

SINS AND PUNISHMENTS I

Sins and Measure-for-Measure Punishments

"There is nothing analogous to the hell punishments of the Apocalypse of Peter except the subterranean punishments of the Orphic-Pythagorean *nekyiai*."¹ By finding Greek precedents for the sins and punishments of the Apocalypse of Peter, Dieterich sought to strengthen his claim that the Apocalypse of Peter was a lightly Christianized Orphic-Pythagorean *katabasis*.

In the preceding chapter Dieterich's view that an ancient Greek descent to Hades stands behind the structural features of the Apocalypse of Peter was criticized, and it was shown that predecessors to and relatives of the tours of hell could be found in Jewish apocalyptic literature. In this chapter Dieterich's view of the exclusively Greek provenance of the sins and punishments of the Apocalypse of Peter will be scrutinized, although the discussion here will not be restricted to the Apocalypse of Peter, but will include all the tours of hell. No attempt to determine either/or—either a Jewish provenance, or a Greek—will be made, however. The direction of recent scholarship has been toward rendering that particular distinction increasingly hazy.

Even without the problems related to the Jewish/Greek distinction, Dieterich's quest for origins is problematic. It was suggested in the preceding chapter that the demonstrative explanations characteristic of the tours of hell are influenced by a very ancient form of exegesis that appears in Mesopotamian literature. No one would suggest, however, that the authors of the Jewish apocalypses of the Hellenistic period read cuneiform. Rather, the form was known to them because it appeared in a variety of

1. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 212.

texts with which they were well acquainted. Nor has the question of the ultimate origin of the tour form in Jewish literature been resolved by pointing to 1 Enoch and Ezekiel. Should the tours be understood as going back to Babylonia? Or are they native Jewish developments?

Perhaps a more appropriate object for the historian, certainly one more easily achieved, is the determination of proximate sources. One goal of the following investigation will be to form a picture of the kinds of sources on which the authors of the earliest tours of hell might have drawn.

The other goal is to point out certain distinctive sins and punishments that appear in several texts and to use them to illumine the relations of the various texts to one another. Observations about the development of particular groupings of sins and punishments will be offered in this chapter and the next; the attempt to provide a more comprehensive picture of the development of the texts will be reserved for Chapter 5.

SINS

In the following pages most of the attention will be directed at punishments rather than at sins, since the punishments prove to be more useful for determining relationships among texts. Thus a few general words about the sins treated in the tours of hell are in order.

The sins in the tours of hell range from murder to idle chatter in church or synagogue, but the two most common kinds of sins are sexual sins and sins of speech. As Table 2 indicates, sexual sins appear in all the texts except the Apocalypse of Zephaniah. No attempt has been made to indicate on the table the occurrence of a sin more than once in a text. Adultery and fornication are treated together because they are so difficult to distinguish. The Ethiopic version of the Apocalypse of Peter, for example, calls the sin of the women hanging by their hair fornication (chap. 7), while the women described in the same way in the Greek version (chap. 24) are guilty of adultery. It is difficult to say whether the women of the fourth court in the Isaiah fragment are guilty of adultery or fornication when they "lead men astray." Abortion and infanticide also prove extremely difficult to separate. Does killing infants mean infants already born or not? Thus these categories too are treated together here.

The emphasis on proper sexual behavior in early Jewish literature is so overwhelming that comment is hardly necessary.² Sexual purity is one of

2. For references, see F. Hauck, "*μοιχεύω*," *TDNT* 4(1967):729-35; F. Hauck and S. Schulz, "*πόρνη*," *TDNT* 6(1968):579-95; J. Jensen, "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication? A Cri-

Table 2. SEXUAL SINS IN THE TOURS OF HELL

<i>Text</i>	<i>Adultery/ Fornication</i>	<i>Immodesty</i>	<i>Loss of Virginity Before Marriage</i>	<i>Abortion/ Infanticide</i>	<i>Homo- sexuality</i>	<i>Incest</i>
Apoc. Pet.	X		X	X	X	
Acts. Th.	X	X		X		
Apoc. Zeph.						
Apoc. Paul	X		X	X	X	
Eth. Apoc. Mary	X		X	X	X	X
Eth. Apoc. Bar.	X		X	X	X	X
Apoc. Gorg.	X					
Gk. Apoc. Mary	X			X		
Apoc. Ezra				X		X
Vis. Ezra	X		X	X		X
T. Isaac					X	
L. Pach.			X			
Dar. Tesh.	X	X				
Isa. frag.	X					
Josh. frag. ^a						
Ged. Mosh.	X				X	X
Elij. frag.	X		X		X	

^aFor most of the punishments in this text, no sin is mentioned. There are several hanging punishments that in other Hebrew texts are applied to sexual sins, primarily adultery/fornication.

the important ways in which the Hebrew Bible directs Israelites to differentiate themselves from their neighbors who practice the "abominations" that eventually cause the land to vomit them out. Adultery is forbidden in the Ten Commandments, and death is the punishment for all kinds of sexual misbehavior. This attitude continues to make itself felt in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, in Philo's works, at Qumran, and in rabbinic literature.

The emphasis in early Christian literature is similar and equally overwhelming. Perhaps the major difference is that Christian literature tends to encourage celibacy, while this is a relatively uncommon attitude in Jewish circles before the year 70 and almost unheard of after.³

Sexual sins also play a part in texts of the Hellenistic and Roman period that are neither Jewish nor Christian, although they do not seem to have rated among the major sins of archaic and classical Greece.⁴ The earliest appearance of adulterers in Hades seems to occur in the fragment of Hieronymos of Rhodes's (third century B.C.E.) Life of Pythagoras preserved by Diogenes Laertius (*Lives* 8.21), where Pythagoras is said to have seen men hanging in Hades "who did not wish to have intercourse with their own wives." I. Lévy is certain that this enigmatic phrase refers to adultery.⁵ (Dieterich, who reads the passage the same way, points out that Pythagoras [or Hieronymos] has chosen "a most remarkable mode of description."⁶) Later authors describe punishments in hell for sexual wrongs: incest (Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.623) and adultery (Lucian, *Menippus* 11, *True Story* 2.26). Sexual wrongdoing and even the tendency to such wrongdoing, a lustful disposition, are found in pagan lists of vices.⁷

Adultery/fornication is the most widely diffused category of sexual sin, as Table 2 shows. It appears almost everywhere. Loss of virginity before marriage and abortion/infanticide, on the other hand, appear almost exclusively in Christian texts;⁸ the ex-virgins of the Elijah fragment make it

tique of Bruce Malina," *Novum Testamentum* 20(1978): 161–84. All these articles are intent on showing that early Christian sexual ethics were superior to contemporary Jewish sexual ethics; Jensen is somewhat more subtle than the two TDNT articles. Despite this bias, the texts assembled offer an impression of the insistence of the Jewish and Christian literature on the importance of chastity.

3. For a brief discussion of the practice of celibacy at Qumran and among the Therapeutae and of favorable attitudes toward celibacy in rabbinic literature, see G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981; first published 1973), 99–102.

4. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 163–70, esp. 168–69.

5. Lévy, *Pythagore*, 82.

6. "Eine sehr bemerkenswerte Art der Bezeichnung," Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 169.

7. E.g., Plutarch, *Education of Children* 5b, 12b; Claudius Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* 3.13.

8. I include the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch among the Christian texts since Leslau believes that it is a copy of a Christian text. (See chap. 1, above.)

the single exception (see chap. 1, above). In fact, it is worth noting that the two sins are closely linked; five of the seven texts that mention the loss of virginity before marriage also contain a punishment for abortion/infanticide.⁹ The two exceptions are not unexpected. One is the Elijah fragment, which is probably not a Christian work. The other is the very brief vision of hell in the Life of Pachomios, where the sin that I have classified as loss of virginity before marriage is described in veiled language as soiling one's body without the parents' knowledge. No clear pattern emerges in the distribution of homosexuality and incest.

Sins of speech include blasphemy, false witness, slander, and gossip, categories that overlap in so many cases that it seemed best to group all these sins of the tongue together. A sinner may be said, for example, to have blasphemed his neighbor. Here "to blaspheme" has nothing to do with God, but seems to mean either to slander or to bear false witness. Further, it is difficult to know how to compare the range of meanings of terms in different languages. Sins of speech appear in all the texts except the Apocalypse of Zephaniah, the Apocalypse of Ezra, and the Testament of Isaac.

Sins of speech are condemned in the Hebrew Bible, in early Jewish literature, in rabbinic literature, and in early Christian literature.¹⁰ In pagan Greco-Roman literature the concern is not entirely absent. Blasphemy in its strict sense and the breaking of oaths are important crimes in classical Greek thought.¹¹ Less clear-cut sins of speech are not neglected altogether. Plutarch condemns flatterers, an important social type in his milieu.¹² Ptolemy includes among the undesirable personality traits created by certain configurations of the stars the tendency to slandering, swearing falsely, blaming, speaking evil, speaking abusively, and speaking frivolously.¹³ References to such failings are not common, however.

The prominence of sexual and verbal sins in the tours of hell, then, seems to owe more to biblical tradition than to Greek. Surprisingly, it goes hand in hand with a relative lack of attention to other central sins of the biblical tradition. Murder appears in only three tours of hell (the Apocalypse of Peter, the Apocalypse of Gorgorios, and *Gedulat Moshe*) while stealing appears in four (the Acts of Thomas, the Apocalypse of Gorgo-

9. Three of those five texts, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Apocalypse of Paul, and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary, dress the ex-virgins in dark raiment. A trace of this punishment appears in a different context in the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch, also among these five texts, where dark raiment is the punishment of avaricious virgins.

10. E.g., Ps. 34:12-13; Prov. 6:17; 1 Enoch 96:7; 1QS 4; b. Sotah 42a; Rom. 1:29-30; Col. 3:8-9; 2 Tim. 3:3; Didache 2:3-5.

11. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 163-70.

12. *Education of Children* 5b.

13. *Tetrabiblos* 3.13.

rios, the Joshua b. Levi fragment, and *Gedulat Moshe*). Yet murder and stealing are forbidden in the Decalogue just as clearly as are adultery, blasphemy, and bearing false witness.¹⁴

It may be that the strong interest in sexual sins and sins of speech in the tours of hell is a result of the invisibility of these sins.¹⁵ Gossip and slander are daily occurrences, impervious to legislation. The smaller the social group, the more intense such sins are likely to be. There is great psychological realism in Pachomios' vision of monks punished in hell for having gossiped about other monks. Sexual sins, too, are almost by definition private, precisely the sins that never come before a court. Murder is difficult to conceal, and the murderer is likely to be brought to justice by an earthly court. But to see slanderers and adulterers reap the just reward for their hidden crimes, one must await the punishment of heaven.

