967.

Wilcken, Ulrich. "The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri." *APF* 11 (1935): 112-14.

Wilhelm-Hooijbergh, A. E. "A Different View of Clemens Romanus." *HJ* 16 (1975): 266-88.

Wilson, J. C. *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen Biblical Press, 1993.

Wilson, Walter T. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.

———. *The Sentences of Sextus*. WLAW 1. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.

Wilson, William Jerome. "The Career of the Prophet Hermas." *HTR* 20 (1927): 21-62.

Windisch, Hans. *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origenes: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Dogmengeschichte*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1908.

Yoder Neufeld, Thomas R. *Put on the Armour of God: The Divine Warrior from Isaiah to Ephesians*. JSNTSup 140. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Yong, Kukwah Philemon. "The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Analysis of Paul's Use of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003.

Young, Franklin W. "The Shepherd of Hermas: A Study of His Concepts of Repentance and of the Church." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1946.

Young, Steve. "Being a Man: The Pursuit of Manliness in *The Shepherd of Hermas*." *JECS* 2 (1994): 237-55.

Zahn, Theodor. *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Vol. 1/1. Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888.

———. *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons: Eine Ergänzung zu der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1901.

———. *Hermae pastor e novo testamento illustratus*. Göttingen: Huth, 1867.

———. *Der Hirt des Hermas*. Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1868.

Zuntz, Günther. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the* Corpus Paulinum. SLBA. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.