The sins and punishments of the tours of hell at first glance appear to be a promising source for social history. Unfortunately, the condemnation of a practice does not necessarily indicate that it was a living issue for the author of the text and his community, for these texts are part of a tradition. They draw consciously on earlier tours of hell, and consciously and unconsciously show the influence of the canonical texts of Judaism and Christianity. Thus the appearance of certain sins in the later texts may indicate no more than this dependence; the social problems that lay behind the original mention may have vanished long since. In the absence of even a rough date or location for many of the texts or extensive knowledge of the social world of those texts that can be dated and located with some accuracy, restraint must be exercised in trying to reconstruct the social setting of the texts on the basis of the sins proscribed.

Variations in the descriptions of sins and punishments might also appear to hold out promise as clues to the social world of the texts. For example, it is tempting to suggest on the basis of the fact that women hang by their

14. It is interesting to compare the catalogs of vices in the New Testament, which draw on the same background, Jewish and Greek, as the early tours of hell. There fornication is more common than murder and theft, but murder and theft are among the most common sins (B. S. Easton, "New Testament Ethical Lists," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51[1932]:5). For more recent discussion of these catalogs, see S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran-Texte* (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1959).

15. I wish to thank G. D. Cohen for pointing out to me that the curses in Deut. 27:15–26 have been understood by many commentators to be unified by their reference to invisible sins. (See, e.g., A. Phillips, *Deuteronomy*, Cambridge Bible Commentary [Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973], 181; G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, Old Testament Library [London: SCM, 1966], 168–69.) Several of these sins are sexual, but none is a sin of speech.

breasts for adultery/fornication in Jewish texts, but by their hair in Christian texts, that women's hair was associated with their sexuality by Christians but not by Jews. Yet Lieberman has assembled evidence to show that not only the Romans and their Byzantine successors, but also the Jews of the geonic period, punished sexual immodesty by shaving the head.¹⁶

On the other hand, when enough information about the background of the texts is available, it may be possible to make sense of the presence of particular sins in some texts but not in others. The lopsided presence of loss of virginity before marriage and abortion/infanticide in Christian texts is a good example.

Unlike Judaism, Christianity holds celibacy as an ideal and institutionalizes it in monasticism. The ex-virgins of the Apocalypse of Paul are said to have been "appointed as virgins." Some of the aborters and infant killers are specifically identified as nuns (Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary) or as priests and widows (Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch). This supports the reasonable a priori assumption that loss of virginity before—or without—marriage and abortion and infanticide are especially likely to be problems in a society that has institutionalized celibacy. For nuns, marriage is not a solution to pregnancy.

In Jewish society premarital pregnancy could be legitimized by marriage. While sex before marriage was certainly not acceptable, its consequences were less visible, and it is thus likely to have been less a subject of discussion.¹⁷

Yet Christian monasticism alone does not explain the configuration of the texts. Abortion/infanticide is prominently punished in the Apocalypse of Peter, which comes from the period before the institutionalization of monasticism, although the favorable view of celibacy certainly goes back to the earliest Christian literature.

Tacitus' famous remark on the Jewish failure to practice infanticide (*Histories* 5.5) is a good indication of how widespread that practice was in the ancient world. Not only in Tacitus' Rome, but also in the Hellenistic world and classical Greece, abortion was a perfectly acceptable form of contraception.¹⁸ The earliest Roman law against abortion comes under Septimius Severus and is directed against divorced women who procured

16. Lieberman, "Shaving of the Hair and Uncovering of the Face Among Jewish Women" (appendix to "On Sins and Their Punishments," 52–54).

17. L. Epstein, *Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism* (New York: Bloch, 1948), 126–31, assembles evidence for the relatively common practice of intimacy of engaged couples from the tannaitic period to the late Middle Ages. Naturally the rabbis were not pleased.

18. S. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York: Schocken, 1975), 69, 164–69.

abortions to deprive their ex-husbands of the child. Under Caracalla there was legislation against drugs and magic.¹⁹ Only when the empire became Christian did infanticide become illegal.²⁰ The law on abortion did not change even after the empire had become Christian.²¹

Thus it may be that the causes for the practice of abortion and infanticide punished in the hells of these tours changed from the earlier period to the later. In the early period, when many Christians were converts to the religion, abortion and infanticide may simply have been a continuation of the accustomed Greco-Roman practices. Later, when Christians were likely to be descended from many generations of Christians, celibacy had become institutionalized in monasticism. Thus some pregnancies could not be legitimized by the simple expedient of marriage. The fact that a number of the later texts specifically designate the sinners as nuns, widows, or priests suggests that in this case these later texts are not simply copying automatically the sins listed in earlier texts.

MEASURE-FOR-MEASURE PUNISHMENTS IN ANCIENT GREECE, ROME, AND ISRAEL

One large and important group of punishments in the tours of hell consists of those based on the principle of measure-for-measure. The principle appears in many ancient legal systems. The biblical formulation, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" (Exod. 21:24, Lev. 24:20), is part of a wider ancient Near Eastern pattern.²² Although it is important in other

19. Ibid., 168.

20. J. T. Noonan, Jr., *Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Belknap, 1965), 85-86. In 318 it became a crime, parricide, for a father to kill his child (*Codex Theodosianus* 9.15.1). Only in 374 did killing an infant become homicide (*Codex Theodosianus* 9.14.1).

21. Noonan, *Contraception*, 86. There were, to be sure, dissenting voices in the Greco-Roman world. The Hippocratic oath forbade the administration of abortifacients; and Aristotle distinguishes between the period before the fetus has sensation, when abortion is perfectly acceptable, and after, when it is not (Pomeroy, *Goddesses*, 69). Galen claims that Solon and Lycurgos had legislated against abortion, and Musonios claims other antiabortion legislation (S. Reinach, "Morale orphique et morale chrétienne," in *Cultes, mythes et religions* [Paris: E. Leroux, 1908-23], 3:280). One of the inhabitants of hell in the apparently pagan Bologna papyrus is a woman who has had an abortion (Turcan, "Catabase orphique," 149-55).

22. Elsewhere in the Bible in a legal context: Gen. 9:6; Deut. 19:19. For ancient Near East, Code of Hammurabi, Laws 192-231 (*ANET*, 175-76); J. Greenberg, "Crimes and Punishments," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York and Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1962); H. H. Cohn, "Talion," *EJ*.

areas of Greek thought, talion does not seem to have played a part in the Greek legal system.²³ At Rome, on the other hand, the *lex talionis* goes back to the Twelve Tables.²⁴

Talion, as the principle of measure-for-measure is called after the Roman legal term, did not long exist in its pure form. In many of the texts that have come down to us the principle has already undergone interpretation. Just retribution for bodily injury may be a fine rather than infliction of a matching injury. In many codes, the two types of punishment exist side-by-side.²⁵

Talion is also found as a principle of justice outside the legal codes. There are several instances in the Bible. For example, Adoni-bezeq, a Canaanite king, understands his disgrace at the hands of the Israelites as an instance of talion, retribution for what he had done to other kings (Judg. 1:7), and the men who insisted that Daniel be thrown into the lion's den are punished by being thrown in themselves (Dan. 6:24).²⁶

Among the Greeks the belief in talion is associated particularly with shadowy groups like the Pythagoreans or those learned in the mysteries. Aristotle refers disapprovingly to the Pythagoreans' belief that "it is just for one to suffer that which he did" (*Magna Moralia* 1194a = 1.33.13). The chorus in Aeschylus' *Libation-Bearers* expresses a point of view similar to the one attributed to the Pythagoreans (306-14).²⁷

Such retribution is often placed in the afterlife. Plato (*Laws* 870 d-e = 9.10) refers to a popular belief taught by the initiates of the mysteries that murderers will suffer punishment in Hades and then return to this world to be murdered by others.²⁸ Aristotle, again disapproving, says that the Pythagoreans attribute to Rhadamanthos, the judge of the dead, the maxim "If one suffers what he himself did, it is true justice" (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1132b = 5.5.3).²⁹

23. The concept is not mentioned by A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens: Procedure* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1971), nor does Herdlitzka, "Talion," PW, refer to its presence in Greek law.

24. For a discussion of the development of the concept from the Twelve Tables to the *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, see Herdlitzka, "Talion."

25. E.g., Code of Hammurabi; Exod. 21:19, 22, 24. In the Twelve Tables, provision is made for payment rather than dismemberment in certain cases (Herdlitzka, "Talion," 2070-71).

26. Cohn, "Talion," offers these and many other biblical examples, some of which are not quite measure-for-measure.

27. Aeschylus is often considered to have been influenced by the mysteries. E.g., G. Thomson, *Aeschylus and Athens*, 2d ed. (1946; reprint ed., New York: Haskell House, 1972), feels able to identify Aeschylus as "an early Pythagorean" (291).

28. An odd combination—punishment in Hades and on return!

29. See Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 205-10, for references to other classical texts.

Jubilees is probably the first extrabiblical Jewish text to make use of the principle. According to Jubilees, Cain, who killed his brother with a stone, died when his stone house fell on him. "With the instrument with which a man kills his neighbor with the same shall he be killed; after the manner that he wounded him, in like manner shall they deal with him" (Jub. 4:32, *APOT*).

The formulation in Jubilees is very close to various rabbinic rules. The rabbis delight in multiplying examples of God's just punishments and rewards according to the principle "By the measure a man measures out, so it is measured out to him" or "All the measures of the Holy One, blessed be he, are measure for measure."³⁰ The principle can be applied to good behavior or to evil.

Mishnah *Soṭah* 1:8–9 (Danby) provides an excellent example of the rabbinic use of talion:

⁸Samson went after [the desire of] his eyes—therefore the Philistines put out his eyes, as it is written, *And the Philistines laid hold on him and put out his eyes* (Judg. 16:21); Absalom gloried in his hair—therefore he was hanged by his hair; and inasmuch as he came in upon the ten concubines of his father, therefore they thrust ten spear-heads into his body, as it is written, *And ten young men that bare Joab's armour compassed about and smote Absalom and slew him* (2 Sam. 18:15); and inasmuch as he stole away three hearts, the heart of his father, the heart of the court, and the heart of Israel (as it is written, *So Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel* [2 Sam. 15:6]), therefore three darts were thrust into him, as it is written, *And he took three darts in his hand and thrust them through the heart of Absalom* (2 Sam. 18:14).

⁹So, too, in a goodly matter: Miriam awaited Moses one hour, as it is written, *And his sister stood afar off* (Exod. 2:4), therefore Israel delayed for her seven days, as it is written, *And the people journeyed not till Miriam was brought in again* (Num. 12:15). . . .

It is interesting that there are very few instances in rabbinic literature of the application of this principle to the world to come. This is at least in part the result of the exegetical nature of so much of rabbinic literature. Talion is almost always applied to a biblical text, and biblical texts are almost always concerned with this world.³¹

30. See Lieberman, "Sins," 48, n. 106, for references.

31. In "Some Aspects of After Life in Early Rabbinic Literature," in *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1965), English section, Lieberman writes: "These earlier rabbinic sources . . . do not portray the topography of Gehenna in its details. . . . They do not mention the refined tortures of Gehenna, their minutiae, and the ramified penal code which governs Hades. The rabbis certainly lacked neither the imagination nor the legal mind required for such descriptions" (496). This is a tantalizing remark. Lieberman never tells us how he would explain this situation.

Instances of the application of talion to the world to come are not entirely lacking in rabbinic literature, however.³² B. Gittin 56b–57a reports that when Onqelos, a nephew of the Emperor Titus, decided to convert to Judaism, he conjured up the ghosts of the notorious villains Titus and Balaam and of Israelite sinners³³ to see how they were faring in the next world. Titus has been punished by having his ashes scattered every day over the seven seas; he had planned to avoid God's wrath by having his ashes scattered. (This punishment must be seen in relation to the horror the ancients felt at lack of proper burial.)

Balaam is punished by having boiling semen poured over him. Although the motivation for this punishment is not provided in this passage, elsewhere the rabbis charged Balaam with the responsibility for the seduction of the Israelite men by the daughters of Moab (Num. 25:1–9).³⁴ Thus Rashi (to b. Gittin 57a) comments that Balaam's punishment is "measure for measure."

The crime of the Israelite sinners was that they had mocked the words of the sages. Boiling excrement is poured over them. The appropriateness of this punishment is not obvious, but perhaps the thought is that these sinners had treated what is precious as refuse.

THE STORY FROM THE PALESTINIAN TALMUD

In "On Sins and Their Punishments," Lieberman argues that the dream of the pious man of Ashkelon from the Palestinian Talmud (discussed under the introduction to the Hebrew texts and the Latin Elijah fragment in chap. 1, above) is another rabbinic passage that applies the principle of measure-for-measure to the world to come. The passage is of great importance for this study. In it the tax collector is given the difficult epithet *דמעי*

32. Lieberman, "Sins," 48, n. 106, provides references. I pass over b. Sotah 10b, an expansion of the Mishnah, where Absalom hangs over Sheol. It does not provide a picture of what goes on in Sheol itself. Similarly b. Sanhedrin 90a: "He denied the resurrection of the dead; therefore he will have no share in the resurrection of the dead, for all the measures of the Holy One, blessed be he, are measure for measure" is not relevant here. It rationalizes the exceptions given by Mishnah Sanhedrin 10:1 to the rule that all Israel has a portion in the world to come. A *b'raita* in b. Ketubot 5b says, "A man should not let his ears hear idle chatter for they will be burnt first of his limbs." Lieberman must take this to be burning in Gehenna.

33. For "Israelite sinners" the Munich MS and the Venice first edition read "Jesus." Fascinating though this is, it is not important for our purposes.

34. In Num. 31:16 Moses implies that Balaam was responsible. The rabbis make this point in Sifre Numbers 131 and 157, b. Sanhedrin 106a, and elsewhere. See Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, 6:134–35, n. 785, for a more inclusive list of references.

בריה, which Lieberman suggests means “paunchy.” If so, the tax collector, a glutton, is made to suffer a fitting punishment, thirst, while the poor man is rewarded with plenty.³⁵ This punishment is obviously related to the punishment of Tantalus in Greek myth; the appearance of related punishments in the Apocalypse of Paul family will be discussed in Chapter 4, below.

The passage from the Palestinian Talmud goes on to describe the fate of Miriam of “the onion bulbs,” as Lieberman translates another difficult phrase. Those reporting the story disagree; either Miriam was hanging by her nipples, or the hinge of the gate of hell rested in her ear. The exact nature of her sin is also disputed. Either she bragged of her fasting, or she pretended to fast more than she actually did. In either case she was a hypocrite. This, Lieberman argues, is the meaning of her epithet.³⁶ This second punishment is not a measure-for-measure punishment.

In *Vom Reichen Mann und Armen Lazarus*, his study of the Lazarus story in Luke and its sources, H. Gressmann argues that the story of Lazarus shares a source with the story in the Palestinian Talmud and related Jewish texts, including *Darkhei Teshuvah*, and the Egyptian tale of Setme and his son Si-Osiri. This story survives in a late first-century C.E. demotic text.³⁷

The moral of this tale, revealed by the wonder-child Si-Osiri to his father by means of a tour of the seven halls of Amente, is that social status and moral status are not necessarily equivalent. In the fourth hall of Amente men who had been poor but wicked during life undergo a kind of tantalization, reaching for the food and water that hang above them while pits are dug beneath them to prevent them from ever attaining their object. In the fifth hall a rich man is discovered with the bolt of the door of that hall fixed in his eye. In the seventh hall with Osiris and his attendants stands a

R. A. Kraft suggests to me that Balaam’s punishment may be related to the LXX’s translation of the chamber, קמרה (Num. 25:8), in which Phineas finds and kills the Israelite man and Moabite woman. According to the LXX, the chamber is a furnace, κάμνος. It should be noted, however, that the punishment of those who mocked the words of the sages is *boiling* excrement. The measure-for-measure nature of semen in relation to Balaam’s crime is clear; boiling may be no more than an added touch.

35. “Sins,” 34–35.

36. Ibid., 35–36, on the relation of onions to hypocrisy.

37. H. Gressmann, *Vom Reichen Mann und Armen Lazarus*, Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 1918. The back of the papyrus in Greek is dated 46–47 C.E. It is thus assumed that the copy of the Setme tale must be later, but not too much later. The style and spelling point to the last century of Ptolemaic rule or the first century of Roman rule; this is quite compatible with the date on the verso (Griffith, *Stories*, 41, 67–70). Quotations in the body of the text are taken from Griffith’s translation.

poor man dressed in the funeral garment of the rich man. It was the contrast between the rich man's splendid funeral and the poor man's unceremonious burial that led to the tour of Amente; when Setme wishes aloud to share the fate of the rich man, his son takes him to Amente to show him his error.

The setting for the story of the Palestinian Talmud is similar: the observation of the pious man of Ashkelon of the difference between the funeral of the rich tax collector and his pious friend. Like Setme the pious man exclaims about the contrast. Unlike Setme the pious man sees the difference as unjust. The punishment of the tax collector is equivalent to that of the poor men of the fourth hall in Setme's vision, while the punishment of the rich man in Setme's vision is one of the punishments given to Miriam in the Palestinian Talmud.

The moral of the story in the Palestinian Talmud is different from that of the Setme tale. The story in the Palestinian Talmud attempts to explain why the wicked flourish and the righteous suffer. The answer is, first, that this injustice matters very little because the righteous will be rewarded in the world to come while the wicked are punished, but further that even the suffering of the righteous in this world is not arbitrary, for the righteous do occasionally sin, and it is because of those sins that they suffer here. On the other hand, even the wicked occasionally do good, and thus they are allowed their reward here so that they may find only punishment awaiting them in the world to come.

The explanation given the pious man eliminates the apparent injustice in the fates of his friend and the wicked tax collector not only by describing the glorious life after death of the one and the sad condition of the other, but also by justifying their conditions in this world.³⁸ The rabbinic passion for perfect justice exemplified in the passage from Mishnah Sotah quoted above may explain why the rich man of the Palestinian Talmud receives the punishment of Tantalus rather than a pivot in the eye like the rich man of the Setme tale, for, as Lieberman argues, in the Palestinian Talmud the rich man's punishment is measure-for-measure.³⁹ Although Miriam's punishments do not appear to be explicable on the measure-for-measure prin-

38. Gressmann, *Armen Mann*, 43-46, makes many of the same observations about the relation between the two stories. He wants to understand their differences as a result of the difference in form of the two stories. For him Setme's tale belongs to the category of *Märchen*, while the story from the Palestinian Talmud belongs to the category of *Legende*. Thus for Gressmann the Setme story is typologically prior.

39. Lieberman, "Sins," 35. Even if we remain agnostic about Lieberman's interpretation of the tax collector's epithet, tantalization is a fitting punishment for a rich man.

ciple, both of them are later doled out on a measure-for-measure basis.⁴⁰

Gressmann sees the story in the Palestinian Talmud as literarily dependent on the Setme tale.⁴¹ Of the motifs common to both stories, reversal, tantalization, and the pivot, only the presence of the pivot seems to require explanation. Reversal is a natural human solution to inequity. Tantalization originates in classical Greece⁴² and thus was available to writers of the Hellenistic period.

While the pivot appears a number of times in later rabbinic literature and once in a Christian tour of hell, the only earlier example of this motif is a sculpture of a man in whose chest the pivot of a door rests. This sculpture comes from the fourth millennium B.C.E.; it was found at Hierakonpolis in Egypt.⁴³ Gressmann views the use of the chest as the resting place for the pivot as a concession to architectural necessity and argues that this sculpture is an exact parallel to the torture described in the Setme tale and the story from the Palestinian Talmud.⁴⁴ But this parallel is extremely early and, despite Gressmann's explanation, not as close as one might wish. Without evidence of an ongoing Egyptian tradition of pivots in the body, it is reasonable to ask whether this motif too might have been the common property of the Hellenistic Mediterranean. While the Setme tale and the story from the Palestinian Talmud are undeniably similar, the hypothesis of a common nonliterary source seems more defensible than the claim of literary influence in one direction or the other.

But the precise nature of the relationship between the story in the Palestinian Talmud and the Setme tale is not of great importance for present

40. Hanging by the breasts appears as a measure-for-measure punishment in the Isaiah fragment, *Darkhei Teshuvah*, *Gedulat Moshe*, and the Elijah fragment. The pivot in the ear becomes a measure-for-measure punishment in *Darkhei Teshuvah* and the Apocalypse of Ezra.

41. Gressmann argues that the story in the Palestinian Talmud is a combination of two independent stories, one of the tax collector and the pious man, the other of Simeon b. Shetah and the witches. According to him, Miriam comes from the Simeon b. Shetah story. By rights, the pivot should be in the ear of the tax collector. This is indeed the case in Rashi's version of the story in his comments to b. Sanhedrin 44b (*Armen Mann*, 17). Miriam properly hangs by her breasts (23). (Gressmann thinks that she is Mary, the mother of Jesus.)

42. Gressmann points out that the description of the poor men as men whose wives robbed them while they were alive is reminiscent of Oknos in Pausanias' description of the painting of Polygnotos at Delphi (ibid., 33–34).

43. Griffith (*Stories*, 46, note to line 3) refers to a sculpture, discovered by Quibell at Hierakonpolis, of a man whose chest is used as the rest for the door pivot. Gressmann (*Armen Mann*, 38–39) suggests a date of 3800 B.C.E. for the sculpture. Its grotesque form, he argues, was intended to scare demons away from the building, the same function many ascribe to the Aramaic incantation bowls.

44. Gressmann, *Armen Mann*, 38–39.

purposes. What is important is that the idea of measure-for-measure punishment in the next world is not restricted to (culturally) Greek sources. Indeed, the idea is so natural that it probably appears in some form in most cultures without any influence of one on another.

In Jewish literature we have seen a well-developed tradition of measure-for-measure punishments from the Bible through Jubilees into tannaitic and later rabbinic texts. Twice in rabbinic literature the principle is applied, although not explicitly, to the next world. One of these instances, the story from the Palestinian Talmud, is likely to be quite early.

MEASURE-FOR-MEASURE PUNISHMENTS IN THE TOURS OF HELL

Measure-for-measure punishments are a significant component of the punishments in most of the tours of hell, as Table 3 makes clear. Since most of these punishments are not explicitly described as measure-for-measure, the determination that a punishment is measure-for-measure contains an unavoidable element of subjectivity. This explains the occasional vacillation about numbers in the table.

Several forms that measure-for-measure punishments take will be discussed below. Only forms that appear a number of times will be treated. Unlike the environmental punishments to be discussed in the next chapter, each measure-for-measure punishment has its own history; thus no general conclusions will be offered at the end of the chapter.

HANGING IN THE ANCIENT WORLD IN LITERATURE AND IN PRACTICE

Hanging by the sinful limb is a form of measure-for-measure punishment of particular importance in the Jewish texts, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Acts of Thomas. It plays a more minor role in the other texts with a significant number of measure-for-measure punishments.

In the ancient world hanging was used less for execution than for public disgrace. A modern historian of capital punishment commenting on Tacitus' description of hanging among the Germans writes, "It is clear that hanging was originally chosen not as a good way of killing the offender—sometimes indeed he was killed first—but as an excellent device for enhancing the deterrent effect of the death penalty by exposing his body to the public gaze in the most ignominious and abject of postures."⁴⁵

45. E. Gowers, *A Life for a Life?* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1956), 9.

Table 3. MEASURE-FOR-MEASURE PUNISHMENTS IN THE TOURS OF HELL

	No. Punishments	No. Measure- for-Measure	Percent Measure- for-Measure
Apoc. Pet. (Eth.)	20	8	40
Apoc. Pet. (Gk.)	15-16	5-6	33-40
Acts Th.	6-7	4	57-67
Apoc. Zeph.	3	1	33
Apoc. Paul	24	9-10	38-42
Eth. Apoc. Mary	26	7-8	27-31
Eth. Apoc. Bar.	23	7-8	30-35
Apoc. Gorg.	11	3	27
Gk. Apoc. Mary	20	5	25
Apoc. Ezra	7-9	4	44-57
Vis. Ezra	15	5	33
T. Isaac	5	—	—
L. Pach.	6	—	—
Dar. Tesh.	5	5	100
Isa. frag.	5	5	100
Josh. frag. ^a	7/11	1	—
Ged. Mosh.	13	6	46
Elij. frag.	8	5	63

^aThe figures for Josh. frag. take account of both versions. The shorter contains four punishments of hanging by a limb, the longer, six. Since sins cannot be specified for any of these punishments, it is impossible to determine whether they are measure-for-measure punishments. Certainly many of them function as measure-for-measure punishments in other texts.

Deuteronomy assumes the practice of hanging the criminal's corpse in its legislation against allowing the humiliation to last more than one day: "And if a man has committed a crime punishable by death and he is put to death, and you hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but you shall bury him the same day, for a hanged man is accursed by God" (Deut. 21:22-23, RSV).

Several biblical passages illustrate the use of hanging implied by this law. The baker who is Joseph's companion in prison is first decapitated and then hung on a tree (Gen. 40:19). Joshua first kills and then hangs five Canaanite kings (Josh. 10:26). The Philistines hang the bones of Saul and Jonathan in a public square (2 Sam. 21:12). David hangs the hands and feet of the murderers of Ish-Bosheth in public (2 Sam. 4:12). On the other hand, Haman and his sons seem to have been put to death by the process of hanging (Esth. 8:7, 9:13).

In the Hebrew Bible the verb "hang" is תלה or תלא. It is almost always translated into Greek by κρεμάννυμι or a derivative. In Esther, it is trans-

lated by *σταυρόω*, crucify. Perhaps this is a reflection of the Mesopotamian practice of impaling.⁴⁶ Paul (Gal. 3:13) uses Deut 21:22–23 as a proof text in relation to Jesus' crucifixion.

Whatever the precise nature of Israelite practice, hanging and impaling are closely linked. In what appears to be the most ancient text in any literature containing a reference to hanging, the Sumerian "Inanna's Descent to the Netherworld," the goddess, temporarily dead, is hung from a stake.⁴⁷ For the rabbis, hanging after death was restricted to blasphemers and idolaters. Mishnah Sanhedrin 6.4 provides a fairly detailed picture of the rabbis' image of what the practice had been like, if not of the practice itself: "How did they hang someone? They sank a beam into the ground and a piece of wood extended from it. They placed the two hands together and hanged him."⁴⁸

Hanging as a form of punishment and disgrace appears also in Greek and Roman sources. In the *Gorgias* (525c) Plato speaks of the worst sinners hanging (*ἀναρτάω*) in the prison of Hades as examples. He does not include any further details in his description. Diogenes Laertius (*Lives* 8.21) preserves the report of Hieronymos of Rhodes that during his descent to Hades Pythagoras saw the soul of Hesiod bound (*δέω*) to a bronze pillar while the soul of Homer hung (*κρεμάννυμι*) from a tree as punishment for their sacrilegious stories about the gods.

It is not clear whether Hesiod is to be visualized as hanging from his pillar. The verb *δέω* sometimes seems to imply hanging. In Lucian's *True Story* 2.26, Rhadamanthos sentences Cinyras and Helen to be bound (*δέω*) by their genitals, whipped with mallow, and sent away from the Isles of the Blest for their adulterous elopement. A little later (2.31) Lucian sees Cinyras *hanging* (*ἀπαρτάω*) by his genitals during his tour of the Isles of the Wicked.

In the tours of hell men frequently hang by their genitals for fornication. Only in a Muslim text, the *Book of the Ladder* (chap. 79), do *women* hang by their genitals. This is not surprising given the realities of human anatomy. In the Jewish tours of hell adulterous women hang by their breasts, in the Christian tours, by their hair, the parts of the body the women used for seductive display.

Hanging by the hair appears for other reasons in the *Elegies* of Propertius (4.7.45). Propertius' dead lover Cynthia appears to him in a dream

46. G. Bertram, "κρεμάννυμι," *TDNT* 3(1964):918.

47. *ANET*, 55.

48. See also S. Mendelsohn, "Capital Punishment," *JE*; Sifre Deuteronomy 221 and b. Sanhedrin 46b.

and describes her loyal slave Lalage "hanging by her twisted hair and scourged" by a rival. Lalage's only crime is loyalty to her mistress.

Hanging was actually used as a punishment by the Romans. Plautus (*Asinaria* 301) and Terence (*Phormio* 220, *Eunuch* 1021) describe the whipping of slaves who are hanging (*pendere*) by their heels. The Acts of the Martyrs and rabbinic accounts also provide evidence for the practice. Sifre Deuteronomy 221 says that the Bible does not prescribe hanging a *live* criminal "the way the empire does." Lieberman shows that the rabbis' account of an instrument they call גרדון (= *gradus*) corresponds to the *catasta* known from Christian accounts.⁴⁹ The *catasta* was a raised platform used for the questioning and torture of slaves. The person under torture was said to be lifted or suspended (Hebrew, תלה; Latin, *levare, suspendi, extendi*). The descriptions I have read do not make it clear whether the victim was actually hanging, but the verbs used suggest that he was. The use of this form of questioning and torture was extended from its original application to slaves and applied to Christians and, during certain periods, Jews.

HANGING IN HELL

Hanging in the ancient world, then, is not primarily a method of execution. As a form of punishment that has humiliation as a major goal, it is particularly appropriate for the never-ending torment of hell, when execution is meaningless.

Hanging has one other important virtue in a world where the law of talion has such great appeal. It is a punishment that can be applied—at least in the imagination, where the laws of gravity need not operate—to any crime. The author of the Epistle of Titus quotes the Elijah fragment, devoted almost entirely to hanging punishments, to prove the point: "By the limb with which each man sinned, by the same limb will he be punished."

The midrash in *Darkhei Teshuvah* makes the same point. People are punished by the sinful limb "to show that the Holy One, blessed be he, is a righteous judge. The limbs that committed the sin are punished in Gehenna more than the other limbs." A similar though less general formulation is found as early as the Mishnah (Soṭah 1.7): "With the measure a man

49. S. Lieberman, "Roman Legal Institutions in Early Rabbinics and in the Acta Martyrum," in *Texts and Studies* (first published in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 35[1944]: 1–55) 69–71. See also H. Leclercq, "Catasta," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1907–53).

metes out, it is meted out to him. . . . [The adulterous woman] began to sin with the thigh, and afterwards the belly—therefore the thigh suffers first, and then the belly. . . ." (This mishnah is followed by the account of punishments by the sinful limb quoted above.) A more general formulation offered in the exegesis of the same biblical text (Num. 5:21–29) is found in Sifre Numbers 18: "The limb which began the transgression, from it will begin the punishment."

Almost all the tours of hell contain some hanging punishments, but many of these punishments consist not of hanging by the sinful limb but simply of hanging or hanging upside down. Most often such hanging is combined with other tortures. In both Ezra apocalypses, for example, beasts suck at the breasts of hanging women in punishment for abortion or infanticide. Thus, while the hanging forms part of a measure-for-measure punishment, it is not itself measure-for-measure.

An examination of punishments of hanging by the sinful limb uncovers a striking emphasis on two kinds of sins, sexual and verbal (Tables 4 and 5). Of course, it has already been noted that these two types of sins are special concerns of the tours of hell, but their dominance is overwhelming. In fact, when the results of Table 4, where all the punishments of hanging by the sinful limb are listed, are reclassified in Table 5 into the categories of sins of speech and female and male sexual sins, only two punishments from the Acts of Thomas, one from the Greek Apocalypse of Mary, and three from *Gedulat Moshe*, less than a fourth of all hanging punishments, are eliminated.⁵⁰

The verbal sins are uniformly punished by hanging by the tongue. The sins mentioned include slander, gossip, blasphemy, and false witness, sometimes several in a single text.

The results of sexual sins are different for men and women, and for women there is some variation between Jewish and Christian texts. In the Isaiah fragment, *Darkhei Teshuvah*, the Joshua b. Levi fragment (*Reshit Hokhmah*), and *Gedulat Moshe*, women hang by their breasts. In the Latin Elijah fragment, women are said to be tortured in their breasts, but hanging is not specifically mentioned. Still, hanging is the dominant form of

50. The Joshua b. Levi fragment is not counted here because in neither version are its hanging punishments assigned sins. *Gedulat Moshe* contains two hanging punishments for women, hanging by the hair and hanging by the feet, to which no sins are assigned. Without the seven hanging punishments that can be culled from the two versions of the Joshua b. Levi fragment and the two unexplained punishments of *Gedulat Moshe*, a total of twenty-eight punishments of hanging by the sinful limb emerges. Of these, six are not assigned sins that are verbal or sexual.

Table 4. MEASURE-FOR-MEASURE HANGING PUNISHMENTS

<i>Text</i>	<i>Limb</i>	<i>Sin</i>
Apoc. Pet.	tongue	blasphemy
	hair (women)	Eth.: fornication
	Eth.: thighs } (men)	Gk.: adultery
	Gk.: feet }	Eth.: fornication
Acts Th.	tongue	Gk.: adultery
	hair (women)	slander, lying
	hands	immodesty
	feet	stealing
Apoc. Paul ^a	tongue	running to do evil
	eyebrows (men)	adultery
	hair (women)	adultery
	eyelids (men)	incest
Gk. Apoc. Mary	ear	eavesdropping, gossip
	tongue	slander, false witness
Dar. Tesh.	genitals (men)	fornication
	breasts (women)	immodesty
Isa. frag.	tongue	slander
	genitals (men)	fornication with gentile women
	breasts (women)	leading men astray
Josh. frag. ^b	hands	
	tongue	
	eyes	
	ears	
	nose	
	feet	
	breasts	
Ged. Mosh.	eyes	looking at married women, neighbor's money
	ears	listening to vain words, not words of Torah
	tongue	gossip, idle chatter
	feet	walking in slander, not to good deeds
	hands	stealing, murder
	breasts (women)	leading men to unchaste thoughts
	hair (women)	
	feet (women)	

Elij. frag.	genitals (men)	adultery, pederasty
	tongue	blasphemy, false witness
	eyes	stumbling through glances
	breasts (women) ^c	fornication
	hands (men)	fornication

^aThe passage in Apoc. Paul 39 reads, "I saw men and women hanging by their eyebrows and hair." Thus it is not clear whether people of both sexes hang by each part of the body or whether men hang by their eyebrows, while women hang by their hair. In light of the parallels from other texts, the latter interpretation seems more likely.

^bI have listed the contents of both versions combined. The longer version omits ears; the shorter omits noses, feet, and breasts.

^cThe women of Elij. frag. are said to be "tortured" in their breasts; hanging is not specifically mentioned. The punishment appears in the midst of the hanging punishments, however, and the women's partners hang.

punishment in the Elijah fragment. The Isaiah fragment, *Darkhei Teshuvah*, and *Gedulat Moshe* explain that in order to lead men astray these women nursed their babies in public. Thus hanging by the breasts is a perfect application of measure-for-measure.

In the Apocalypse of Peter and the Acts of Thomas, on the other hand, the women hang by their hair (Eth. Apoc. Pet., neck and hair). The Apocalypse of Peter specifically says of these women that they "plaited their hair not to create beauty, but to turn to fornication" (Eth. Apoc. Pet. 7, HSW). The wording suggests that the crime is one of seduction, as in the Jewish texts. (Similarly, Vis. Ezra 17 describes the punishment [not measure-for-measure] of married women "who adorned themselves not for their own husbands but to please other men.") In Acts Th. 36 those being punished are immodest women who "went about in the world bare-headed" (HSW). Again the fittingness of the punishment is emphasized. The Isaiah fragment notes that the women who brazenly nursed in public also uncovered their hair before men with the same goal.⁵¹

Apoc. Paul 39 makes no attempt to explain the punishment of its adulterous women hanging by their hair. This may suggest that the relation of hair to sexuality was obvious to the intended audience. In addition to the women hanging by their breasts, *Ged. Mosh.* 13 has women hanging by their hair, but their sin is never explained.

Men hang by their genitals, hands, feet, and eyes for their sexual sins.

51. See Lieberman, "Shaving of the Hair and Uncovering of the Face Among Jewish Women."

Table 5. HANGING PUNISHMENTS FOR VERBAL AND SEXUAL SINS

<i>Text</i>	<i>Sins of Speech</i>	<i>Sexual Sins: Women</i>	<i>Sexual Sins: Men</i>
Apoc. Pet.	tongue	hair	Eth.: thighs Gk.: feet
Acts Th.	tongue	hair	—
Apoc. Paul	—	hair	eyebrows
Apoc. Ezra	—	—	eyelids
Gk. Apoc. Mary	tongue	—	—
Dar. Tesh.	—	breasts	genitals
Isa. frag.	tongue	breasts	genitals
[Josh. frag. ^a	tongue	breasts	hands, feet, eyes]
Ged. Mosh.	tongue	breasts	eyes
Elij. frag.	tongue	breasts ^b	genitals, hands, eyes

^aNo sins are mentioned for the hanging punishments. I list the likely limbs.

^bSee Table 3, footnote c.

Usually the sin is fornication/adultery, but the Elijah fragment adds homosexuality. The Isaiah fragment specifies that the fornication of the men in its hell was with gentile women.

Part of Lieberman's argument for the Jewish origin of the Elijah fragment is that it contains men hanging by their genitals and women hanging by their breasts. These two categories, he argues, do not appear in Christian sources.⁵² In fact, of the other Jewish texts, only the Isaiah fragment and *Darkhei Teshuvah* offer men hanging by their genitals, and Lieberman is not entirely correct in saying that no Christian text contains such a punishment. In Eth. Apoc. Pet. 7, men hang by their thighs (HSW; *ApNT*, "loins") for having joined the women who are hanging by their hair. "Thighs" seems to be a more modest version of what is found in the Hebrew sources. The "feet" of Gk. Apoc. Pet. 24 may be an even more modest circumlocution. Otherwise hanging by the feet is without parallel as a punishment for sexual sins.

In the Elijah fragment adulterers and pederasts hang by their genitals, but the partners of the women who are hanging by their breasts form a separate category; they hang by their hands. The Manual of Discipline from Qumran (1QS 7:13–15) contains the following rule: "Anyone who takes his hand from under his garment when he is poorly dressed so that his nakedness is seen shall be punished for thirty days." There is no unanimity among commentators about the interpretation of 7, "hand," in this

52. Lieberman, "Sins," 47.

passage.⁵³ Some see Isa. 57:8 as parallel. While the new Jewish Publication Society translation takes the difficult ṭ there as "lust" in light of the Ugaritic *yld*, "to love," many earlier readers have understood it as a euphemism. The conjunction of these two examples seems to suggest that "hand" could be a euphemism for penis. It is not clear, however, why the author of the Elijah fragment should choose a euphemism at one point in the text but not at another.⁵⁴

Still another limb is singled out for a hanging punishment for sexual sin in the Elijah fragment. People (or men) who are said to have been tempted by looking, gazing with lust at guilty deeds,⁵⁵ are punished by hanging by their eyes.

If the sexual content of the sin in the Elijah fragment is not perfectly clear from the wording, there is no ambiguity in *Ged. Mosh.* 13. There adulterers (or, more precisely, "those who looked at married women," together with those who coveted the money of others) hang by their eyes. (In the last compartment of this hell other fornicators are found, tortured alternately by snow and fire.)

As Lieberman notes, there are other punishments related to hanging by the eyes in tours of hell.⁵⁶ In Apoc. Paul 39, men hang by their eyebrows

53. I wish to thank W. L. Lipscomb for pointing out this parallel to me. P. Wernberg-Møller (*The Manual of Discipline* [Leiden: Brill, 1957], 118, n. 30) traces the modern understanding of ṭ as penis to R. Marcus ("Textual Notes on the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 11[1952]:205-11), who points to the use of ṭ in Isa. 57:8. Wernberg-Møller himself does not accept this suggestion. He reports, however, that his teacher Driver agrees with Marcus. H. E. del Medico (*Deux manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte* [Paris: P. Geuthner, 1951], 82) makes the same point as Marcus. G. Vermes (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* [Cleveland: William Collins & World, 1978], 94) also views "hand" as a euphemism.

54. R. A. Kraft suggests to me that this may indicate the use of more than one source in the Elijah fragment. I have already argued for editorial activity in the fragment (see chap. 1, above), but this euphemistic measure-for-measure punishment does not share the characteristics of the punishments I see as the editor's work.

55. "... in videndo scandalizati sunt, respicientes in concupiscencia reatu gesta. . . ." *Videndo* is de Bruyne's emendation of the meaningless *adendo*. Stone (*Books of Elijah*, 15) emends to *ad-tendendo*, which seems better graphically. The meaning of the passage is not changed.

I am unhappy with de Santos Otero's translation (HSW 2:158), "... who have stumbled through their glances and who have looked at foul things with craving for them. . . ." This suggests two separate sins, and the nature of the sin implied by "foul" and "craving" is not at all clear. M. R. James's translation (*LAOT*, 55), "... they that have [been] offended in regard of sight, because they looked upon things done guiltily in concupiscence. . . ." seems preferable.

56. Lieberman, "Sins," 47, n. 105.

for adultery, while in Apoc. Ezra 4:22–24 a man hangs by his eyelids for incest. The eyebrow and eyelid of the Apocalypse of Paul and the Apocalypse of Ezra may be adaptations of hanging by the eye intended to make the punishment more reasonable anatomically. The measure-for-measure nature of the punishment is not made explicit in these texts, since the sin is not described by reference to “looking.” The Apocalypse of Ezra’s description of the man’s sin as “fulfilling a small desire” may be intended to suggest a link to the eyes, the instrument of desire. Perhaps this line of reasoning proved too obscure for the editor of the Vision of Ezra, who describes the sin of those who committed incest as “desiring an evil desire,” but has them punished by hanging without reference to a particular limb or organ (vv. 19–21). Lieberman suggests that the eyebrow is chosen in the Apocalypse of Paul because Juno, the guarantor of the sanctity of marriage, is associated with the eyebrow. If he is right, the use of the eyebrow would not mean that the eye is perceived as the sinful limb.

To summarize, the prominence of punishments of hanging by the sinful limb in certain tours of hell seems to be a result of the suitability of hanging for the ongoing punishment necessary for the eternity of existence in hell and of the ease with which hanging can be used to apply the principle of measure-for-measure. Yet despite the potential for adaptation to a wide variety of sins, hanging is applied primarily to verbal and sexual sins. Parallels to the hanging punishments appear not only in Greek but also in Jewish literature. The most elaborate formulations of the principle of punishment by the sinful limb come from Jewish literature, although these formulations are not applied to the world to come. Roman practice, too, seems to have been an important influence; it probably accounts for the many instances of hanging upside down that figure as part of punishments that are not measure-for-measure.

The presence of some of the same sins and hanging punishments in the Apocalypse of Peter on the one hand, and the Apocalypse of Paul, the Apocalypse of Ezra, and the Greek Apocalypse of Mary on the other is not surprising. These Christian texts share other sin-and-punishment combinations (see, e.g., the discussion of punishments for abortion and infanticide, below), and the hanging punishments are not particularly close.

But the persistence of particular combinations of sin and punishment from the Apocalypse of Peter and the Acts of Thomas through the relatively late Hebrew texts certainly requires explanation. Here the correspondences are much closer. Did these later Jewish texts know the Apocalypse of Peter or a lost relative? Or did all these texts inherit the hanging punishments for verbal and sexual sins from a lost Jewish text (or texts)

that predates the Apocalypse of Peter? These questions will be discussed in Chapter 5, below.

TANTALIZATION AND THE PIVOT PUNISHMENT

Another form of measure-for-measure punishment that appears in a number of tours of hell is tantalization. There are several versions of the punishment of Tantalus in Greek mythology,⁵⁷ but it is from the description in the nekya of the *Odyssey* (11:582–92) that the English word “tantalize” is derived. There Tantalus stands up to his chin in water that recedes as he attempts to drink it, while the tempting fruit on trees above him evades his grasp.

In Apoc. Paul 39 a version of this punishment is given to people who broke their fasts early. They hang over a body of water but are unable to reach the water to drink from it, and they cannot reach the fruit that is placed in their sight. Variants on this sin-and-punishment combination appear in Eth. Apoc. Mary (65–66) and Eth. Apoc. Bar. (74). Tantalization here is a measure-for-measure punishment: inability to control the desire to eat in this world leads to the inability to partake of food in the next world. This is the principle operating in the very similar tantalization of the tax collector in the Palestinian Talmud, discussed above.

The midrash in *Darkhei Teshuvah*, which integrates the story of the Palestinian Talmud into the schema of hell with five chambers, places tantalization in the first chamber, although the trees of the Palestinian Talmud are gone and only water is mentioned.

In the Setme tale tantalization is the punishment for wicked poor men who in life struggled to find enough to eat while their wives robbed them. In death they are condemned to continue the struggle. “Food, water, and bread” hang above them, but as they reach for the food, pits are dug beneath them (45, 49).

In addition, both Eth. Apoc. Mary (55–56) and Eth. Apoc. Bar. (68–69) include a similar scene in their descriptions of heaven. Just outside the heavenly city, as in Apoc. Paul 24, stand men who were perfect in ritual but proud and (in the Apocalypse of Paul and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary) lacking in good deeds. In the Apocalypse of Paul and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary it is stated that these men will eventually be allowed to enter heaven. In the Apocalypse of Paul nearby trees do penance for these men by bowing over and over. This scene has been transformed into an-

⁵⁷ Schwenn, “Tantalos,” PW.

other instance of tantalization in the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch. The trees bear delicious fruit, but as the men reach for it the trees stretch up, out of their grasp. The Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch adds a retreating brook.

Since a description of tantalization close to those in the tours of hell discussed above appears in the *Odyssey*, there is no need to claim that the Apocalypse of Paul and its two descendants are influenced by the Palestinian Talmud or the Setme tale. But there is one detail of the description found in the Apocalypse of Paul, although not in its descendants, that is close to the Palestinian Talmud and that does not appear in Homer or in any of the other classical sources I know.⁵⁸ The tongues of those who prematurely broke their fasts in the Apocalypse of Paul are described as "very dry." In the version of the Palestinian Talmud's story found in Hagigah, the tax collector's tongue is hanging out.⁵⁹ It is interesting that Miriam's sin in the Palestinian Talmud involves irregularity in her fasting.

Another possible link between the Palestinian Talmud and the Christian tours of hell is the pivot that appears in Miriam's ear in the Palestinian Talmud. Under the influence of the Palestinian Talmud, a pivot figures also in *Darkhei Teshuvah*, where it has become a measure-for-measure punishment: the woman's sin is now described as gossip as well as hypocritical fasting.

As noted above, the rich man of the Setme tale is punished with a pivot in his eye.⁶⁰ In Peter the Venerable's account of the visit of Joshua b. Levi to hell in *Contra Judaeos*, Pharaoh lies with his head under the threshold of hell and the pivot of the door of hell in his eye.⁶¹

The pivot also appears in rabbinic texts unrelated to tours of hell.⁶² Both 'Avot d'Rabbi Natan (ed. Schechter, Appendix B, p. 136) and Yalqut Shim'oni (*Vayyelekh*, 940), report Moses' attempt to convince God to revoke his death sentence. In 'Avot d'Rabbi Natan, Moses offers to put his eye under the door three times a day if God will save him from death. In Yalqut Shim'oni, Moses offers to do so three times a year. The thought seems

58. Ibid.; J. E. Hylén, *De Tantalos* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1896), 63–83; W. Scheuer, "Tantalos," *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1916–24) 5: 75–86. It is interesting that Tantalus' crime is sometimes related to speech (see Hylén, *De Tantalos*, 31–35).

59. Gressmann, *Armen Mann*, 72, apparatus, believes that the version in p. Sanhedrin, where no mention is made of the tongue, is more original because it is in Aramaic. Lieberman, "Sins," 33, apparently disagrees.

60. Griffith, *Stories*, 46, translates "bolt" but in his note says that the translation is uncertain and that "pivot" is just as likely.

61. *Patrologia Latina* 189, 632.

62. These rabbinic parallels are noted by Lieberman, *Shkkin*, 39, n. 4.

to be that this punishment is painful enough to be a fair exchange for death.

Midrash Tehillim 104:26 also relates the punishment to death: even putting the tongue under the pivot of the door will not save one from death or Sheol. Lieberman prefers a marginal reading in which one rabbi speaks of the tongue under the pivot, another of putting *oneself* under the pivot.⁶³

Thus all the instances of this punishment in Jewish literature are related to life after death. Either they take place in the afterlife, or they are intended to save from death or hell.

In Apoc. Ezra 4:16–18, the only Christian tour of hell to contain a pivot as punishment, Ezra sees old men with fiery pivots in their ears. Their sin was eavesdropping.⁶⁴ As in *Darkhei Teshuvah*, the punishment has become measure-for-measure.

While *Darkhei Teshuvah* and perhaps Peter the Venerable's *Contra Iudaeos* show the influence of the Palestinian Talmud, there is no reason to argue that the other texts do, especially because the torture is applied to a variety of limbs. It is interesting that the two rabbinic texts involving Moses resemble the Setme tale in making the eyes the pivot's resting place.

If a pivot appeared in the Apocalypse of Paul along with its peculiar form of tantalization, a strong case could be made for some kind of link between the story in the Palestinian Talmud and the apocalypse. The presence of the pivot in the Apocalypse of Ezra is intriguing but difficult to interpret. In light of the rabbinic evidence, it may be that the pivot was a widely known motif, not restricted to tours of hell; its presence in texts from different periods and milieux may require no more explanation than the presence of tantalization.

WATER-CARRIERS IN THE ISAIAH FRAGMENT

The Isaiah fragment contains a punishment that in English might be called tantalization but that does not derive from the punishment of Tantalus. The four versions of the Isaiah fragment show some important differences in the wording of the punishment and in the nature of the sin thus punished. All versions agree that the inhabitants of the first compartment of hell carry water to a pit that never fills up. The two Geniza fragments add

63. Ibid., 40, n. 4.

64. See Lieberman, "Sins," 41, n. 70. The translation "eavesdropper" is an improvement on A. Walker's translation, "they who would not listen" or "who heard wrong" ("Revelation of Esdras," *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 8:572).

another clause. The carriers are not "עֲזוּבִין" according to the first fragment, but are "נֶעֱזוּבִין" according to the second. Both words are passive participial forms of the verb "leave" or "allow."

Further, the first Geniza fragment says that those punished ate and drank and possessed(?) the best fields and vineyards⁶⁵ in this world and transgressed the commandment that forbids coveting. The second Geniza fragment and the version in *Bet ha-Midrash*, although they show substantial differences in wording, mention only the sin of covetousness and not the material conditions of the lives of the sinners.

Lieberman interprets the passage as follows: The first Geniza fragment is correct in seeing two sins, for both Geniza fragments indicate two punishments, carrying water, and not being עֲזוּבִין or being נֶעֱזוּבִין. Since the other punishments in this text are measure-for-measure, these must also be measure-for-measure. The first sin, living luxuriously in this world, preserved only in the first Geniza fragment, is punished with the never-ending labor of bringing water to a well that never fills up. This is measure-for-measure for idleness. The idleness, unfortunately, is not explicit; Lieberman finds it implied in the description of living well.

The correct reading for the second half of the punishment, according to Lieberman, is the first Geniza fragment's negative. The phrase means "not permitted." The water-carriers are not permitted to drink their water in punishment for their covetousness. Lieberman compares this punishment to that of the tax collector in the Palestinian Talmud. He argues further that אֵינָן עֲזוּבִין is the exact equivalent of *non permittebantur* in the tantalization scene in the Apocalypse of Paul.⁶⁶

Lieberman's application of the law of talion can be improved on if the futile task of trying to fill the well is given to those who coveted in life. The attempt to make this task the punishment for idleness is the weakest element of Lieberman's argument, for nowhere are the high-living sinners said to have been idle. But the never-ceasing effort to fill a bottomless well is surely appropriate for people who were never satisfied with what they had, but always wanted more.

Similarly the punishment of not being permitted to drink is more appropriate for the first part of the sin as reported in the first Geniza fragment. There it is said explicitly that the people ate and drank in this world.

65. The sentence in this version of the Isaiah fragment (Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies*, 197) is corrupt. Literally it reads, "These are men who, in this world, used to eat and drink and delightful fields and pleasant vineyards. . . ." Lieberman ("Sins," 37) understands the sentence to mean that the sinners owned fields and vineyards.

66. Ibid., 37–38, 41. *Non permittebantur* is the reading of the Paris MS. The St. Gall MS reads *non sinebat eos*, while, as Lieberman notes, Redaction 7 reads *non sinebantur*.

An advantage of this approach is that the first sin of the first Geniza fragment now corresponds to the first punishment, while the second sin corresponds to the second punishment.

The Isaiah fragment's version of tantalization seems unrelated to the version found in the other tours of hell,⁶⁷ but a source is not hard to find. Lieberman notes that the water-carriers of Hades are a common classical motif, according to F. Cumont one of the most common designs on sarcophagi in late antiquity.⁶⁸

PUNISHMENT FOR ABORTION AND INFANTICIDE

Another variety of measure-for-measure punishment is meted out to parents who have committed abortion and infanticide in the Apocalypse of Peter, the Apocalypse of Paul, the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary, the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch, the Greek Apocalypse of Mary, the Apocalypse of Ezra, the Vision of Ezra, and perhaps the Acts of Thomas. All the punishments are related.

The "perhaps" of the Acts of Thomas applies to the description of the punishment of the sinners who "perverted the intercourse of man and woman" (chap. 55; HSW). This phrase in the context of the tours of hell usually suggests adultery or fornication. But nearby, heaps of infants identified as the children of the sinners are piled up as testimony against their parents. A common feature of the punishment for abortion/infanticide is that the children are present to accuse their parents.

It is likely, then, that the perversion of the intercourse of men and women implies abortion or infanticide, the outcome of its more obvious sense, adultery or fornication. On the other hand, it is possible that the infants are complaining about the parents' adultery, which has tainted them.⁶⁹ This would not explain why the children are infants, however. Thus the crime of perverting intercourse of man and woman is probably best understood as including abortion and infanticide.

67. Lieberman makes a case for the parallels between the Isaiah fragment and the Palestinian Talmud, but is cautious: "This reminds us to some extent of the passage in the Palestinian Talmud mentioned above" ("Sins," 38). His sense of a relationship grows out of his family tree for the Jewish texts, with which I take issue below (see the Apocalypse of Peter and the Jewish texts in chap. 5).

68. F. Cumont, *Lux Perpetua* (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1949), 214.

69. Methodius, *Symposium* 2.6, cites the Apocalypse of Peter about God's tender care for "children who are born before their time, even if they be the offspring of adultery" (HSW 2:675). This suggests a taint attached to adulterous conception.

Apocalypse of Peter, Ezra Apocalypses, Greek Apocalypse of Mary

The Apocalypse of Peter is the earliest of the texts that contain a form of this punishment. Chapter 8 of the Ethiopic version describes two punishments, one following the other, similar in some details. In the first, women stand up to their necks in a pit of refuse. Their children sit opposite them, and lightning comes forth from their eyes and pierces the mothers' eyes. In the second punishment men and women stand naked, as their children, who are "in a place of delight," accuse them before God. Milk comes forth from the mothers' breasts and turns into devouring beasts. These beasts then torture the parents forever, "because they forsook the command of God and killed their children."

In both punishments the parents are confronted by their children. Are the punishments doublets of a single original? The women in the first punishment are explicitly said to have undergone abortions. The second punishment includes both men and women. The logic of talion would suggest that the sin of the mothers in the second punishment involved rejection of nursing. Thus this punishment may be seen as appropriate for infanticide. If so, the Apocalypse of Peter contains separate punishments for two related sins.

The Greek version of the Apocalypse of Peter contains only the first punishment and specifies abortion as the sin. Since the preserved Greek is relatively late, it is possible to explain the absence of the second punishment as the result of the discomfort of a scribe (or redactor) with the presence of two such similar punishments.

Clement of Alexandria's citations of the Apocalypse of Peter in his *Eclogues* are the earliest witnesses to its text. In *Eclogue* 41, Clement mentions the care-taking angel (τημελοῦχος; the adjective becomes the proper name Temlakos in the Ethiopic), who appears in the Ethiopic text in the second punishment. The verb Clement uses to describe the parents' sin is ἐκτίθηναι, "to expose" (children).⁷⁰ Clement goes on to describe the lightning coming forth from the children and striking the mothers' eyes.⁷¹ In the Ethiopic version of the Apocalypse of Peter this is the punishment of the mothers who have had abortions.

In *Eclogues* 48–49, Clement again cites a passage about the care-taking

70. Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, cites Clement in *Stromateis* 2.18 as an example of this usage.

71. The translation in HSW, "a flash of fire," is misleading. Ἀστραπή means "lightning." It is true that Clement writes ἀστραπή πυρός, but it is unfortunate to lose the literal sense of ἀστραπή. The Greek of the Apocalypse of Peter is corrupt, but it seems to have read ἀκτίνες πυρός.

angel, but this time in relation to children who are victims of abortion. The verb here is *'εξαμβλόω*, to cause to miscarry. Clement then quotes the passage about the mothers' milk turning to beasts.

The evidence of the *Eclogues* strongly supports the originality of two punishments, as in the Ethiopic text. Clement clearly knows both punishments, although it appears that he attributes to the aborters the punishment that the Ethiopic text gives to the infanticides, and vice versa. The Ethiopic's assignment of punishments seems preferable to Clement's, since the punishment by means of mothers' milk should belong, according to the principle of measure-for-measure, to the infanticides rather than the aborters.

The motif of the children's accusation of their parents does not appear in either of the passages in the *Eclogues*. This does not necessarily mean that it was not found in the text before Clement. It was certainly known by the late third century, for it appears in Methodius' citation of the Apocalypse of Peter (*Symposium* 2.6). Although the wording is somewhat different, the content is unmistakable.

Like the Apocalypse of Peter, and perhaps dependent on it, the Vision of Ezra contains two distinct punishments. Women who bore children in adultery and then killed them are sent into a burning furnace while the children accuse their mothers before God (vv. 51–53). Other women hang in fire while serpents suck at their breasts. These women too killed their children. In addition, they “did not give their breasts to other orphans” (vv. 53a–54).⁷²

This last clause seems to be an attempt to make manifest the measure-for-measure nature of the punishment, but it misses the point. The sin of these women was not that they withheld milk from other children but that they withheld milk (and all care) from their own children.

The Vision of Ezra, then, follows the Apocalypse of Peter in the presence of two punishments and in some details of the punishments, but it does not distinguish two sins. It is not clear whether “killing” children implies abortion, infanticide, or both. As opposed to the Apocalypse of Peter, only women are punished; while the beasts that emerge from the

72. The women with the serpents at their breasts are found only in the long form of the Vision of Ezra, although the short form (MS V) suggests an omission, for, as it stands, the angel's explanation, “These are they who killed their children and did not give their breasts to other orphans” (v. 54), appears to apply to the accusing children (v. 53). Thus Dinzelbacher's claim (“Die Vision Alberichs,” 437–38) that v. 53a, which describes the women with serpents, is an interpolation is difficult to accept. Even if he is correct that the other passages peculiar to the long version are interpolations, this passage, for which the Apocalypse of Ezra supports the long version, cannot possibly be correct as it stands in the short version.

mothers' milk in the Apocalypse of Peter devour both mothers and fathers, the serpents of the Vision of Ezra ignore fathers and suck at the mothers' breasts.

The Apocalypse of Ezra contains only one punishment for abortion/infanticide (5:2-3). Four beasts suck at the breasts of a woman who is hanging for the sin of begrudging her milk and throwing her babies into rivers. This is very close to the second punishment of the Vision of Ezra, but the creatures are beasts, as in the Apocalypse of Peter, rather than serpents.

The aborters and infanticides of the Greek Apocalypse of Mary appear in chapters 5-7, where they are immersed in a river of fire up to their breasts and necks. The depths of immersion are not accidental. The crime of those immersed to their breasts, both men and women, is described as throwing off their children and committing fornication. If throwing off children were described as denying milk to them as it is elsewhere, the punishment would be measure-for-measure. The measure-for-measure nature of immersion to the neck is made explicit by describing the sin of the men and women so punished as "eating human flesh," that is, abortion.

A punishment more closely related to those in the Ezra apocalypses appears in chapter 20, where a deaconess is seen hanging while a ten-headed beast chews at her breasts. (It is typical of the Greek Apocalypse of Mary to be concerned with the sins of church officials.) Her sin is that she defiled her body in fornication. The principle of talion has been submerged here, but perhaps it can be recovered. The sins and punishments of the two Ezra apocalypses suggest the following line of reasoning. The end result of fornication is abortion or infanticide, figuratively or literally "denying milk." The breast is thus the sinful limb in relation to the results of fornication, and a beast chewing at the breasts is a measure-for-measure punishment for fornication.

A second passage in the Greek Apocalypse of Mary makes use of a similar punishment. In chapter 19, female presbyters hang by their nails while fire comes forth from their mouths and burns them. Then beasts emerge from the fire and gnaw at the women. The sin of these women is that they remarried after the death of their presbyter husbands. The beasts are not explicitly related to the breasts here, but the associations of this punishment suggest that the author of the text considered the women guilty of fornication.

Beasts sucking at the breasts of women appear also outside the tours of hell. In its description of the woes to come on Egypt in the last days, the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah predicts a great horror: "At that time the king will command that every nursing woman be seized and brought to him in

fetters and that they suckle dragons and that their blood be sucked from their breasts. . . .⁷³

In his edition of the Apocalypse of Elijah, J.-M. Rosenstiehl notes that the apocalypse in an Arabic Life of Shenouti includes a similar evil. Jesus reveals to Shenouti the catastrophes to come on Egypt: "Woe to women who are pregnant and nursing in those days! They will pierce the bellies of pregnant women, they will make serpents go in who will penetrate and suck the breasts. . . ." Rosenstiehl believes that the author of the Life of Shenouti drew on the Apocalypse of Elijah. The date of the Arabic translation of the Life is not known; Amélineau thinks that the Coptic Life from which it was translated can be dated quite precisely to 685–90 on the basis of historical allusions.⁷⁴

The presence of this motif in texts unlikely to have been influenced directly by the Apocalypse of Peter because their concerns are so different is relevant to the question of the nature of the relationship between the Apocalypse of Peter and the two Ezra apocalypses. The Ezra apocalypses do not seem to show the influence of the Apocalypse of Peter in any other specifics, and the woes of the Apocalypse of Elijah and the Life of Shenouti contain an element present in the Ezra apocalypses, but not in the Apocalypse of Peter, beasts sucking at the breasts. Further, both the Apocalypse of Elijah and the Apocalypse of Ezra contain descriptions of the antichrist that belong to the same genre, although they do not share many details. On the other hand, the Vision of Ezra contains two separate punishments for abortion/infanticide without providing any rationale like the two separate sins of the Apocalypse of Peter. One way to make sense of the two punishments in the Vision of Ezra is to attribute them ultimately, if not directly, to the influence of the Apocalypse of Peter.

Apocalypse of Paul, Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary, Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch

A somewhat different form of punishment for the same sins appears in Apoc. Paul 40, Eth. Apoc. Mary (65), and Eth. Apoc. Bar. (71–72). In the Apocalypse of Paul men and women are tortured on a fiery spit (*ApNT*),

73. A. Pietersma and S. T. Comstock, with H. A. Attridge, *The Apocalypse of Elijah*, Texts and Translations 9, Pseudepigrapha Series 19 (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981) 37.

74. J.-M. Rosenstiehl, *L'Apocalypse d'Élie*, Textes et études pour servir à l'histoire du Judaïsme intertestamentaire 1 (Paris: P. Guethner, 1972), 40–41. E. Amélineau, trans., "Vie arabe de Schnoudi," *Mémoires de la mission archéologique française au Caire* 4 (1888): *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne aux IV^e et V^e siècles*, 342–43. I translate from the French.

while beasts tear them to pieces. The description of their sin does not allow a decision between abortion and infanticide. According to the Coptic version, the dead children watch the punishment. In the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary nuns hang in the midst of fire, while fiery snakes, dogs, lions, and panthers attack them. Both abortion and infanticide are explicitly mentioned here. In the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch priests and widows who had abortions hang from fiery trees while fiery snakes and dogs devour them.

In these texts the devouring beasts are not associated with the mothers' breasts. The punishments offer a different kind of measure-for-measure. In all three texts an accusation similar to that in the Apocalypse of Peter is reported: the children, who are not actually present except in the Coptic version of the Apocalypse of Paul, are said to have complained that their parents threw them to the beasts (Apoc. Paul: dogs, pigs, river; Eth. Apoc. Mary: dogs, pigs; Eth. Apoc. Bar.: dogs, beasts). In turn their parents are tortured by beasts, although not precisely the ones to whom they threw their offspring.

Duensing takes this punishment as evidence of the Apocalypse of Paul's dependence on the Apocalypse of Peter.⁷⁵ But placed among the punishments assembled here, the punishment in the Apocalypse of Paul does not appear to be very close to that of the Apocalypse of Peter. The only elements of the punishment in the Apocalypse of Paul that might suggest dependence on the Apocalypse of Peter are the accusation of the children, which differs considerably in its content in each of the apocalypses and which is to be found in all the texts examined here except the Apocalypse of Ezra, and the presence of angels to whom the murdered children are entrusted. (See under the Apocalypse of Peter and the Apocalypse of Paul in chap. 5, below.)

The Angel Temelouchos

Both the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch call the angel in charge of the souls of the dead infants Temelouchos (or a variant). This name appears also in the Ethiopic version of the Apocalypse of Peter; it is a transformation of the Greek adjective *τημελοῦχος*, care-taking, which describes that angel in excerpts from the Apocalypse of Peter in Clement (*Eclogue* 48) and Methodius (*Symposium* 2.6).

⁷⁵ HSW 2:757.

The Latin version of the Apocalypse of Paul refers to the angels involved in this episode as "angels of Tartarus"; it lacks the term or name "Temelouchos" altogether. The Greek version of the Apocalypse of Paul, which contains an unnamed angel in the episode of the infanticides, gives the name Temelouchos to the angel to whom the evil soul is entrusted after it leaves the body (chap. 16) and to the angel who participates in the torture of a gluttonous elder (chap. 34). The angel in chapter 16 in the long Latin is named "Tartaruchus"; in chapter 16 in the St. Gall manuscript and in both manuscripts in chapter 34 the angels are called "angels of Tartarus." The Coptic twice refers to an angel named "Aftemelouchos." He appears in the passage parallel to chapter 34 in the Greek and Latin versions (Coptic 12a) and also in the episode of the infanticides as the angel who presides over their punishment and to whom the souls of their victims are entrusted (14b–15a).

In his edition of the Coptic Apocalypse of Paul, E. A. W. Budge suggests that the name "Aftemelouchos" means "four angels." In Coptic ⲁϥⲧⲉ means "four," and Budge takes ⲙⲉⲗⲟϥϥⲟⲥ to mean "angel" on the basis of Arabic parallels.⁷⁶ It is true that four angels torture the bishop (12a) and defiled virgins (13b) in the Coptic Apocalypse of Paul. (Four angels torture the bishop [chap. 35] and the virgins [chap. 39] in the Latin version as well.) But both times the Coptic calls the four angels ⲁⲣⲣⲉⲗⲟⲥ. The word ⲙⲉⲗⲟϥϥⲟⲥ is not Coptic. If the Coptic text originally referred to Temelouchos where the Latin has the more easily understood "angels of Tartarus," "Aftemelouchos" may represent an attempt to naturalize the peculiar name by making at least one element meaningful in Coptic, perhaps under the influence of the four angels who appear earlier in the text.

Both the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch put the name of the angel at the end of the episode of the infanticides, as in the Apocalypse of Peter. Contact with the Apocalypse of Peter is not out of the question for Ethiopic texts, but because there are no other signs of the Apocalypse of Peter's direct influence, either in this episode or elsewhere, it seems preferable to assume that the version of the Apocalypse of Paul on which the Ethiopic texts drew contained the name Temelouchos, probably in the position in which it is found in the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Baruch. This version might have been an Ethiopic translation of the Apocalypse of Paul, although it is also possible that the Ethiopic descendant texts drew on an Arabic version

76. E. A. W. Budge, *Coptic Texts*, vol. 5 (reprint of *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* [1915]; New York: AMS, 1977), 1060, n. 1.

no longer extant or not yet recovered. It may well be that other copies of the Apocalypse of Paul in Coptic contained the name Temelouchos (or Aftermelouchos) at the end of the episode of the infanticides. Since none of the other versions of the Apocalypse of Paul shows any trace of the care-taking angel, the reading of the Coptic may indicate renewed contact between the Apocalypse of Paul and the Apocalypse of Peter in Egypt.

PUNISHMENT FOR LOSS OF VIRGINITY BEFORE MARRIAGE

In the discussion of sexual sins above, it was noted that there is a close correlation between the appearance of a punishment for abortion/infanticide in a text and the appearance of a punishment for the loss of virginity before marriage. Eight instances of a punishment for abortion/infanticide appear in the seventeen tours of hell, and seven of a punishment for loss of virginity; five texts contain both. Thus, although the punishments for loss of virginity are not measure-for-measure, this is a convenient place to discuss them.

All the punishments for abortion/infanticide, it appeared above, contain common elements. The same is true for the punishments of the ex-virgins, except the two that appear in texts that do not contain punishments for abortion/infanticide, the *Life of Pachomios* and the *Elijah fragment*. In the *Elijah fragment*, the ex-virgins are roasted on a gridiron; in the *Life of Pachomios*, souls, not identified as female, are burned inside a huge stone structure.

The earliest version of the punishment in the remaining texts is that of *Eth. Apoc. Pet. 11*. There the virgins are "clad in darkness for raiment" (HSW); their flesh is to be torn apart. In *Apoc. Paul 39* the young women are dressed in black, and tormenting angels lead them "toward darkness" by means of blazing chains set on their necks. *Eth. Apoc. Mary (64)* copies the punishment as described in the *Apocalypse of Paul* quite closely: the women are again dressed in black, fiery chains encircle their necks, and they are led toward a fiery river.

The situation in the two remaining texts is a little more complicated. In *Eth. Apoc. Bar. (70-71)* "people" punished in an abyss of fire are said to have lost their virginity in deserted places without having been given in marriage by their parents. This is exactly how the sin of the ex-virgins, all female, is described in the *Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary*. At the very beginning of the tour of hell, Baruch sees "virgins clothed in darkness" (70). "These are mad virgins who were avaricious." The sin-and-punishment combination of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, the *Apocalypse of Paul*, and espe-

cially the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Mary has been broken up. The punishment of dark raiment is still identified with virgins, but their sin is not loss of virginity before marriage. Loss of virginity is provided with a punishment unrelated to the others.

The description of the punishment of the ex-virgins in Vis. Ezra 43–44 contains a crucial word, apparently corrupt, that defies interpretation. Ezra sees virgins coming toward the west with a cry and with five-hundred-pound *pogines* (MS L) or *bogis* (MSS VH).⁷⁷ Unfortunately neither *pogines* nor *bogis* is readily understood as Latin or muddled Greek. The variants in the two textual traditions suggest that the copyists were unsure of the meaning. The phrase “toward the west” may echo the Apocalypse of Paul’s “toward darkness”; as the Latin *occiduum* reminds us, the west is where the sun sets. Perhaps the five-hundred-pound burdens the women bear are chains or something similar.⁷⁸

The dark raiment of the Apocalypse of Peter, then, is transmitted through the Apocalypse of Paul to the two Ethiopic texts. The additions of the Apocalypse of Paul to the punishment as it appears in the Apocalypse of Peter also recur in the later texts. The Apocalypse of Peter and the Apocalypse of Paul are much closer here than in the punishments for abortion/infanticide. It is interesting that the Vision of Ezra, which for abortion/infanticide showed parallels to the Apocalypse of Peter found nowhere else, is here linked to the other texts, if at all, through parallels to the Apocalypse of Paul.

BLINDNESS

Blindness appears as a measure-for-measure punishment in the Apocalypse of Peter, the Apocalypse of Paul, and the Apocalypse of Zephaniah. The importance of this cluster of texts justifies discussion of this punishment despite the relatively small number of occurrences.

One of the three groups of sinners that Zephaniah sees submerged in a sea consists of catechumens who have heard but not fulfilled the word of God (15–16). They are blind.

The blind catechumens are paralleled in Eth. Apoc. Pet. 12 by blind and

77. The selection of readings published by Wahl from the new MSS of the Vision (“Vier neue Textzeugen”) includes nothing of use here.

78. J. R. Mueller and G. E. Robbins, “Vision of Ezra,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, in press), translate the problematic word as “neck irons.” They were kind enough to inform me that their translation is based on the parallels in the other tours of hell.

dumb men and women dressed in white, who are tortured with coals of fire. Their sin is described as follows: "These are they who give alms and say, 'We are righteous before God,' while they have not striven for righteousness" (HSW). In Apoc. Paul 40 these sinners are "the heathen who gave alms and did not know the Lord God." They are blind and are dressed in bright clothing. (The St. Gall manuscript adds that they are found in a pit of fire.)

It is interesting that in the Apocalypse of Paul the clothing of the sinners and alms are mentioned, as in the Apocalypse of Peter, and that, as in the Apocalypse of Zephaniah, the sinners are not (originally) believers. The wording in the Apocalypse of Peter does not suggest that the sinners are heathen or catechumens. Thus the Apocalypse of Paul contains details found in both the other texts, while the Apocalypse of Zephaniah and the Apocalypse of Peter do not share any distinctive details. This is exactly what one would expect given the other evidence for the relationship of the Apocalypse of Paul to the two earlier texts.

The sin of the Apocalypse of Zephaniah, hearing but not fulfilling, is not exactly the same as the sin of the Apocalypse of Peter, claiming to be righteous but not striving for righteousness. Blindness is an appropriate punishment for both, however. It is the physical actualization of the lack of self-awareness or self-criticism that allows the sins to come into being.

Blindness appears as a punishment in both Greek and Jewish literature.⁷⁹ In the case of Oedipus, blindness, although self-inflicted, has much the same significance as in the case of the sinners of the tours of hell: blame-worthy ignorance is crystallized into physical blindness. The blindness inflicted on Samson by the Philistines is understood as a measure-for-measure punishment by Mishnah *Soṭah* 1:8 (Danby): "Samson went after [the desire of] his eyes—therefore the Philistines put out his eyes. . . ."⁸⁰

79. See M. E. Monbeck, *The Meaning of Blindness: Attitudes Toward Blindness and Blind People* (Bloomington, Ind., and London: Indiana University, 1973), 48–53.

80. I would like to thank G. W. E. Nickelsburg for pointing out that pseudo-Philo's treatment of this incident (43.5) makes the same point.